



MINUTES

SOUTHERN NEVADA HEALTH DISTRICT WORKSHOP FOR PROPOSED BODY ART REGULATIONS

January 13, 2022 – 1:00 p.m.

Meeting was conducted virtually via Webex Events

STAFF PRESENT: Karla Shoup – Consumer Health Programs Manager
Mark Bergtholdt – Supervisor, Special Programs
Dante Merriweather – Senior Environmental Health Specialist, Special Programs
Michelle Goodsell – Environmental Health Specialist II, Special Programs
James Muth – Environmental Health Specialist II, Special Programs
Erin O'Malley – Administrative Assistant II, Special Programs

ALSO PRESENT: (via Webex Events) Albert Conant, Cristian Ogando, Emily Eichorn, Cesia De León, Lydia Dudoit, Josh Peattie, Rebecca Bryant, Karla Delarosa, Yhara Rivera, Dave L., Miguel Zavala, Sean Dowdell, Adolfo Medina, Tamara Ferrigno, Mari Gonzales, Emily Rocha, Benjamin Lepore, Benaiah Poindexter, Rusty Graf, Anessa Moore, Nilson Corea, Tattoos By Monk, Call-in User 4 (audio only), Call-in User 5 (audio only)

I. **INTRODUCTORY REMARKS and INTRODUCTION OF SNHD STAFF**

Mark Bergtholdt introduced the SNHD staff members attending the meeting. He called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. and stated the name and email address of Webex Events attendees were collected when they entered the meeting. He

Mark Bergtholdt provided the website address, www.SNHD.info/bodyartregs, where the supporting documents and agenda for the meeting are posted and reviewed the agenda with the attendees.

II. **FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT:** A period devoted to comments by the general public about those items appearing on the agenda. Comments will be limited to five (5) minutes per speaker. Please clearly state your name and address and spell your last name for the record.

Mark Bergtholdt opened the First Public Comment portion of the meeting and requested attendees raise their hand (via Webex) if they would like to participate. Seeing no one, he closed the First Public Comment portion of the workshop.

III. MAJOR CHANGES TO CURRENT REGULATIONS

Dante Merriweather presented an overview of the changes proposed for the regulations. These revisions were made after a review of the Nevada State Administrative Code, the National Environmental Health Association Body Art Model Code and input received from the public.

We are proposing numerous clarifications. More than fifty redundant or obsolete definitions have been removed. Language proposing the granting of waivers of the regulations has been included. There are proposed changes to the mandatory language within the consent forms, and the imminent health hazards section of the regulations has been streamlined to include consolidated instructions for corrective action.

The largest proposed change to the two regulations for Tattooing and Body Piercing is combining them into one set of Body Art Regulations. We are also proposing changes to the body art card that will set a minimum level of experience for an artist before they can take on any apprentices. The proposed regulations will also limit the number of apprentices that an artist can have at any one time.

From an operational standpoint, the hand sink requirements have been more clearly defined, including a clarification that hand sinks must be permanently plumbed to potable water and sanitary sewer. The hand sinks must be a minimum size and there must be at least one hand sink for every four workstations, located no more than fifteen feet from a procedure table. Any facility in compliance with the current hand sink requirements are fine until a change of ownership occurs or a remodel of the facility.

The minimum size of a workstation has been decreased from one hundred square feet to eighty square feet.

Also proposed are detailed requirements for an equipment processing room for any facility that uses reusable equipment that needs to be sterilized. Additionally, the minimum testing for the sterilizer has been increased from once a year to monthly. This is the minimum requirement adopted by the state. Each sterile pack must include a class five or six indicator to indicate proper sterilization conditions reached the surface of the equipment. For facilities that use reusable equipment, an ultrasonic cleaner must be used on equipment prior to processing the equipment in a sterilizer.

