

# **Materials for Item No. 4**

-Minutes re 7/31/2025 regular meeting

STATE OF NEVADA

JOE LOMBARDO  
Governor



DR. KRISTOPHER SANCHEZ  
*Director*

PERRY FAIGIN  
NIKKI HAAG  
MARCEL F. SCHAEERER  
*Deputy Directors*

ADAM SCHNEIDER  
*Executive Director*

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY  
OFFICE OF NEVADA BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COUNCILS STANDARDS  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

MINUTES  
OF PUBLIC MEETING  
July 31, 2025

1. **Call to Order.** Director Schneider opened the live meeting at 12:00p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Director Schneider read the Zoom log-in information into the record for AB 219 compliance as Meeting ID: 879 0910 6662, Passcode: 673378, telephone 1 669 900 6833. Board members Sally Balecha, Mariah Smith, O.D., Julie Alamo-Leon, O.D., Jeffrey Austin, O.D., and executive director Adam Schneider, Esq. were present via Zoom. Quorum established.
3. **Public Comment.** Director Schneider invited public comment. No public comment received.
4. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Election of Board President, Vice-President and Financial Officer re FY2025-26. Dr. Austin moved for Dr. Smith to be president. Dr. Alamo seconded. No other nominations. Motion passed unanimously. Dr. Smith moved for Dr. Austin to be vice-president. Dr. Alamo seconded. No other nominations. Motion passed unanimously. Dr. Smith sought clarification that Dr. Alamo was the Board's FY2025 financial officer, and then moved for Dr. Alamo to be financial officer. Dr. Austin seconded. No other nominations. Motion passed unanimously.
5. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Complaint 25-15.

Director Schneider stated all Complaints on this Agenda are being presented in a double blind manner, i.e., the Board is not being told who the complainant is or who the subject licensee is, and the materials associated with this agenda item are redacted to eliminate any identification of party identities.

As to Complaint 25-15:

The inquiry letter lays out the history that Licensee 1's dies years ago, and Licensee 1's lawyer told the Board about the death and that the Subject Licensee would be the successor to the stock of Licensee 1's entity. Those emails were provided during the course of the investigation.

Subject Licensee admits he never filed a Fictitious Name for several years after he took over the business from the deceased Licensee 1, and claims not to have known about advertising the services of the deceased Licensee 1 on the business' website. The Board was reminded about in the past

issuing a fine for an OD who claimed he/she did not know or control the content of his/her own website.

Licensee 1's last name is common to at least one other licensee in the same area of the State, which potentially led to a siphoning of patients looking for the same surname when Licensee 1 has been deceased for years.

Subject Licensee has moved to WA, and no longer practices in NV, sold his interest in the business, and the new OD-owner timely filed Fictitious Name applications.

Entity 1's website has changed and the advertising on the doors have changed.

Director Schneider is not advocating one way or another for a sanction, but ala last meeting's Complaint 25-14 of belatedly filed Fictitious Name and illegal partial ownership of the OD's spouse, should a fine be issued, any fine should be administrative and not something reportable to the Databank.

Director Schneider invited Dr. Austin's comments. Dr. Austin stated the Board encountered the same kind of thing as Complaint 25-14, and there is no malintent, and recommended an administrative fine for that same amount. Dr. Smith recognized the Complaint is about the Subject Licensee but also noted timely compliance by the new owners and the correction of the advertising once they were aware of the issues. Dr. Alamo agreed.

Dr. Smith moved for \$200 administrative fine. Dr. Alamo seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

6. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Complaint 25-16. The summary is a patient upset that the patient cannot go to a different OD due to the Subject Licensee already using the yearly benefits where the patient wanted the OD to rewrite the prescription from 2.75 to 3.0 so the patient can order contacts elsewhere.

The review of the billing shows it was billed for the fitting and not any products. The question for the Board is when, where, and how the patient's \$75 visual plan benefit is spent or billed and if it arises to the level of unprofessional conduct.

