

GUAM BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR OPTOMETRY

Tuesday, March 31, 2026 at 8:30 AM Guam (ChST)
 194 Hernan Cortes Ave., Terlaje Prof. Bldg., Ste. 213A
 Hagåtña, Guam 96910
 Phone: 671-735-7404-12
Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83710020357?pwd=holdMbmqGCI9WNXjZOUmMdePdvjicd.1>

Meeting ID: 837 1002 0357

Passcode: 071528

MINUTES

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status	
I	CALL TO ORDER	Meeting Chaired by M. San Nicolas	Chair	0840	Call to Order	
II	Roll Call	GBBC <u>Present:</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marlene San Nicolas, O.D., Chairperson <u>Virtually Present:</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Kim, O.D., Vice-Chairperson <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Anglim, O.D., Secretary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julian Archer, O.D., Treasurer	Other Attendees: <u>Present:</u> Sharon Manibusan, HPLO <u>Virtually Present:</u> PeterJohn Camacho, DPHSS Melani Cruz, Public	GBEO	0840	Quorum Establish
III	Proof of Publication	Reviewed and found to be in conformance with current laws 03/24/26 and 03/27/26. <i>Motion to Approve: Dr. Kim; 2nd: Dr. Archer.</i>		08841	Confirmed	
IV	APPROVAL OF AGENDA	<i>Motion to Approve: Dr. Kim; 2nd: Dr. Archer.</i>	GBEO	0841	Unanimously Approved	
V	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	Minutes Dated: 02/24/2026 <i>Motion to Approve: Dr. Kim; 2nd: Dr. Archer.</i>	GBEO	0841	Unanimously Approved	
VI	TREASURER'S REPORT	No report S. Manibusan to provide a treasurer's report for the next board meeting.	J. Archer	0842	No Report, Until Next Board Meetin	
VII	HPLO REPORT	No report	HPLO	0842	No Report	
VIII	OLD BUSINESS	A. The practice act revision (TPA) – ongoing discussion Dr. San Nicolas encouraged members to review the current Practice Act and rules and regulations to become familiar with their wording, and it was emphasized that any questions or areas of uncertainty should be discussed collaboratively to ensure a shared understanding of their meaning moving forward.	GBEO	0843	Ongoing Discussio	
		B. Rules and regulations proposed revision 2.0 – ongoing discussion	GBEO		Ongoing Discussio	
		C. Complaints:				

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GBEO-CO-2025-001 S. Manibusan reported that no response had been received from the AG’s office regarding the submitted request for guidance on how to proceed without the applicant’s knowledge and in the absence of supporting records. 	GBEO		Ongoing, No Update from AG’s Office
		<p>D. Inspection The Board discussed readiness to send out the revised letter to the Attorney General and proceed with related inspections, confirming that the letter had been previously reviewed and discussed at the last meeting. Consensus was expressed to move forward with sending the letters, while logistical considerations such as inspection assignments and whether to conduct them in pairs were noted for future discussion. The members also deliberated on establishing an appropriate timeframe for the inspections, taking into account scheduling conflicts and planned travel, and generally agreed to provide a defined window—potentially between June and July—to allow adequate coordination and flexibility.</p> <p>The members agreed to adjust the inspection timeframe to May 1 through June 30 in order to complete activities prior to the summer holiday period, noting that there were 13 sites to be inspected. It was confirmed that the notification letters would be distributed both by mail and email to ensure redundancy and proper communication, with additional measures such as delivery verification or receipt confirmation requested to ensure that all recipients acknowledged receipt. The members also agreed on the need to convene a meeting prior to May 1 to organize inspection assignments, form groups, and ensure alignment on procedures before commencing the inspections.</p>	GBEO		Noted
IX	NEW BUSINESS	A. Initial Applications by Endorsement		0857	
		<p>1. Melani A. Cruz The Board reviewed the application of M. Cruz and identified inconsistencies regarding her licensure and claimed years of practice, noting that while documentation indicated her Virginia license was issued in 2021, she asserted having practiced since 2017, raising concerns about whether any prior practice occurred without proper licensure. Additional discussion considered possible licensure in Washington State; however, it was noted that supporting documentation had not been fully provided. Despite these concerns, it was reiterated that under current regulations, all applicants are required to complete the practical examination regardless of years of experience, rendering the question of her total length of practice less impactful on the immediate licensure decision, though clarification of her credentials and compliance with endorsement requirements remained necessary.</p> <p>The applicant, M. Cruz, was acknowledged as present during the meeting and provided clarification regarding her licensure history, stating that she had been licensed in Washington</p>			Unanimously Approved