Finally, there is a proposal to set conditions for expired equipment that can be stored within the facility. These conditions include allowing the equipment to be used only for practice when it is properly labeled and stored. There are also proposed minimum requirements for jewelry and improved instructions for handling solid waste and biohazardous waste.

These changes have made the Regulations more concise, reducing the number of pages from 67 to 59 pages.

This is a broad overview of the main items that have been altered, expanded, or deleted in this revision. All concerned parties are strongly urged to closely read and review the proposed revisions in a timely manner and present any concerns to the Southern Nevada Health District as soon as possible.

Mark Bergtholdt stated that due to the previous two workshops, some draft language has been added to the proposed regulations. He emphasized that he could not make promises that the

drafted language would be in the final regulations. Mr. Bergtholdt said he would read out the draft language when the appropriate section was introduced for comment. He stated comments would be taken by section and requested that anyone who had a comment raise their hand (via Webex).

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS TAKEN REGARDING PROPOSED SOUTHERN NEVADA HEALTH DISTRICT REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE SANITATION AND SAFETY OF BODY ART ESTABLISHMENTS

1. Definitions: This section is where all the definitions are. Words that are defined in these Regulations will appear in bold text through the Regulations.

Mark Bergtholdt stated some definition changes were under consideration, including the word “mentor” to replace “journey” in Section 1.23. He stated the Health District is considering adding “microblading,” which means a technique in which incisions are made into the dermis using a manual tool equipped with needles. The incisions are then filled with pigment to mimic natural hair. Microblading is limited to parts of the face and is meant to be semi-permanent. Mr. Bergtholdt stated under consideration is a definition of “microblading artist” to be added, meaning a person issued a microblading card under the provision of these regulations set forth in Section 8. A “microblading card” is under consideration, which means a card issued by the Health Authority to a person who is limited to practicing microblading. He then asked for any comments on Section 1.

Emily Rocha from Seven Tattoo Studio commented that she was seeing public chat disabled in her app. Erin O’Malley and Mark Bergtholdt responded that comments were being received from other attendees. Ms. Rocha stated she had a question regarding the comment about microblading. She asked if someone has a body art card, would there be a separate one for people only performing microblading? And if the artist does all types of permanent makeup, will there be something on the card stating they can do microblading?

Rebecca Bryant from Permanent Makeup by Rebecca stated she had a question regarding microblading the definition of it being semi-permanent. She stated it was her understanding that all tattooing is permanent, and the pigment particles stay in the skin for a lifetime, even though they may not be visible. Ms. Bryant questioned why microblading is being labeled as semi-permanent. Mark Bergtholdt stated it is the Health District’s understanding that it only goes into a layer of skin that is sloughed off, so it does fade over time. Ms. Bryant asked if she could discuss the issue at a future time, and Mr. Bergtholdt asked for her input. She stated microblading does go into the dermis and dermis live cells that don’t all exfoliate. She said the epidermis exfoliates, but what is left is in the skin. Mr. Bergtholdt stated the Health District would take this into consideration.

Albert Conant commented that in the previous definition of “journey” it had journey as a person who had a body art card for four or more years. He stated he believed the last time this was discussed the time period was moved to six years. Mr. Conant requested clarification on the proposed language. Mark Bergtholdt commented the Health District was proposing no changes, which is in Section 8.

Karla Calero stated she was going to comment, but her question had already been answered.

2. Imminent Health Hazards: These are the conditions that require immediate closure of a body art establishment.

Emily Eichorn stated she wanted to comment on something a previous participant had asked about pigments being considered semi-permanent for microblading versus tattooing. She said it was her understanding from research she had done that the difference is not just the level the pigment reaches, but that semi-permanent does not have metals while permanent tattooing has metals in the pigments used. Ms. Eichorn asked if this research was correct. Mark Bergtholdt thanked her for the information she provided.

Hearing no comments on Section 2, Mark Bergtholdt moved to Section 3.