Director Schneider invited Dr. Smith's comments. Dr. Smith stated different plans have different billing parameters, and the OD cannot use 2023 benefits for 2024, and any misquote by an administrative person of the OD does not arise to the level of unprofessional conduct. Dr. Austin stated the OD appears to have done the billing correctly, that this is an insurance company issue, and what the patient sought is something that the OD cannot do for benefits that no longer exist. Dr. Alamo agreed, and stated patients do not always understand how their vision or medical insurance plan works. Public Member Balecha agrees, and that the patient tried to use a benefit that had already passed and was no available any longer, and the patient should contacted her insurance company.

Dr. Smith moved to dismiss with no further action. Public Member Balecha seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

7. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Complaint 25-17. This Complaint was received from the Board of Medical Examiners. The summary is a patient presented to the practice but did not want to adhere to pre-testing protocols and the exam was an add-on beyond the OD's last scheduled patient of the day. Claimant alleged an American with Disabilities (ADA) violation or that accommodations should have been provided but never stated what those accommodations should have been. The Subject Licensee assessed the visual acuities which per the Subject Licensee were

compliant with the drivers license vision regulation of NAC 483.340.

Director Schneider is not advocating one way or another for a disposition, but an option to the claimant could be a referral to the Office of ADA to file a complaint there.

Director Schneider invited Dr. Smith's comments. Dr. Smith stated a recommendation for dismissal. The front office or optician would not necessarily know the patient's medical conditions or information within the medical records. Dr. Austin agreed. Dr. Alamo agreed. Public Member Balecha agreed and that the doctor tried to get to the patient but the patient refused certain testing.

Dr. Smith moved to dismiss with no further action. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

8. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Complaint 25-18. This can be categorized as an alleged rude behavior complaint, in addition the patient likely does not understand how many steps need to occur during the trial fitting process. As to the alleged inappropriate touching/brushing, these are uncorroborated with no corroborative witnesses. Plus the Subject Licensee's legs could have touched the patient's legs incidental to the exam process, and those can occur in a professional manner.

Director Schneider invited Public Member Balecha's comments. Public Member Balecha commented the OD can be very close to the patient's body and in her own examinations is not uncomfortable because that is a necessary process for the examination, and recommended to dismiss the case. Dr. Smith stated in practice that ODs can brush into patients accidentally, where she would then apologize, but that is the nature of the examination sometimes. Dr. Alamo agreed with Dr. Smith, and that ODs are in close proximity to the patient which is normal depending on what equipment is being used.

Colloquy that the Board takes these allegations seriously but with these facts and lack of evidence, this particular matter should be dismissed but that patients can take their grievance to other appropriate avenues. Director Schneider stressed that with additional corroborative evidence for similar allegations, he would investigate further as part of his job duties. Dr. Smith agreed.

Dr. Smith moved to dismiss with no further action. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

9. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Possible conversion of Stripe to FiServ/Clover re licensee electronic transaction software. With Stripe, the Board pay fees of 3.25% per electronic transaction, decreased from years past of Quickbook's 3.45%, where the transaction after subjecting that fee goes into Board's accounts-receivable Nevada State Bank (NSB). FiServ/Clover offers a rate of 2.7%. Plus it is NSB approved software, so it should result in an easy connection from the Board's website into the Board's NSB account.

There are service charges associated with using Clover. Essentially for \$0.50/day, i.e. \$15/month, i.e., \$180/year, the Board can avail itself to 0.55% in further lessened electronic transaction fees.

On licensee renewals alone, the projection is \$540,000 comprised of 600 renewals x \$900. If the Board stays with Stripe's 3.25%, the Board pays \$17,550 in transaction fees. If the Board goes with FiServ/Clover's 2.7%, the Board pays \$14,580 in transaction fees. Factoring in the \$180/year in service changes, this would mean the Board keeps \$2,790 more with Clover than with Stripe.

The next question is how much does install cost, to make sure this is not cost-prohibitive. The Board's I.T. vendor, Reno Techs, bills at \$65/hour for our 11 forms where we receive funds from

licensees, and a projected \$650 for those 11. FiServ's I.T. says the project should only take an hour or two. So even by spending \$800 comprised of \$650 install with Reno Techs plus \$180/subscription with Clover, the Board captures an additional \$2,000. Essentially this results in the Board saving money by spending money.

