

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

STATE OF NEVADA
BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR SOCIAL WORKERS
PUBLIC MEETING
VIDEO CONFERENCE WITH LAS VEGAS

LCB FILE NUMBER: RO55-19
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2019
RENO, NEVADA

Job No.: 590010

Reported by: CAROL HUMMEL, RPR, CCR #340

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BOARD MEMBERS

PRESENT IN RENO, NEVADA

Vikki Erickson, MSW, LCSW, CPM, President
Susan Neilsen, Secretary/Treasurer
Sandy Lowery, LCSW, LCADC Deputy Director
Karen Oppenlander, LISW, Executive Director
Monica Hoover, Capital Partners
Rota Rosaschi, Nevada Public Health
Monique Normand
Diana Ramirez

PRESENT BY VIDEO CONFERENCE

Monique Harris, Vice-President
Asheesh Bhalla, Esq. Deputy Attorney General
Stefani Maplethorpe
Jenna Grant
Deborah Romes
Tara Baker
Mary Ann Deriendo

1 -oOo-

2 FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2019, 9:00 A.M.

3 -oOo-

4

5 MS. ERICKSON: Good morning. We'll call the
6 meeting to order. It is the public, I guess the public
7 hearing. And it is December 13th, 2019, at 9:15 A.M.

8 And let's take roll call.

9 My name is Vikki Erickson. I'm the board
10 president.

11 MS. NEILSEN: Susan Nielsen. I'm the public
12 member and secretary-treasurer.

13 MS. ROSASCHI: Rota Rosaschi with the Nevada
14 Public Health Foundation, which is just a public member, I
15 guess.

16 MS. RAMIREZ: I am Diana Ramirez, and I'm a
17 public member.

18 MS. NORMAND: My name is Monique Normand. I'm
19 a clinical social worker intern, public member.

20 MS. HOOVER: Monica Hoover with Capital
21 Partners. I represent the Board of Social Workers.

22 MS. LOWERY: Sandy Lowery, Deputy Director.

23 MS. OPPENLANDER: Once again, I'm Karen
24 Oppenlander, Executive Director for the Board of Examiners

1 for Social Workers. If we can do the same thing in
2 Las Vegas.

3 MS. HARRIS: Monique Harris, Vice Chair.

4 MS. DERIENDO: I'm Mary Ann Deriendo,
5 D-e-r-i-e-n-d-o.

6 MS. OPPENLANDER: And your first name?

7 MS. DERIENDO: Is Mary Ann.

8 MS. OPPENLANDER: And Ann is spelled how?

9 MS. DERIENDO: A-n-n. No hyphen, just a
10 space.

11 MS. GRANT: I'm Jenna Grant. I'm a clinical
12 social worker.

13 MS. ROMES: I'm Deborah Romes. I'm a clinical
14 social worker.

15 MS. BAKER: I'm Tara Baker. I'm a social
16 worker. I work for Clark County School District but I'm
17 here on behalf of myself.

18 MR. BHALLA: Asheesh Bhalla, Deputy District
19 Attorney General, and Board counsel.

20 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. Welcome.

21 So let's do Agenda Item 2, public comments.

22 No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this
23 matter of the agenda until the matter has been

24 specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which

1 action may be taken.

2 Hearing none, let's move to Agenda Item 3, for
3 possible action, review, discussion and for possible
4 approval of agenda.

5 MS. OPPENLANDER: Thank you, President
6 Erickson. We have no changes on the agenda.

7 MS. ERICKSON: So we don't need to take
8 action; is that correct?

9 MS. OPPENLANDER: You can take an action. I
10 don't know what Dag Bhalla would say. I believe the
11 agenda is correct as presented.

12 Do we have to take a motion there?

13 MR. BHALLA: It's not required, but since it's
14 on the agenda, I would suggest making a simple motion to
15 approve the agenda as-is and proceed.