3. Facilities and Equipment: This section describes the minimum requirements for a body art establishment.

Mark Bergtholdt stated the Health District is considering adding 3.13.2.8, which states a sterilizer can be kept at a workstation if the sterilizer does not require any water supply or sewage connections, and the reusable equipment and/or jewelry is cleaned in a procedure room, stored in a manner that prevents contamination, is sterilized unwrapped, and used immediately after sterilizing.

Sean Dowdell commented that he had two questions, one pertaining to the sterilizers and workstations. He commented that the top of the line sterilizer in the industry is called a statim G4 and G6000. Mr. Dowdell stated his shop uses the G4s, which require a water source, and they are currently hooked up in workstations for immediate use. He said when sterilizing jewelry or needles, it sterilizes in three and a half minutes, uses exhaust through the P trap in the plumbing, and then the jewelry and needles are used right away. Mr. Dowdell commented he thinks the language on that should be changed to say if it requires a water source that it is hooked up to the water source and still viable.

Sean Dowdell commented that his second question on Section 3 was regarding hand sinks. He commented that he is trying to figure out why, with all the universal precautions being implemented to make things more stringent, the Health District is lessening the requirement for asepsis on hand sinks – one per four stations when the rule has been one per station up to this point. He commented he believes this is a step backwards with asepsis in the studio environment for cleanliness. Mark Bergtholdt thanked him for his comment and stated it would be taken into consideration. He responded to the statim comment by saying if the statim is connected to water and sewer then a waiver could be applied for to install it within the facility. Mr. Bergtholdt stated all the ones he had seen had their own tank and did not have any waste associated with them. Mr. Dowdell said it comes with an extra cost in order to eliminate the self-serve tank and can be hooked into plumbing. He said it is a cleaner, more viable sterilizer used in that fashion. Mr. Bergtholdt thanked him again for his comment and said a solution will be available if the regulations are approved as proposed.

4. General Sanitation: This section describes the minimum sanitation requirements for a body art establishment.

Mark Bergtholdt stated the only thing the Health District is suggesting be changed is allowing the sterilizer to be at the workstation, and equipment in peel-packs or heat-sealed plastic can be sterilized at a permitted body art establishment, which broadens where packs can be sterilized.

Emily Eichorn commented to ask if the Health District was making sterilizers mandatory or would still allow single-use products. Mark Bergtholdt explained that the regulations have

provisions stating that if single-use products are used exclusively, a sterilizer will not be required.

5. Responsible persons and other body art establishment employees: This section describes the responsibilities of each person working in a body art establishment.

Mark Bergtholdt stated the Health District is considering clarifying Section 5.1.3 so that the responsible person will be held accountable for compliance with all requirements of these regulations and nothing else. He said Section 5.1.3 currently includes all the other laws and regulations for facilities.

Emily Rocha commented on the responsible person section and said their studio is open late so she would need a few responsible persons. She asked if she would need to update the Health District each time the responsible persons changed. Mark Bergtholdt replied that the Health District will not keep track of the responsible person at the facility but said when the Health District inspects the facility it is expected the responsible person will speak up and be able to answer questions.

Miguel Zavala of Stedfast Tattoo Parlor commented on the responsible person section, stating many shops are not open nine to five like the Health District and asked if the responsible person must have the Health District's hours. He asked how the shop should correlate the responsible person with a health inspection when they do not know when an inspection will occur. Mark Bergtholdt stated that any time the business is open, a person must be designated as a responsible person. Mr. Zavala asked if that meant they needed multiple responsible people, and Mr. Bergtholdt stated they did. Mr. Bergtholdt said a responsible person is also needed for code enforcement or other inspections, and a person is needed who will step up and say they know the answers to the questions that will be asked.

6. Patrons: This section describes the minimum requirements for a patron and what they must be advised.

Mark Bergtholdt stated the Health District is considering adding Section 6.1.5 that states body art establishments are prohibited from applying body art not specifically exempted by these regulations to persons less than fourteen years old.