The recommendation is for the Board to vote Yes. Dr. Alamo stated the due diligence has been conducted and that with Director Schneider running the numbers as he did, this proposal would save the Board money in the short-term and long-term. Dr. Smith stated she trusted Director Schneider's analysis and recommendation.

Dr. Smith voted to authorize the expenditure and change in software. Dr. Alamo seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

10. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Consideration and approval of June 16, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes. Director Schneider confirmed all present Board members had an opportunity to review the draft. Dr. Smith moved to accept as written. Dr. Austin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

11. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** NRS 636.346(2)(e) interpretation. Question from an OD on whether trained techs can perform IPL under OD supervision. Director Schneider directed the Board to Item nos. 3 and 5 in the 6/2024 Minutes in the meeting materials provided for background which was the last time the Board discussed IPL in earnest and IPL is considered within the scope per the Board's vote in 6/2024.

Director Schneider discussed the relevant law, i.e., the practice of optometry includes "directing the use of [a] . . . device to treat an abnormality of the eye or its appendages" per NRS 636.025(1)(h). So as long as assistants are under the direct supervision of the OD and the OD performs the final exam (NRS 636.346(3), assistants can "use an ophthalmic device" per NRS 636.346(2)(e).

The question for the Board is whether IPL devices are deemed an "ophthalmic device" in order for ODs to provide direct supervision of assistants when using those devices.

Director Schneider asked for Dr. Smith's comments. Dr. Smith stated the intent of the law was that techs can use ophthalmic devices, and not just IPL, under the OD's direct supervision so long as the OD performs the final examination and assumes the responsibility for the tech's conduct. Dr. Austin agrees with Dr. Smith regarding the intent of the law, and it is reasonable to allow the assistants to perform services to assist the OD in their practice so long as the OD provides the direct supervision, performs the final exam, and assumes the responsibility for the assistant's work. Public Member Balecha abstained from any comment as the topic was beyond her expertise compared to the optometry members of the Board. Dr. Smith moved that the answer to the question is Yes inclusive of other modalities if it meets the statutory definitions, with requisite OD direct supervision, the OD performing the final examination, and the OD assuming the responsibility for the tech's conduct. Dr. Alamo obtained clarification that the motion was in fact inclusive of OD direct supervision. Dr. Austin seconded. In light of Public Member Balecha's abstention, motion passed 3-0.

Following all Action Items requiring a vote, Director Schneider acknowledged that Public Member Balecha had to leave the meeting early.

12. **Executive Director report re Casey Neilon audit.** The meeting materials includes a standard auditor terms of engagement from years past. The \$16,500 maximum is an increase from 2023's \$11,800 maximum and 2024's \$15,000 maximum. When asking around to other Boards, the going rate appears to be \$20,000 with other auditors, so the Board is still under market. Plus Casey Neilon has a good familiarity with the Board's transactions and documents from years past.

13. **Executive Director report re R0008-25 and communications with LCB.** The Board was reminded that R0008-25 is the Board's temporary regulation for non-optometry business relationships. In Director Schneider's experience, a Board's perspective versus what LCB is tasked with does not always line up, so LCB has reviewed the temporary regulations, and LCB is looking to: 1) consolidate certain subsections; and 2) remove certain subsections as duplicative or stated elsewhere somewhere in NRS 636 per the meeting materials. Director Schneider directed the Board's attention to the meeting materials where the footnotes to LCB's proposed revisions describe the changes from what the Board submitted in January 2025 after multiple workshop sessions in the summer of 2024.

There is nothing out of bounds from a rule-making perspective that LCB is asking for, and it seems like the Board does not need to contest any revisions. There is nothing for the Board to vote on today, and instead that will occur at the next meeting on September 25, 2025.

Colloquy regarding the proposed removal of subsection 2 as duplicative of an already existing statute NRS 636.375(5), and R0008-25 is a temporary regulation needing to be converted to a permanent regulation for NAC 636. No objections voiced as to proceeding with the proposal as presented.

