



STATE OF NEVADA

## BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR SOCIAL WORKERS

4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite C121, Reno, Nevada 89502

### MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING

Friday, August 9, 2019

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** The meeting of the Board of Examiners for Social Workers (BESW) was called to order by Vikki Erickson, Board President, at 9:05 a.m. The meeting was held at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) System Computing Services Building, Room 47, in Reno, Nevada, 89557. There was a simultaneous audioconference conducted at Mojave Mental Health, 6375 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite A100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89146. President Erickson noted that the meeting had been properly posted and that the Board members present constituted a quorum.

**ROLL CALL:** Roll call was initiated by President Erickson, with the following individuals present:

Members Present:

Vikki Erickson, LCSW, President (**Erickson**)  
Monique Harris, LCSW, Board Member (**Harris**)  
Stefaine Maplethorpe, LCSW, Board Member (**Maplethorpe**)  
Susan Nielsen, Secretary / Treasurer (**Nielsen**)

Staff, Advisors Present

Karen Oppenlander, Executive Director (**Oppenlander**)  
Michael Detmer, Esq., Board Counsel (**Detmer**)  
Miranda Hoover, Board Lobbyist (**Hoover**) joined meeting at 9:12 a.m.

*Board members and Board staff will be identified by the above **bolded** means throughout the minutes.*

**Erickson** turned to Agenda Item 2, public comment.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

A guest in attendance was welcomed and she introduced herself as Kathy Wild, LCSW. Ms. Wild stated that she renewed her license in June. She said it was easy and smooth on the new website. She commented that website has come so far and her colleagues and peers are all giving the same feedback. Ms. Wild said it is well done and much appreciated. At that time, there was no additional public comment.

**REGULAR AGENDA:**

**Board Operations**

**Erickson turned to Agenda Item 3A (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of June 14, 2019 Board Meeting Minutes.**

**Maplethorpe made a motion to approve the Board minutes for June 14, 2019; Nielsen seconded the motion. Ayes: Erickson, Maplethorpe, Harris and Nielsen. Passed unanimously.**

**Erickson turned to Agenda item 3B (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Application for Licensure Pursuant to NRS 641B 220.3 for the Licensing of Applicant, C.T.** Oppenlander stated that Board members have been provided with sealed manila envelopes containing an application, information from the California Board of Behavioral Sciences, a letter from Cinda Tejeras (the applicant), and several reference letters regarding licensure as an LSW for Cinda. Ms. Tejeras signed a waiver before appearing. **Erickson** paused the meeting for several minutes so that Board members could review the information.

**Erickson** asked Cinda if she wanted to address the Board about her application. Cinda said that the letter she wrote explained a lot of what she went through and that she loves working as a social worker. She worked as a LCSW for several years after the incident with no complaints. She stated that she has learned from this experience immensely. **Erickson** mentioned that previously Ms. Tejeras was a LCSW in California and she is now applying for licensure as an LSW in Nevada. She asked if Board members had any questions or comments.

**Harris** asked why Cinda is applying for LSW instead of LCSW. Cinda explained the difficulties she had in California to reinstate her LCSW license. When she relocated to Nevada she decided to apply for an LSW license. **Oppenlander** commented that, considering Cinda's circumstances, going through the LSW doorway makes the most sense for her now.

**Nielsen** asked about the CEUs Cinda has been obtaining since she surrendered her license. Cinda replied that while she was an LCSW, she became certified in suicide prevention.

**Nielsen** asked how was the question of the balance of monies owed to California was resolved. Cinda stated that they informed me that as long as I rescinded my license, I would not have to pay that. If I were to go back to California and want to get back into becoming licensed in California, then I would have to pay that.

**Harris** asked about the circumstances where Cinda was accused of negligence. Cinda replied that she was given no direct formal process as to how to talk to inmates and the process of asking questions to find out where they were in that moment, as to whether or not they were suicidal. If they had intent, what their plan of action was. All of that was discussed with the inmate and there was no intent or plan or desire to, to kill self. He just wanted to go into the hospital because he was tired of not getting any sleep because of another inmate. Cinda stated that she did not do the actual written documentation immediately and that was where she was in error.

**Harris** asked if suicide risk was why Cinda went to see the inmate. What was the purpose? Cinda responded that he wanted to go to the department of health services to inpatient care, because he was tired of not getting sleep and he wanted to go and get some rest. He was in a two person cell in the general population area. **Harris** asked when Cinda found out about the inmate's previous suicidal and homicidal activities; was it during the interview or after? Cinda stated that the inmate had no previous history of suicide. He had a previous psychiatric history, he was schizophrenic and in prison for murder. He was not medicated. She spent the whole hour interview gathering this information, finding out whether or not he needed more services, and he was scheduled to see his psychiatrist, the next day. **Harris** asked if Cinda didn't know about those things in order to document. Cinda replied that she knew he had no previous history of suicide as she was talking to him. He said he did not feel suicidal and he had no plan of action to commit suicide.

**Erickson** asked if Board members wanted her to read three reference letters for the record. She then did so.

**Harris** noticed that the timeline in which the incident occurred, it looked like it was before Cinda received her LCSW. Is that the case? Cinda said she was still an intern when all of this was transpiring.