Benjamin Lepore commented that he would like to talk about Section 6.3.6.5 and 6.3.6.6, the requirement for all expiration date and batch and/or lot number of all sterilized equipment used or pre-sterilized that will be used and applied under the skin, and the expiration date, brand, color, batch and/or lot number of all inks, dyes, and pigments used in the body art procedure. He commented that he would like to see these removed and believes these are "overkill" or an "overstretch" of what needs to be recorded on the release forms. Mr. Lepore commented this will clog up the system in a high-volume shop and that there isn't enough evidence of infections and issues due to not recording these things. Mark Bergtholdt thanked him for his comment.

Emily Rocha commented that she had a question regarding 6.3.5 which requires questions regarding the patron's condition. She asked if this is something to add to consent forms and how the Health District would like industry to implement asking the client if they've eaten in the last four hours and questions like that. Mark Bergtholdt stated these are clarifications on what should be asked on a consent form, improving upon current regulations. Ms. Rocha commented she has sometimes had to eject a client because they tell her they have not been drinking when clearly, they have been. She asked if this section is to cover industry legally if,

for instance, the client is under the influence but not showing it. She requested additional clarification on the patron evaluation section. Mr. Bergtholdt said it could be used that way and suggested she speak with her attorney about whether somebody could be excluded based on how they answer a question. He stated this is a conversation that can be had with a patron to identify contraindications that would not permit somebody to receive a tattoo.

Emily Rocha commented that if they are having this conversation with a client and asking questions, a lot of which are already on the consent forms - besides if they have eaten in the last four hours – she would like to know how the Health District would like this included in the consent forms. She asked if this could just be a yes or no, or if specific verbiage is required by the Health District. Ms. Rocha stated she does permanent makeup and her consent forms are yes and no, but the tattoo artists have clients initial, so she wanted to see if the Health District had any specific requirements. Mark Bergtholdt stated as long as the questions are on the consent forms, it would be sufficient.

Albert Conant commented that he had concerns with government-issued identification. He said when they have minors come in with their parent and their birth certificate, generally the only identification most minors have is a school photo i.d. He asked if that was acceptable, because if not they would have to refuse a lot of clients and lose business. Mark Bergtholdt stated that would be acceptable.

Erin O'Malley read a comment from Lydia Dudoit into the record, as she did not have a microphone. Ms. Dudoit commented that recording dates and lot numbers of disposables and ink, et cetera, increases the risk of cross contamination when more things are brought in and out of the station like paperwork, et cetera, to write that down. Ms. O'Malley asked if anything needed to be added to the comment and Ms. Dudoit indicated not. Mark Bergtholdt thanked her for her comment.

7. Body Art Procedures: This section describes the minimum steps and conditions of any body art procedure.

Mark Bergtholdt said the Health District is considering adding this statement to Section 7.4.7, "All jewelry used for initial piercings must be obtained from a reputable jewelry supplier. All custom manufactured jewelry used in initial piercings must meet the following standards:" and then it goes on to 7.4.7.1.

Mark Bergtholdt said the Health District is also considering a change to 7.4.7.6, "All threaded or press-fit jewelry used for initial piercings must not expose any threads or other crevices after final assembly."

Mark Bergtholdt said for jewelry receipts the Health District is rolling the material certificate information into the receipt. He said the Health District is suggesting, "Purchase records for jewelry purchased for initial piercings must: be maintained on premises for a minimum of ninety days; be maintained for a period of two years; be available upon request, and include the number and type of jewelry purchased, list the name of the manufacturer of the jewelry purchased, list the country of origin of the jewelry, list the lot number or other information indicating the location, date, and time of manufacturing of the jewelry." Mr. Bergtholdt stated this is all included in Section 7.4.8, and Section 7.4.9 will be deleted – material certificate.