14. **Executive Director report re ARBO Conference, Minneapolis, MN Saturday June 21-Tuesday June 24, 2025.** To honor ARBO's request to present a summary of the convention in light of being awarded a scholarship, Director Schneider highlighted his attendance as follows:

Saturday June 21, 2025 was a session before the start of the convention, led by ARBO counsel Dale Atkinson where regulatory law was discussed on topics like conflicts of interest and due process to investigated licensees, and open meeting law. For example, certain boards offer free CEs for Board meeting attendance which might be something for this Board to consider.

Sunday June 22, 2025's highlights included a discussion of nationwide events. For example, South Carolina and Stanton Optical are involved in litigation. Minnesota after a 20 year process now can perform injectables and small lump removals. Opternative, Inc. (aka Visibly) has sued the South Carolina Board of Medical Examiners regarding restrictions on online examinations, and is in front of South Carolina Supreme Court. Director Schneider met with the ARBO liaison for Nevada, Dr. Luanne Chubb. Dr. Smith presented a video for the 2025 Nominating Committee.

Monday June 23, 2025's highlights included a discussion of a California federal court lawsuit of Total Vision vs. Vision Services Plan that is in the process of potential settlement. ARBO discussed Council on Endorsed Licensure Mobility for Optometrists aka CELMO, where the licensee pays that program to perform license by endorsement applications. NBEO gave a lengthy presentation on its testing and part III which includes 12 stations inclusive of 10 kinds of patient encounters.

Tuesday June 24, 2025's highlights included some praise for Nevada. One of the Boards' lawyers on the panel had recommended to all the Boards to look at Nevada's board policy when it comes to retiring licensees and medical record access. A spokesperson for the Council for State Governments-Interstate Compact Enactments gave a presentation of licensure compacts. This evoked a large discussion about the differences in scope of practice across the country.

Director Schneider emphasized the importance of Nevada continuing to attend ARBO's national convention given the amount of information provided and goes to the purpose of what the Board does. ARBO-national appreciated Nevada being more participatory than in years past, including Director Schneider attending both ED meetings also the attorney meetings. He has been invited as a speaker or on a panel for next year.

Dr. Smith echoed the importance of Nevada's participation, and the need to place this cost into the budget given the attendance is worthwhile for the information to be obtained from other Boards nationally. She thanked Director Schneider for attending it, as well as attending both the ARBO ED meeting and the ARBO attorney meetings, and agreed it made sense for ARBO to have Director Schneider be a speaker given his background and education.

15. **Executive Director report re licensing transactions for FY2025.** Director Schneider summarized the below, and noted how much the Board relies upon renewals in Q1 of even numbered years to function.

<b>6/10/2025 – 6/30/2025</b>	<b>FY2025 cumulative</b>	<b>FY2025 licensee fees cumulative</b>	<b>Less 3.45% transaction fees</b>
New licenses: 4	17*	9337.50	9030.88
Licenses by endorsement: 2	11	4950	4779.23
Glaucoma: 0	6	1050	1013.78
OPAC: 4	23	1665	1665.49
Fictitious Name: 3	34	1700	1641.35
Location changes: 3	53	1475	1424.11
Additional locations: 9	60	12000	11586
LOGS:1	52	1300	1255.15
PRR: 2	40	0	0
Refunds: 0	5		
Mobile: 0	2	1087.50	1049.98
Substitute location: 0	6	1200	1158.60
Public complaints: 2	21	0	0
2026-2028 CE review: 3	9	0	0
Total	341	\$35,765.00	\$34,604.57

\* (1) application submitted with check. \$450 not subject to 3.45% transaction fee.

16. **Executive Director report re licensing transactions for FY2026.** Director Schneider summarized the below:

<b>7/1/2025 – 7/23/2025</b>	<b>FY2026 cumulative</b>	<b>FY2026 licensee fees cumulative</b>	<b>Less 3.25% transaction fees</b>
New licenses: 2	2	712.50	689.34
Licenses by endorsement:	0		
Glaucoma:	0		
OPAC:	1	75	72.56
Fictitious Name:	4	200	193.50
Location changes	6*	300	291.06
Additional locations:	3	600	580.50
LOGS:	4	100	96.75
Active to Inactive Status	0		
PRR:	0		
Refunds:	0		
Mobile:	0		
Substitute location:	0		
Public complaints:	1		
2026-2028 CE review:	2		
Total	23	\$1987.50	\$1923.71

\* (1) application submitted with check. \$25 not subject to 3.25% transaction fee.

17. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Proposed items for future Board meetings. None stated.

18. **Public Comment.** Director Schneider invited public comment. No public comment received. Dr. Smith inquired into whether next meeting will include a workshop on the new NRSs passed in the summer. Director Schneider stated the next meeting would include: 1) a regular meeting; 2) a workshop for updated NACs inclusive of the regulation to increase the fee limitation of \$825 and make consistent with the statutory cap of \$1200 per license; and 3) a Notice of Intent to Take Action on the Board's temporary regulations as both the CE definitions and business relationships. He will attend at the Nevada State Business Center Building on 3300 W. Sahara to comply with statute.

19. **For Board Discussion and Possible Action.** Dr. Smith moved to adjourn. Dr. Austin seconded. Adjournment occurred at 12:52p.m.

6 persons attended virtually, inclusive of Board members and Executive Director. No role call conducted or sign-in sheets provided.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **FY 2025-2026 Regular meeting schedule**

Thursday 7/31/2025 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom  
Thursday 9/25/2025 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom  
Thursday 10/30/2025 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom  
Wednesday 12/10/2025 12:00p.m. (pst) Reg. Bd. Meeting- phone or Zoom

\* \* \* \* \*

❖ The Board is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for any member of the public who has a disability and wishes to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify the Nevada State Board of Optometry: in writing at P.O. Box 1824, Carson City, Nevada 89702; via email at [admin@nvoptometry.org](mailto:admin@nvoptometry.org); or call 775-883-8367 as far in advance as possible.

❖ To request an advance copy of the supporting materials for this meeting, contact [admin@nvoptometry.org](mailto:admin@nvoptometry.org) or call 775-883-8367.

This Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda was posted in compliance with NRS 241.020, before 9:00 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting at the following locations:

- Nevada State Board of Optometry office, Reno, NV 89523
- Nevada State Board of Optometry website: <https://nvoptometry.org/>
- Nevada Public Notice website: <http://notice.nv.gov>

# **Materials for Item No. 5**

-licensee emails re advanced aesthetic procedures

Dear Members of the Nevada State Board of Optometry,

I am writing to respectfully request that the Board consider proposing legislative changes to Nevada's optometry laws to expressly authorize qualified optometrists to perform advanced aesthetic procedures beyond the ocular adnexa within their clinical practice. As primary eye care providers, optometrists possess in-depth training in ocular anatomy, periocular structures, and dermatologic health of the adnexa. With appropriate education and certification, optometrists are uniquely positioned to safely and effectively provide these services to patients in-office expanding access to care while maintaining the highest standards of patient safety.

Advanced aesthetic procedures, such as non-ablative laser resurfacing, radiofrequency skin tightening, intense pulsed light therapy, and similar non-surgical treatments, fall squarely within the anatomical area and clinical expertise of optometrists. Our training includes extensive knowledge of the eyelid and facial anatomy, skin physiology, tissue healing, and the safe operation of medical devices that emit light and heat energy. Many optometrists already utilize these technologies for therapeutic purposes such as treating ocular rosacea, meibomian gland dysfunction, and periocular skin lesions. These treatments involve working within the most delicate and anatomically complex regions of the face, namely, the periocular area where the skin is the thinnest. Given this, it is logically inconsistent and clinically restrictive to prohibit optometrists from applying the same technology to less sensitive, non-ocular regions of the face such as the cheeks, forehead, and jawline. The skin in these areas is thicker, has a higher tolerance to energy-based devices, and presents fewer risks than the periocular zone.

In Nevada, other licensed health professionals, including nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and advanced aestheticians, are permitted to perform these same procedures after completing appropriate training. Optometrists, who are already licensed to prescribe medications (including for dermatologic conditions), hold DEA registrations, and manage delicate ocular tissues on a daily basis, have equivalent, if not greater, qualifications to provide these services safely. Restricting our ability to perform advanced aesthetic treatments not only limits patient choice but also creates unnecessary barriers to care for procedures that can be integrated seamlessly into existing eye care practices.