16 MS. NEILSEN: I move that we accept the agenda
17 as presented.

18 MS. ERICKSON: Can I get a second, please,
19 with your name.

20 MS. HARRIS: Monique Harris. I'll second.

21 MS. ERICKSON: All in favor, with your name.

22 Erickson, aye.

23 MS. NEILSEN: Aye.

24 MS. HARRIS: Aye.

1 MS. DERIENDO: Aye.

2 MR. BHALLA: Sorry. Have all the board
3 members up there voted?

4 MS. ERICKSON: Yes.

5 Any opposed?

6 Hearing none, motion passes. Thank you.

7 Agenda Item 4. Mr. Bhalla, I'm open to
8 feedback and guidance as well. Just to let you know that,
9 sir.

10 MR. BHALLA: Of course.

11 MS. ERICKSON: Agenda Item 4, review and
12 discussion, summary of public comments received during the
13 Board public workshops conducted in Reno, Nevada, on
14 September 11th, 2019, and Las Vegas, Nevada, on September
15 12th, 2019, pertaining to proposed regulations contained
16 in LCB file number R055-19.

17 Board minutes, as transcripts, from the
18 workshops were approved at the October 11th, 2019,
19 meeting.

20 MS. OPPENLANDER: Karen Oppenlander for the
21 record. Many of the following items I'm going to
22 summarize right now are posted on our Website, and have
23 been, because they're things that have occurred. And many
24 of you that I see from a distance, when I was in Las Vegas

1 I saw you down there before, and here I've seen people
2 before too, so this should be familiar terrain for many.

3 In July, after the legislative session was
4 complete, the Board held a workshop that was a two-day
5 workshop, on July 30th, 2019, with 12 people in attendance
6 to prepare to create NAC changes. I'll explain NAC in
7 just a second.

8 The next day the Board continued in their
9 workshop on July 31st, 2019, with 14 people in attendance
10 to create those NAC changes.

11 NAC changes are the Nevada Administrative
12 Code. We refer to them lovingly as NACs. And what those
13 two days of workshop created was something that would
14 become known as R55-19. And we're here today with the
15 intent, if you look at the entire agenda, and you get to
16 the end of it, to ask for adoption of R55-19.

17 Moving R55-19, although it wasn't called that
18 at the time, the first step was having a public workshop
19 in Reno, which some of you were at, on September 11th,
20 2019, and there were 21 people in attendance.

21 The next step was to have a public workshop in
22 Las Vegas. And some of you, I believe down there, were at
23 that, and there were 10 people in attendance. And did I
24 say September 12th, 2019? I meant to.

1 The following day -- and the things I'm going
2 to summarize here pertain to all three days. The
3 following day I went and made a presentation to the
4 Department of Public and Behavioral Health, and we were on
5 their agenda on September 13th, 2019. And the content of
6 what we said there is in their minutes on their Website.

7 So the topics that we talked about at both
8 public workshops on September 11th and September 12th at
9 the Board of Health, and at the Department of Public and
10 Behavioral Health, on their agenda, were as follows.

11 We talked about what became known as R55-19,
12 and we talked about general provisions. And we were
13 suggesting that changes would be made to the NAC, Nevada
14 Administrative Code, for the definition of LASW, Licensed
15 Associate Social Worker, and LSW, Licensed Social Worker,
16 reversing changes made in 2017.

17 Moving forward we brought forward the Board's
18 suggestions for NAC change in licensing and supervision,
19 including the length of time an application for licensure
20 would stay open. Removing the option for an MSW graduate
21 to take the bachelor's exam. Changing the time frames for
22 when a failed exam may be retaken. Reducing the period
23 for restoration of an expired license from three to two
24 years. Stipulating educational requirements for a

1 Provisional "B" license. The length of time for an exam
2 and expiration for a Provisional "A" license. Increasing
3 fees for applications, initial licensure, endorsement, and
4 renewals. And disallowing payments by cash.