Rebecca Bryant commented on the previous section of the regulations and asked if the Health District will provide a list of blood centers that would disqualify patrons from having a procedure done. She stated they have everything from heart medications to vitamin E that

could possibly affect bleeding in a procedure. Ms. Bryant commented that she wondered if the Health Department could set a protocol for this, instead of her advising her client to ask their doctor if they can have the procedure done due to the medication they are taking. Mark Bergtholdt stated the Health District can look into that but pointed out heparin and warfarin are identified in the regulations, as well as antiplatelet drugs. He said most people who are on anticoagulants probably know they are. Karla Shoup stated she believes the purpose of that question (on client forms) is also to function as a “heads up” for the artist that there may be more bleeding during the procedure so the artist can be prepared.

Vanessa Nornberg commented that she was representing Metal Mafia and requested clarification on what is meant by reputable jewelry supplier. Mark Bergtholdt stated common sense decisions on this. He said anybody who could order and point to the company from which they bought it would be considered a reputable supplier. Mr. Bergtholdt stated Metal Mafia would be considered a reputable supplier. Ms. Nornberg commented that she wondered if guidelines would be offered by the Health District to people purchasing to make sure they are finding reputable suppliers and “gating” this, if needed. Mr. Bergtholdt replied that the Health District doesn’t have guidelines and is using common sense definitions of “reputable.” He said this would not include someone making jewelry in their garage and boxing it.

Sean Dowdell representing Club Tattoo commented he had a two-part question. He referred to Vanessa’s question and commented it seemed a big ambiguous regarding jewelry suppliers. Mr. Dowdell asked how the Health District would react when a studio was found piercing with externally threaded jewelry or using non-ASTM F138 or 136 implant-grade materials, and what would happen to studios in these situations moving forward. Mark Bergtholdt responded that the Health District is suggesting that they can use non-ASTM standard items if purchased from a reputable firm. Mr. Dowdell stated there are several shops piercing with externally threaded jewelry that is not ASTM F136 or 138 and asked what would happen to those companies. Mr. Bergtholdt stated if it was sourced from reputable supplies, there would be no changes. Karla Shoup stated that with these regulations, there would be a one-year transition. Mr. Dowdell commented that in the current proposed regulations it states ATSM F138 and F136 is a new standard and internally tapped jewelry in the guidelines. He asked what would happen to studios not using those materials and internally threaded jewelry. Mr. Bergtholdt stated it was taken under advisement from the previous workshops and there are drafts to some proposed regulations that the Health District is considering. He stated he read those regulations out to the attendees. Mr. Dowdell stated he agreed with these regulations, but that thirty to forty percent of the studios do not currently abide by them and that there would have to be a follow-through to make sure they are either no longer piercing or using. He said the reputable distributorships make little to no sense unless their materials usage follows the guidelines. Mr. Bergtholdt thanked him for his comment and stated it would be taken under consideration.

Rebecca Bryant and Erin O’Malley reviewed how to “raise a hand” in Webex and how to “chat.”

Sean Dowdell of Club Tattoo commented regarding Section 7.16.1, under “The following acts are expressly prohibited by the Health Authority in body art” item 7.16.1.8 single point piercing should be struck. He commented these are antiquated thoughts, as single point piercings have been around for fifteen years at this point and is a procedure he invented. Mr. Dowdell stated it has been proven safe and has been around a long time with long-standing standards in place. He commented it makes no sense to exclude (sic) it from items such as skin peeling, cutting, branding and that single point piercing is piercing with one hole instead

of two. Mr. Dowdell commented that it does not belong in this section and should be removed. Mark Bergtholdt thanked him for his comment.

Erin O'Malley announced to all attendees that anyone using an iPad could access the "chat" function in Webex with the "smiley face" icon at the bottom of their screen.