Other states have recognized the value of allowing optometrists to incorporate advanced aesthetic care into their scope of practice, provided the proper education, certification, and safety protocols are in place. Nevada patients would greatly benefit from similar modernization of our state laws, especially in underserved regions where access to these treatments is limited.

For these reasons, I urge the Board to consider drafting and supporting a statutory amendment to formally include advanced aesthetic procedures beyond the ocular adnexa within the optometry scope of practice, contingent on completion of Board-approved training and adherence to established safety standards. For example, there is an aesthetics school in Las Vegas that offers a comprehensive advanced laser course for health care professionals looking to expand their knowledge and comfort with advanced aesthetic devices through a 50-hour program complete with classroom education and practical training. Completing such a course would place an optometrist in an opportune position to use these devices appropriately and safely. This change would align Nevada with evolving national trends in patient care, support the

professional growth of optometrists, and most importantly, enhance access to safe, effective, and comprehensive treatment options for our patients.

I appreciate the Board's dedication to ensuring the highest standards of patient care and safety in Nevada. My request is made with the shared goal of expanding safe, effective treatment options for our communities while maintaining the rigorous professional standards our patients deserve. I welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Board to explore education requirements, develop clinical protocols, and ensure proper oversight for optometrists who wish to provide advanced aesthetic procedures.

By updating our laws to reflect modern training, technology, and patient needs, Nevada can remain in the forefront of innovative, patient-centered care. Thank you for your time, your service, and your consideration of this important matter.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dental's laser privileges are strictly for periodontal procedures. There may be additional work required with the cosmetology board to allow accredited optometrists to become the licensee-in-charge of a cosmetology practice and allow optometrists to obtain an establishment license through said board as a aesthetic practice. Currently they only allow MDs, NPs, RAs, and advanced aestheticians to hold this position.

# **Materials for Item No. 6**

- AB183(9) (revisions to NRS 636.287 re OPAC requirements)
- template email re OPAC approval

Sec. 9. NRS 636.287 is hereby amended to read as follows:

636.287 The Board shall adopt regulations which prescribe the requirements for certification to administer and prescribe pharmaceutical agents pursuant to NRS 636.288. The requirements must include:

1. A license to practice optometry in this State; and
2. The successful completion of the “Treatment and Management of Ocular Disease Examination” administered by the National Board of Examiners in Optometry or an equivalent examination approved by the Board. ~~}; and~~
- ~~3. The successful completion of not fewer than 40 hours of clinical training in administering and prescribing pharmaceutical agents in a training program which is conducted by an ophthalmologist and approved by the Board. }~~

.....

Congratulations. You have met the Nevada State Board of Optometry requirements to administer and prescribe pharmaceutical agents (OPAC). Attached is your certificate.

The 40-hour preceptorship you completed may be applied to 30 of the 50 continuing education hours required at your next license renewal in 2026. Please upload this email to your 2-Year CE Summary for credit on your 2026-2028 renewal.

Within one week, we will inform the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy. Please refrain from writing prescriptions for 15 days from the date on your certificate so the Pharmacy Board can activate your prescribing authority.

Provided below is a link with relevant information to apply for a State Controlled Substance number and a Federal DEA number. The Optometry Board does not process these forms. <https://bop.nv.gov/Services/newapps/Practitioners/>

You may visit our website for information to become certified to treat persons diagnosed with Glaucoma. The Board’s requirements for that certificate are rather stringent and are outlined in NRS 636.2893 and NAC 636.280.