5 Under the heading in our NACs around
6 postgraduate internships the Board had moved forward
7 removing substantially equivalent language on hours being
8 counted from an internship in another state. Asked to
9 increase the number of interns a supervisor could have
10 from three to four. And reducing the frequency or
11 postgraduate internship progress reports from quarterly to
12 every six months.

13 Under continuing education. Specifying that a
14 retired licensee must still complete suicide prevention
15 CEUs for renewal of a license.

16 And last, we moved forward under Standards of
17 Practice adding information regarding what is considered
18 unprofessional conduct.

19 So in all of these meetings that I outlined to
20 you, there were many opportunities, and many people took
21 us up on those opportunities, as well as phone calls and
22 emails, to clarify what I just said. What did it mean?
23 My goodness. So we talked and talked and talked and
24 talked and got it all clarified for those people.

1 So as we moved forward from that point
2 forward, there was not a lot of pushback to the Board any
3 more as people understood why these changes were being
4 recommended by the Board, they accepted that. So we are
5 not expecting a lot of pushback today on R55-19.

6 However, I welcome everybody today. I thank
7 you for being here and for coming to us. We have gone out
8 quite a bit. But at this point, as we have a public
9 hearing with the intent of adopting R55-19, it's really
10 nice that you come in so that we can consider if you have
11 anything new that the Board might need to think about.
12 It's very kind of you to come to this public hearing and
13 help us out that way.

14 Having said that, I think the other thing
15 that's worthy of note. In this particular process we went
16 through there was a six-month period at the beginning of
17 the year to get fee ceilings increased. That was a
18 legislative process under Senate Bill 502. And there was
19 a lot of misunderstanding thinking that at that moment we
20 were trying to increase fees.

21 So during the first six months of the year we
22 had hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of interactions
23 across the state of Nevada to discuss, although we didn't
24 intend to discuss fee increases at that point, we found

1 ourselves discussing them.

2 So in addition to this period after the
3 legislation was signed into law by the governor, we kept
4 going out and talking about anything anybody wanted to
5 talk about. So this has been an extreme outreach, heavy
6 process for the Board, and so hopefully we've been able to
7 talk to most people through the process.

8 The next step for us in the Administrative
9 Rule Making Guide when you are going to change NACs -- and
10 if I sound too educational here, I know that some of the
11 people that are attending are attending for CEUs in ethics
12 today so I'm trying to take time to spell it out. So for
13 those of you that are very familiar with this process,
14 know that I am speaking to those of you that are educating
15 yourself on how the process works.

16 So the next part of the Administrative Rule
17 Making Guide takes us into a process where we take
18 everything that was gathered. And, by the way, there were
19 Board meetings all the way through here where the Board
20 was listening to all the changes that were taking place.
21 And we moved forward with R55-19 to the Legislative
22 Council Bureau attorneys.

23 As we were trained, and as was the case, once
24 we got to the LCB attorneys, there was negotiations that

1 took place. And I didn't see that coming. It was very
2 interesting to me. One of the areas where we were
3 considering removing the option for MSW graduates to take
4 the bachelor's exam could not get through the LCB
5 attorneys.

6 So I was trying to understand what they were
7 talking about to me since they were talking about a
8 constitutional problem that we would, perhaps, be creating
9 if we tried to run this NAC through. And I said, gosh, we
10 don't want a constitutional problem of any sort.

11 So I called up our then Deputy Attorney
12 General, Dag Detmer. And Dag Detmer said, they're right,
13 it's wrong, and we did not catch that during the Board
14 workshop in July.

15 So subsequent to that the President of the
16 Board joined the Director of the Board, as well as the
17 Deputy Director of the Board, along with several members
18 of the Association of Social Work Boards, and we had a
19 conference call. And we determined that we're going to
20 have to go a different route during the legislative
21 session in 2021.

22 So without further ado on that one, that one
23 was taken out of the R55-19 that was in place at the time.
24 So R55-19 is minus that, that change was made, and it is

1 no longer part of it.

2 The next thing we did on November 20th was
3 make a paper presentation to the legislative committee on
4 healthcare. And as it turned out, they accepted our paper
5 presentation. And other boards had to go to the table and
6 speak in Carson City, we did not. So at that point we
7 come here.