Agenda Item	Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
	<p>State since October 2018 and had actively practiced there until relocating to Virginia. She explained that while she was unable to provide an original copy of her Washington license due to its inactive status and record disposal, verification of her licensure dates could be obtained through the Washington State public health website using her identifying information, thereby supporting her claim of several years of professional practice.</p> <p>Board members sought clarification from M. Cruz regarding her eligibility under the requirement of active practice within a jurisdiction of licensure for seven consecutive years, during which she confirmed that although she had not practiced in Virginia for the full seven-year period, she had continuously practiced since 2018, first in Washington State and then in Virginia without any gap in employment. She further confirmed that she currently holds an active license in Virginia and remains actively practicing there, while also informing the Board of her imminent relocation to Guam and intent to obtain local licensure to continue her practice.</p> <p>Board members discussed whether the inactive status of M. Cruz’s Washington license affected the continuity of her practice for endorsement purposes and determined that, regardless of this consideration, she had satisfied the necessary requirements to proceed through the examination pathway. It was clarified that licensure by endorsement was applicable under the current circumstances, and that she would be required to complete a practical examination before the Board. M. Cruz acknowledged and accepted this requirement, and the process for scheduling and conducting the practicum upon her arrival in Guam was explained. The board expressed that this additional step was consistent with existing regulations with ongoing efforts to update them, and a motion was subsequently made to approve her application and allow her to sit for the required practical examination.</p> <p>Dr. Kim discussed the role of background checks in evaluating applicants, particularly in identifying any prior issues related to licensure or professional conduct, and Dr. San Nicolas noted that M. Cruz had a past matter in her file that had been resolved with no charges sustained. While it was generally agreed that the issue was not related to her clinical practice and was therefore considered moot, some members expressed that such information could still be relevant when assessing moral character. M. Cruz was given the opportunity to provide clarification and explained that the matter stemmed from a corporate advertising issue in Washington State, where she was held accountable due to regulatory policies despite not having direct control over the</p>			

Agenda Item		Discussion/Decision	Responsible party	Reporting time frame	Status
		<p>advertisements, and she confirmed that the charges were ultimately dismissed and fully documented in public records. <i>Motion to Approve: Dr. Kim; 2nd: Dr. Archer.</i></p>			
		<p>2. Dean Scott Steinberger Board members reviewed D. Steinberger’s licensure in California, noting that although his license had been issued in 1999 and was valid through 2027, he had practiced for less than seven years in the relevant period. The discussion considered whether the Board could exercise discretion or was strictly bound by law, ultimately determining that he must pursue licensure by examination and complete the practical like other candidates. Background checks were also addressed, revealing a prior matter in his file that had been resolved with no charges sustained and was unrelated to his optometry practice; while some members noted that such information could inform considerations of moral character, it was generally deemed moot for the purposes of licensure.</p> <p>The Board discussed that D. Steinberger’s application was incomplete, noting that the checklist had not been fully completed and that additional documentation was required. Members agreed that his file needed to be reviewed in detail, and they explored the possibility of obtaining information over the phone to facilitate the review. It was confirmed that his prior disclosures to the Board could be examined in the interim. The Board decided to table D. Steinberger’s application until the following month to allow for the submission of the remaining documentation and to enable a more thorough review before any decision. <i>Motion to Table to Next Month: Dr. Kim; 2nd: Dr. Archer.</i></p>			Tabled Until Next Month
X	NEXT BOARD MEETING	Next Scheduled Meeting: April 28, 2026	GBEO	0913	Set Date
XI	ADJOURNMENT	<i>Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Kim; 2nd: Dr. Archer.</i>	GBEO	0914	Adjourned

Minutes Drafted by: FLAME TREE Freedom Center, Inc.

Date Submitted:

Submitted by the GBBC Secretary:

Date:

Approved by the GBBC with or without changes:

Date: 4/28/2026

Certified by or Attested by the Chairperson:

Malcolm J. ...

Date: 4/28/2026