# **Materials for Item No. 7**

- Advantage present billing
- Advantage estimate #1
- Advantage estimate #2

2005 Sierra Highlands Dr. ste125  
Reno, NV 89523  
AdvantageNV.net  
(775)337-8866

PAID



Nevada Board of Optometry  
P.O. Box 1824  
Carson City, NV 89702

Invoice # 41756  
Invoice Date 09-01-25  
Balance Due **\$0.00**

Item	Description	Unit Cost	Quantity	Line Total
Advantage Computers - Plan (1 hour)	Advantage Computers Lite Plan - Includes 1 hour of remote support per month.	\$120.00	1.0	\$120.00
Security Antivirus	Security Subscription (Antivirus) - Enterprise Antivirus  *Billed Monthly	\$5.00	3.0	\$15.00
Backup Plan	Offsite Backup Service - Cloud Storage Amount: 300 GB	\$38.00	1.0	\$38.00

Invoice Notes

Disclaimer

The customer agrees, at time of pickup, that they have all components that were left with Advantage Computers. Advantage Computers is not responsible for any equipment that was left after pickup of hardware. There is no warranty on virus removal and Advantage Computers is not responsible for reinfection of computer. Customer agrees that all the services and parts listed above were completed to satisfaction.

Advantage Computers does not guarantee protection against identity theft, hacking, and other criminal activity.

Subtotal	\$173.00
Tax	\$0.00
Invoice Total	\$173.00
Payments	-\$173.00
Credits	\$0.00
Balance Due	\$0.00

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2005 Sierra Highlands Dr. ste125  
Reno, NV 89523  
www.advantagenv.net  
(775)337-8866



Nevada Board of Optometry  
P.O. Box 1824  
Carson City, NV 89702

Estimate #	6054
Estimate Date	09-11-25
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$480.00</b>

Item	Description	Unit Cost	Quantity	Line Total
Labor	One-time setup fee of tenants for all services and deployment of software on workstations.  *Originally \$375.00, less discount of \$125.00 - Discount for bundling of services.	\$250.00	1.0	\$250.00
Advantage Computers - Plan (1 hour)	Remote Support Hours - Prepaid - Billed monthly. - Consumed in 15-minute increments. - Does not carry or pool into other months. Hours reset monthly. - Any remote support beyond the monthly Prepaid hours are billed at our advertised remote support rate. - Does not include Onsite.	\$120.00	1.0	\$120.00
Complete Security Endpoint Bundle w/24x7 Monitoring	Complete Security Endpoint Bundle w/24x7 Monitoring - Enterprise Endpoint Protection - Detection of malicious programs, tools, lateral moves between devices, etc - Canary files are deployed on endpoints to detect ransomware and malicious software - Website filtering - Patch management via RMM software (latest windows security patches) - Remote monitoring of device via RMM software - Weekly endpoint optimizations are applied to covered endpoints - Detection and response tools - 24x7x365 SOC team that monitors for threats on protected endpoints - Threats are isolated or mitigated by SOC team. Advantage Computers will then contact the client with any necessary steps that are needed  * Billed Monthly per endpoint ** Annual commitment (1 year term)	\$23.50	2.0	\$47.00
Barracuda Email Protection Premium Plus	Protection and backup (Monthly) - Email Security Service + Multilayered security to protect against viruses, SPAM, phishing, typosquatting, DOS attacks + Email Spooling and Email Continuity + Advanced Threat Protection which includes our cloud sandboxing for unknown threat signatures + Automatic email encryption - Cloud Archiving + We will archive every single email; inbound, outbound, and internal... + Single solution for archiving email and instant messages + Full-featured mobile app for remote access  + Advanced search capabilities	\$16.00	3.0	\$48.00

- Cloud To Cloud Backup For Office365
- + API level integration to allow for seamless automatic backup without interruption to email or client site
- Includes unlimited backup and retention of all mailboxes, as well as, OneDrive for Business, Skype for Business, and SharePoint Online

- + Upgraded advanced Impersonation protection.
- Advanced AI processing and protection against impersonating emails.
- Login monitoring. Checks for account hijacking of email accounts.