8 So that's my summary of Item Number 4 on the
9 agenda. I'm going to pause for a second before we move to
10 Item 5.

11 We're now on Item 5 on the agenda which is
12 reviewing and discussing a summary of a written public
13 comment submitted to the Board electronically pertaining
14 to the proposed regulation contained in LCB file number
15 R55-19.

16 We received a written comment from Sylvie
17 Clemons about the proposed regulation changes. I'm going
18 to read it into the record.

19 "Good morning. Prior to the Board vote, and
20 if not too late, I would like to suggest the fees for
21 retired social workers and associates who are not
22 practicing remain the same \$100 as opposed to being
23 increased to \$175. This fee is substantial, especially if
24 someone is not practicing but wants to maintain their

1 license, retired and not practicing social worker. The
2 fees for retired clinical social workers who are not
3 practicing remain the same, \$150. Thank you for your
4 attention to this matter. Silva Clemons, license number
5 3002S, retired LSW, not practicing."

6 Through an analysis of this matter I would
7 like to quickly turn to our Deputy Director and have her
8 let you know how and why the Board would attend to this
9 differently than through NAC changes.

10 Sandy.

11 MS. LOWERY: Lowery for the record. The
12 proposal suggested by Ms. Clemons is not something that
13 can be addressed in our NACs. What it has done is invite
14 us, and in fact reinforced our awareness of needing to
15 establish a new licensure category of inactive license.
16 And because that is not something that can be addressed in
17 our NACs, that is one of the agenda items, I guess you
18 could say, that we will be addressing in the 2021
19 legislative session as we will have NRS changes to be put
20 forth to the legislature.

21 So that particular issue is not addressable in
22 our NACs, but will be carried forward with and reinforce
23 our intent to establish an inactive licensure status.

24 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you.

1 Let's move on to Agenda Item 6, which is
2 review and discussion, summary of information obtained
3 from solicitation of input from Nevada small businesses
4 and licensees pertaining to possible economic impact and
5 copies of submitted responses.

6 Ms. Oppenlander.

7 MS. OPPENLANDER: Karen Oppenlander for the
8 record. Before I turn this over to Sandy Lowery, I wanted
9 to introduce the topic a little bit.

10 Our Board went through a discussion,
11 particularly at the staff level, and with Miranda Hoover
12 from Capital Partners, about how we could do the best
13 possible outreach for the small business impact survey.

14 So when you're following the Administrative
15 Rule Making Guide for how you get one of these R55-19s
16 through the process, you have to do a small business
17 impact survey. In the past, historically, we haven't had
18 really great feedback success. So we did a number of
19 things to become more successful.

20 But beyond that, some things happened during
21 the Board workshop that went on for two days on July 30th
22 and 31st, and that was some real interesting discussions.
23 There were four Board members when we had 12 members one
24 day and 14 the next, and the rest were other people,

1 including public members, including from the University of
2 Nevada, Reno, and University of Las Vegas.

3 And there was a lot of discussion about how
4 can we help incentivize this process to make it more
5 successful for social workers? So we wanted to ask a lot
6 of questions after we left that Board workshop, in
7 addition to small business impact questions. So we're
8 going to come out with a lot of that information in the
9 spring of 2021 -- excuse me, 2020.

10 We're still analyzing the feedback from the
11 surveys we sent out. But today Sandy is going to give you
12 the feedback from the small business impact survey portion
13 of it, as well as the staff analysis of some of the
14 comments we received.

15 Sandy.

16 MS. LOWERY: Okay. Lowery for the record. As
17 Karen said, we historically get very poor response rates
18 from small business impact surveys. So this year, as
19 Karen was detailing, a number of the meetings and the
20 other pieces of efforts that we made to have contact with
21 our constituents, we also sent out small business impact
22 surveys.