8. Body Art Card: This section describes the various body art cards and the limitations of each card.

Mark Bergtholdt commented that the Health District is considering some changes to the section. He stated a person limiting their practice to microblading only parts of the face may apply for a microblading card, a mentor can take up to fifteen microblading apprentices at any one time, and a person with a body art card can take up to five apprentices at any one time.

Albert Conant commented on Section 8.3.1 which mentions American Red Cross and PDT. He commented that his shop is a member of the Alliance of Professional Tattooists and a lot of their training is received through them. Mr. Conant commented he wanted to see more than American Red Cross indicated in the section, because they go to conferences and receive extra training from the Alliance of Professional Tattooists. He commented that the section talks about six months of training and that previously it was twelve months. Mr. Conant asked if they would be required to have that training every six months, or if he was misreading. Mark Bergtholdt stated it was a slight "misread," as it was meant for a person who is new needing a minimum of six months of training.

Emily Rocha commented on body art cards for apprentices training for permanent makeup. She commented she would like the wording to be more specific regarding the six-month requirement. Ms. Rocha stated her apprenticeships are two years, but someone trying to apprentice with her was expelled from an apprenticeship at a different location and was trying to collect a letter from the previous location and then complete the remaining time with her. She commented she would like it stated that if an apprentice doesn't complete an apprenticeship they have to start over again, as she did not believe proper training can be done if collecting a month here and there. Mark Bergtholdt thanked her for her comment.

Erin O'Malley read a comment from Lydia Dudoit into the record, as she did not have a microphone. Ms. Dudoit commented to request the Health District consider changing it to permanent makeup artist on one card and body art artists on a different card, rather than just microblading. She commented that permanent makeup and microblading have the same healing, aftercare, and procedure prep. Ms. Dudoit stated she does both permanent makeup and body art.

Albert Conant commented to agree with separate designations on the card for permanent makeup versus body art. He commented he also could see the apprenticeship program for body art lasting at least two years in many cases, so the idea that somebody could complete it in six months is "kind of crazy." Mark Bergtholdt thanked him for his comment.

Erin O'Malley read a comment from Lydia Dudoit into the record, as she did not have a microphone. Ms. Dudoit commented that if the Health District did not differentiate permanent makeup and body art, then unconstrained permanent makeup artists would be allowed to perform body art without proper training, and vice versa. Mark Bergtholdt thanked her for her comment.

9. **Body Art Special Events: This section describes the conditions and requirements for body art special events.**

Emily Rocha commented that she had a question on this section, as it was discussed in a previous section that stations were going from one hundred square feet to eighty. She asked if the same would apply for special events. Mark Bergtholdt stated that special events currently allow two artists in one hundred square feet, and no changes were proposed.

10. **Health Permit: This section describes how a permit is issued, various exemptions, what information needs to be posted by the body art establishments, and what information needs to be shared with the health district.**

Emily Eichorn commented to ask if any participants could explain the difference between body art and permanent makeup. Mark Bergtholdt stated that generally permanent makeup uses the same techniques as tattoo or other body art, it's just usually limited to the face and areola. He said microblading is a technique that is a sub-part of permanent makeup.

Rebecca Bryant commented there is another fundamental difference between permanent makeup and body art; in permanent makeup the artist has to understand skin tone - color mixing to look natural on the skin – as opposed to using certain chosen colors and not taking skin tone so much into account when creating a certain effect. Mark Bergtholdt thanked her for her comment.

11. **Enforcement: This section describes how the health district will enforce these regulations.**

Hearing no comments on Section 11, Mark Bergtholdt moved to Section 12.

12. **Permit Suspension: This section describes what action can be taken and how the health district can suspend and revoke the permit.**

Mark Bergtholdt stated he would combine comments for Section 12 and 13.

13. **Necessary Legal Language:**

Hearing no comments on Section 12 or 13, Mark Bergtholdt stated he would wait two to three minutes for anyone to provide comments on any section of the regulations. He stated that if anyone had a comment, they could raise their hand or comment in the chat for Erin O'Malley to call on them.