+Upgraded DMARC Reporting

\* Billed Monthly per E-mail/User

\*\* Annual commitment (1 year term)

Microsoft Cloud User Security	Microsoft Cloud User Security (Monthly) - Provides 24x7x365 identity monitoring and response for the following: + Session hijacking + Credential theft + Monitoring of out of country logins and VPN access + Malicious inbox & forwarding rules + Malicious apps registered to user/tenant + Account takeover and business email compromise (BEC) attempts - A dedicated Security team monitors your accounts	\$5.00	3.0	\$15.00
	* Billed Monthly per E-mail/User			
	** Annual commitment (1 year term)			

## THIS IS AN ESTIMATE

### Disclaimer

The customer agrees to and accepts the estimate above. This estimate shall be converted to an invoice and the customer agrees to pay the total in full. The signee is authorized to sign for the entitee listed above and accepts all terms associated with the items listed above. Advantage Computers does not guarantee protection against identity theft, hacking, and other criminal activity.

The information contained in this estimate is confidential, privileged and only for the information of the intended recipient and may not be used, published, or redistributed without the prior written consent of Advantage Computers & Network Solutions, LLC.

<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$480.00</b>
Tax	\$0.00
<b>Estimate Total</b>	<b>\$480.00</b>

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



2005 Sierra Highlands Dr. ste125  
Reno, NV 89523  
www.advantagenet.net  
(775)337-8866



Nevada Board of Optometry  
P.O. Box 1824  
Carson City, NV 89702

Estimate #	6055
Estimate Date	09-11-25
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$380.50</b>

Item	Description	Unit Cost	Quantity	Line Total
Labor	One-time setup fee of tenants for all services. *Originally \$250.00, less discount of \$62.50 - Discount for bundling of services.	\$187.50	1.0	\$187.50
Advantage Computers - Plan (1 hour)	Remote Support Hours - Prepaid - Billed monthly. - Consumed in 15-minute increments. - Does not carry or pool into other months. Hours reset monthly. - Any remote support beyond the monthly Prepaid hours are billed at our advertised remote support rate. - Does not include Onsite.	\$120.00	1.0	\$120.00
Barracuda Email Protection Premium Plus	Protection and backup (Monthly) - Email Security Service + Multilayered security to protect against viruses, SPAM, phishing, typosquatting, DOS attacks + Email Spooling and Email Continuity + Advanced Threat Protection which includes our cloud sandboxing for unknown threat signatures + Automatic email encryption - Cloud Archiving + We will archive every single email; inbound, outbound, and internal... + Single solution for archiving email and instant messages + Full-featured mobile app for remote access + Advanced search capabilities - Cloud To Cloud Backup For Office365 + API level integration to allow for seamless automatic backup without interruption to email or client site - Includes unlimited backup and retention of all mailboxes, as well as, OneDrive for Business, Skype for Business, and SharePoint Online  + Upgraded advanced Impersonation protection. - Advanced AI processing and protection against impersonating emails. - Login hijacking. Checks for account hijacking of email accounts.  +Upgraded DMARC Reporting  * Billed Monthly per E-mail/User ** Annual commitment (1 year term)	\$16.00	3.0	\$48.00
Microsoft Cloud User Security	Microsoft Cloud User Security (Monthly) - Provides 24x7x365 identity monitoring and response for the following: + Session hijacking + Credential theft	\$5.00	3.0	\$15.00

- + Monitoring of out of country logins and VPN access
- + Malicious inbox & forwarding rules
- + Malicious apps registered to user/tenant
- + Account takeover and business email compromise (BEC) attempts
- A dedicated Security team monitors your accounts

\* Billed Monthly per E-mail/User

\*\* Annual commitment (1 year term)

Security Antivirus	Security Subscription (Antivirus) - Enterprise Antivirus	\$5.00	2.0	\$10.00
	*Billed Monthly			

## THIS IS AN ESTIMATE

### Disclaimer

The customer agrees to and accepts the estimate above. This estimate shall be converted to an invoice and the customer agrees to pay the total in full. The signee is authorized to sign for the entitee listed above and accepts all terms associated with the items listed above. Advantage Computers does not guarantee protection against identity theft, hacking, and other criminal activity.

The information contained in this estimate is confidential, privileged and only for the information of the intended recipient and may not be used, published, or redistributed without the prior written consent of Advantage Computers & Network Solutions, LLC.

**Subtotal** **\$380.50**

Tax \$0.00

**Estimate Total** **\$380.50**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