23 We took a different tactic this year. We
24 started by identifying 360 licensed social workers that

1 self-identified as having small businesses. So we
2 submitted to them electronically a small business impact
3 survey in hopes that they would, as an identified small
4 business owner, respond to the information we were
5 requesting.

6 The second thing we did is that we looked at
7 our database, and we identified all of the employers of
8 the social workers in the state of Nevada based on social
9 workers telling us who they work for. We took that list
10 and culled it down to 342 businesses that employed 150 or
11 less employees. That is the benchmark for the small
12 business impact survey. Anything over 150 employees is
13 considered a large business. So that gave us 342
14 businesses.

15 We sent out paper surveys to those 342
16 businesses requesting the same small business impact
17 information that we had sent out to the licensees that
18 identified themselves as small business owners. So in
19 total that meant we reached out to 702 individuals that
20 identified as small business owners or directly to small
21 business owners.

22 Out of that 702 surveys that were distributed,
23 we received 28 back. That was a four percent return. So
24 within the 28 that we received back, the data analysis

1 showed us that 62 percent of those small businesses
2 required their employees to manage their own licensing
3 fees. Therefore, they were not reporting any small
4 business impact from the proposed fee increases.

5 Ten small businesses reported paying for the
6 renewal of their employees. And six of those ten reported
7 zero, minimal, or only moderate impact of the proposed fee
8 increases.

9 The remaining four small businesses reported
10 high impact. And I will be noting the comments that they
11 made in relation to the proposed fee increases.

12 So Comment 1 was, and I quote, "Negatively,
13 and would impact our budget."

14 The agency that submitted the report is a
15 small business that reported 100 total employees, of which
16 our database showed only five social workers. So the
17 proposed fee increase would be related to three LSWs and
18 two LCSWs. So for this particular small business there
19 would be a net fiscal increase of \$150 per year.

20 The second comment was, quote, "We are a
21 nonprofit depending on private donations; therefore, any
22 increases affect us adversely." End quote.

23 Our analysis of this particular business noted
24 that it had 38 employees of which our database show only

1 two social workers, one LSW, and one LCSW. So the net
2 increase to that business of the fee increases was going
3 to be \$62.50 annually.

4 The third comment was, and I quote, "I am a
5 one-person agency that offers low-cost counseling. This
6 change would be a burden financially." End quote.

7 The analysis of this is that as a sole
8 business owner the individual agency is an LCSW, so it
9 would result in a net fee increase per year of \$37.50.

10 The fourth comment was, quote, "It would
11 increase benefit payout to the employee which impacts our
12 annual budget." End quote.

13 Our staff analysis of this response was that
14 the agency had three total employees, and our database
15 showed three social workers, one LSW and two LCSWs which
16 would create a net fiscal increase of \$100 per year to
17 that agency.

18 So in summary, in analyzing the four
19 businesses that self-identified as having a high impact
20 from these proposed fee increases, the total net increase
21 for these four businesses was \$350 a year impacting 11
22 social workers out of the 142 employees represented in
23 those four agencies.

24 So the impact of the small business -- the

1 impact of the fee increases on small businesses appears to
2 be minimal. Thank you.

3 The other piece of the small business impact
4 survey is to identify how we would utilize the fees
5 obtained through the fee increases. And I'm going to
6 defer that to Karen so that she can speak to that.

7 MS. OPPENLANDER: Karen Oppenlander for the
8 record. Regarding the use of money for fee increases, and
9 these are things that I'm reiterating that have come up
10 over the last month in these public meetings. In the
11 course of a fiscal year, the total increase in income from
12 fee increases will be approximately \$72,000. This money
13 will be used in several ways. The Board of Examiners for
14 Social Workers will become fully compliant with 2015
15 legislative mandates to have all licensing applications
16 online. Thus far we have met the first phase of the
17 requirement by moving licensing renewals to an online
18 platform. These additional fees will allow for the second
19 phase, moving the initial applications to the online
20 platform.