Rebecca Bryant of Permanent Makeup by Rebecca commented that she was not able to respond to the attendee who mentioned the difference in microblading being content of the pigment. She stated semi-permanent and permanent actually refer to the depth at which the pigment is inserted into the skin, not the quality of pigment.

Tamara Ferrigno of MM Ink commented she had seen mention of an apprentice card, which is self-explanatory, body art card, and journey body art. She requested clarification on the difference between the body art card and the journey body art card. Mark Bergtholdt stated the journey/mentor body art card allows the artist to accept apprentices, while a body art card cannot take apprentices. The journey body art card is requested by a card holder who has at least four years' experience. Ms. Ferrigno asked how she could receive one of those cards

since she has been in the industry for a while. Mr. Bergtholdt stated they would be issued when the regulations come into effect, upon request.

Dave Lepenske asked about the regulation regarding having a bio waste can and sharps container in the stations. Mark Bergtholdt stated there is no requirement to have a biohazardous waste can in the procedure area unless someone will be producing biohazardous waste above and beyond the sharps.

Rebecca Bryant commented that she would like clarification regarding hand sinks, and the two-section sink that is required, as well as the separate room for cleaning and sterilization. She asked if there needs to be a separate room for cleaning and sterilization, or if it can be done in the treatment room. Ms. Bryant also asked why the two-section sink, and if it is something that is going to be implemented. Mark Bergtholdt stated any currently operating facility would not be required to complete any construction to come into compliance with the facility construction requirements. He said the two-compartment sink is used to wash and rinse the reusable equipment, and if a facility uses all disposables the Health District could consider there is no need for a processing room.

Emily Rocha commented that she would like the Health District to allow a studio to apply for a visiting artist who is coming to town. She provided an example of a visiting artist who did not speak English and said they may not understand the wording. Ms. Rocha asked if the studio would be allowed to apply for the visiting artist. Mark Bergtholdt stated that could be considered.

Emily Rocha commented with a question regarding lot numbers. She stated somebody commented it would be too much work to record each individual color, and it could possibly cause cross-contamination. Ms. Rocha said her studio mostly handles black and gray realism and asked if an artist usually uses a certain color, if they can default the records for certain times periods when the ink is received. Mark Bergtholdt stated he could not comment on how this will come out, but he imagined if they had something they would default to and probably put into some sort of electronic form, that would be acceptable to the Health District. He clarified that what the Health District is looking for is a way to trace back material to where it came from if somebody contracted something. Mr. Bergtholdt said that was the key to having that information available.

Erin O'Malley read a comment from Lydia Dudoit into the record, as she did not have a microphone. Ms. Dudoit asked if digital release forms or an app could be used if it had all the required information. Mark Bergtholdt stated yes.

Seeing no further comments, Mark Bergtholdt moved to the next agenda item.

- V. **SECOND PUBLIC COMMENTS:** A period devoted to comments by the general public, if any, on any subject, and discussion of those comments. Comments will be limited to five (5) minutes per speaker.

Seeing no comments, Mark Bergtholdt closed the Second Public Comments portion of the workshop.

VI. **SUMMARY and FINAL SNHD COMMENTS**

Mark Bergtholdt stated this is the third and final scheduled public workshop. He said an additional workshop may be held in February. Mr. Bergtholdt stated the Health District will

take any comments about the proposed regulations and any data on the impact to businesses until January 31, 2022.

Mark Bergtholdt requested that attendees please complete a business impact survey if they had not already done so. He stated the survey could be found on the health district website where the agenda was located – [SNHD.info/bodyartregs](https://snhd.info/bodyartregs). Mr. Bergtholdt said the business impact survey is used to determine the impact on businesses and it is important to turn that in based on the regulations as they stand now. He said the surveys were included in the e-mail sent with the agenda.

Mark Bergtholdt thanked everyone for their participation.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**

Mark Bergtholdt adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.