21 Additionally, following considerable work with
22 auditors from the executive branch and auditors from the
23 Legislative Council Bureau branch of government and their
24 recommendation, the Board will begin to set aside reserves

1 in 2020. This Board currently has no reserves.
2 Recommendations, depending on the branch of government,
3 has been anywhere from four to 12 months of reserves.
4 This Board has a strategic plan to hit five months of
5 reserve by 2023, meeting the 2015 mandate that's in place
6 from the State of Nevada.

7 And our intent using fee increases is to
8 address the compliance unit backlog by hiring a full-time
9 investigator, along with the increased and attendant
10 attorney's fees that are associated with analyzing and
11 prosecuting disciplinary cases. So for those of you that
12 are newer to this process, today, as we have discussed
13 before, we have a backlog that reaches back to 2009.

14 So our intent is to, as we're mandated to do,
15 address that backlog more efficiently and effectively than
16 we are currently doing.

17 In conclusion, the Board has stated in prior
18 Board meetings that it believes that the benefits of the
19 proposed NAC changes outweigh the cost. With that, we
20 are, from a staff level anyway, complete with Item Number
21 6 on the agenda.

22 Thank you, Madam President.

23 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. Let's move on to
24 Item 7 for possible action, review, discussion for

1 possible approval of adoption of LCB file number R055-19.

2 Reviewed documents shall include:

3 A. The LCB file number R055-19. Revised
4 proposed regulations of the Board of Examiners for Social
5 Workers.

6 B. Notice of intent to act upon a regulation,
7 notice of hearing for the adoption of LCB file number
8 R110-17.

9 MS. OPPENLANDER: That's an error. I
10 apologize. That should be R055-19.

11 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. That threw me off
12 for a bit. I was like uh-oh. Thank you for that
13 correction.

14 C. Minutes from the September 11, 2019, and
15 September 12, 2019, public workshops conducted in Reno and
16 Las Vegas, Nevada.

17 And D. Board small business impact
18 statements.

19 So at this point we'll now take any oral
20 comments prior to hearing any motion for this action.

21 MS. ROSASCHI: You want it from the public or
22 just from the Board?

23 MS. ERICKSON: Public.

24 MR. BHALLA: This would be the time for

1 comments from the public, if there are any.

2 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you.

3 MS. ROSASCHI: Actually, I would like to say
4 something. For the record, Rota Rosaschi. I appreciate
5 the opportunity to work, or to join in and participate in
6 the workshop in July and again in September. I appreciate
7 the efforts of the Board and your willingness to listen to
8 the licensees and to work through some of the issues and
9 matters and concerns that we have and have appreciated the
10 changes that you have made accordingly.

11 So I would like to go on record to thank
12 everybody for all that effort.

13 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you.

14 MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

15 MS. ERICKSON: Your participation is much
16 appreciated as well. Thank you.

17 Las Vegas, do you have any comments from the
18 public?

19 MR. BHALLA: No public comments down here,
20 Madam President.

21 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Bhalla.

22 Hearing none, we can move for a Board vote --
23 go ahead.

24 MS. OPPENLANDER: Karen Oppenlander for the

1 record. I just went to my second in a year and a half, my
2 second board in commissions training, and I was really
3 keying in on public hearings since I hadn't been part of
4 one yet. And for the four Board members that are part of
5 this meeting, if you could self-identify your license
6 level as you work through the parts of this process.

7 For example, let's say you've made a motion
8 and so forth and so on, and it's time to vote. And
9 somebody like Madam President here would say, Vikki
10 Erickson. I'm a licensed clinical social worker, and I
11 vote aye. It would be in that kind of a process where you
12 identify your license level, if that's appropriate.

13 Obviously, the public members won't do that.
14 I just wanted to add that little thing because we don't
15 typically do that, but in a public hearing we must. Just
16 thought I would throw that in. Thank you.

17 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you for the
18 clarification.

19 If I could ask for a motion to approve the
20 adoption of LCB file number R055-19.

21 MS. HARRIS: We couldn't hear you. We heard
22 Vikki. We didn't hear you.

23 MS. NEILSEN: I thought maybe I shouldn't be
24 the one to second this because I'm a public member. I

1 don't --

2 MS. ERICKSON: You're a member of the Board.

3 MS. OPPENLANDER: You would be firsting it
4 anyway if you start now.

5 MS. NEILSEN: I move that we approve the
6 proposed regulations R055-19, proposed regulations for
7 social workers.

8 MS. ERICKSON: Your name and your license
9 level -- or not license level.

10 MS. NEILSEN: My name is Susan Neilsen. I'm a
11 public member of the Board, and I do not practice in the
12 field of social work.

13 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you.

14 Can I get a second, please.

15 MS. HARRIS: Monique Harris, licensed clinical
16 social worker. I second.

17 MS. ERICKSON: All in favor?

18 Vikki Erickson, Licensed Clinical Social
19 Worker, aye.

20 MS. NEILSEN: Susan Neilsen, aye.

21 MS. MAPLETHORPE: Stefine Maplethorpe, LCSW,
22 aye.

23 MS. HARRIS: Monique Harris, LCSW, aye.

24 MS. ERICKSON: Any opposed?

1 Hearing none, looks like the motion passes.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. HARRIS: I have a question before we
4 adjourn. We had two people come in during the
5 conversation or during the meeting. Do they need to be
6 added to the record?

7 MR. BHALLA: They can just sign in and that
8 will do it.

9 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. So we'll move to
10 Item 8, public comment. No vote may be taken upon a
11 matter raised under this item of the agenda until the
12 matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda
13 as an item upon which action may be taken.

14 Do we have any public comments?

15 MR. BHALLA: There is no public comment down
16 here in Las Vegas, Madam President.

17 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. Seeing none here in
18 Reno either. Thank you.

19 So let's move to Item 9. Can I get a motion
20 for adjournment, please.

21 MS. HARRIS: Monique Harris, LCSW, motion to
22 adjourn.

23 MS. MAPLETHORPE: Stefani Maplethorpe, LCSW.
24 I second that motion.

1 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you.

2 All in favor?

3 Vikki Erickson, LCSW, aye.

4 MS. NEILSEN: Susan Neilsen, aye.

5 MS. HARRIS: Monique Harris, aye.

6 MS. MAPLETHORPE: Stefani Maplethorpe, aye.

7 MS. ERICKSON: Any opposed?

8 Hearing none, we're now adjourned. Motion
9 carries. Thank you.

10 (Proceedings concluded at 10:00 A.M.)

11 -oOo-

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY & SECURITY: CAUTIONARY NOTICE
2 Litigation Services is committed to compliance with applicable federal
3 and state laws and regulations ("Privacy Laws") governing the
4 protection and security of patient health information. Notice is
5 hereby given to all parties that transcripts of depositions and legal
6 proceedings, and transcript exhibits, may contain patient health
7 information that is protected from unauthorized access, use and
8 disclosure by Privacy Laws. Litigation Services requires that access,
9 maintenance, use, and disclosure (including but not limited to
10 electronic database maintenance and access, storage, distribution/
11 dissemination and communication) of transcripts/exhibits containing
12 patient information be performed in compliance with Privacy Laws.
13 No transcript or exhibit containing protected patient health
14 information may be further disclosed except as permitted by Privacy
15 Laws. Litigation Services expects that all parties, parties'
16 attorneys, and their HIPAA Business Associates and Subcontractors will
17 make every reasonable effort to protect and secure patient health
18 information, and to comply with applicable Privacy Law mandates,
19 including but not limited to restrictions on access, storage, use, and
20 disclosure (sharing) of transcripts and transcript exhibits, and
21 applying "minimum necessary" standards where appropriate. It is
22 recommended that your office review its policies regarding sharing of
23 transcripts and exhibits - including access, storage, use, and
24 disclosure - for compliance with Privacy Laws.

25 © All Rights Reserved. Litigation Services (rev. 6/1/2019)