**Harris** asked if any the allegations or charges went towards Cinda's supervisor? Cinda replied that they did not. **Maplethorpe** stated with that her license culpability is going to be on her as well for interns. Cinda replied that it is the same case as Nevada as in California that the supervisors are culpable for the interns they supervise. California at the time had a lot of lawsuits filed against them because of the high number of inmates versus the number of people caring for them and overcrowding. There were not enough social workers so interns were hired versus licensed professionals. She became the scapegoat. She thinks a lot of it was that they tried to show that they were trying to do something to correct some of their faults. We were trained by each other. As interns we had supervisors; there's a letter from my supervisor about all the difficulties that there were. There was a high turnover of staff which made it a very difficult place to work in as an intern. You just followed through with what they told you to do. There were times where people didn't write their notes for months after the fact. It wasn't unheard of that interns weren't documenting correctly.

**Nielsen** asked if it was unusual the California Board to file the complaint. **Detmer** replied that an informal complaint can be by someone like a supervisor, a client or anybody. When it comes to the formal complaints based off the informal complaint, the executive director will oftentimes file that. **Oppenlander** stated that depending on how the Board receives an accusation, her name would be there. There are many variables involved.

**Nielsen** commented that she didn't see any documentation of communication to the California Board. **Oppenlander** replied that she did not communicate with the California Board of Behavioral Sciences on this application for a licensed social worker. The way this Board is structured, she would have to be provided some guidance from Board Counsel to launch an investigation. Under the Yes Policy, this was outside of the policy, and we needed to invite the applicant to the Board.

**Maplethorpe** wondered why Cinda did not advocate for herself like she is doing now. Cinda replied that she had to hire an attorney and the court process took almost two years. It was a very long legal and expensive process and the end result was that it's hard to go against a bureaucratic system.

**Erickson** asked whether Cinda would want to go through the internship process again to obtain an LCSW license in Nevada. Cinda said that she would be interested. **Oppenlander** stated that the LSW application is all that is being considered at this time. A possible LCSW license for Cinda is a separate matter for the future.

**Detmer** asked to confirm that Cinda's license was surrendered and has it been confirmed with the California Board. **Oppenlander** said no, that certification of licensure received from the California Board of Behavioral Sciences indicated that the license was surrendered, when the examinations occurred, and she used the information as presented.

**Detmer** stated that the reason he brought this up is because like with other Boards he works with there is typically a form of reciprocity between Boards which is nationwide. So if there is a suspension in Nevada a Board in California would recognize that suspension. This is being phrased or is being represented that it was a voluntary relinquishment which would be different than a suspension. He doesn't know if there were any conditions beyond just the relinquishment. His point is that Boards are always aware of the registries and follow whatever reciprocity policy is in place. It's just not one dictated by regulation or statute. In other words, if the Board has a policy of observing reciprocity of other states' suspensions, it should always be checked if that's the policy. **Oppenlander** indicated that she doesn't have a reciprocity policy that she follows since the Board doesn't have one. The Board does follow endorsement which is a different matter. This LSW application is complete in and of itself and the reason it was brought to the Board is because there was a prior consent decree. We can establish the type of policy that our Board counsel is talking about for the future, but it doesn't exist today. **Harris** asked if there is a statute in place that would support or impact the reciprocity process. **Detmer** replied that he's not seeing anything right now. He commented that if Ms. Tejeras has represented that she has no outstanding suspensions that the Board is aware from the information that's been provided, if she has been less than candid and she's issued license, then that would be a possible disciplinary action down the road.

**Oppenlander** advised Board members to look at the application itself, with redacted social security numbers, etc. At the bottom of page six it says, "Have you ever been the subject of an administrative action / proceeding relating to a professional license or certification?" and "Have you ever been disciplined for unprofessional conduct or professional incompetence?" She checked "yes." She's following our processes as they exist today. **Detmer** said it wasn't his intention to complicate the issue. He just wanted to ensure that there was nothing else outstanding.

**Erickson** asked about the stipulated surrender of license on page 5 of the Order. It indicates respondent further understands and agrees that the Board's adoption of her licensed surrender precludes her from petitioning the Board for a reinstatement of the surrendered license. **Detmer** replied that it basically saying that she is surrendering her license and she can't ask for it back. California doesn't have jurisdiction over in Nevada. It's up to the Board whether or not to issue a license. **Maplethorpe** said she looked at the ASWB website for California and all the information is there.

**Harris made a motion to approve the application for Ms. Tejeras to become licensed as an LSW. Maplethorpe seconded the motion. Ayes: Erickson, Harris, Maplethorpe, and Nielsen. Passed unanimously.**

**Erickson turned to Agenda Item 3C (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Financials for year end, June 30th, 2019.** **Oppenlander** stated that this is item 3C on your financials. She said she referred to these financials earlier in the last Board retreat, although they didn't have copies. She explained that it shows year end numbers. The Board's net position is more favorable than expected. At 100% of the year on June 30th, income was 107% of budget. Expenses were at 91% of budget. The net position adjusted is \$70,000.00 including the prior year fund balance. **Oppenlander** commented that the June numbers were consistent with the monthly numbers throughout the year. **Oppenlander** suggested that she should agendize how much money might be placed in reserves and so forth in the October Board meeting. For now, those monies are in the Bank of America accounts.

**Maplethorpe made a motion to approve the June 30 budget. Harris seconded the motion. Ayes: Maplethorpe, Erickson, Harris and Nielsen. Passed unanimously.**

**Erickson turned to Agenda Item 3D (For Possible Action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of** stipend for field practicum student to assist Board operations.

**Oppenlander** commented that the recent Board retreat, there was a discussion regarding giving stipends to field practicum students should they decide to work with the Board. The student was there during the Board's meeting, she had several interviews, and I have had another student apply. **Oppenlander** said she would like to discuss this matter in the future since she doesn't need a student right now. **Erickson** confirmed that there doesn't need to be a vote on this now. **Oppenlander** confirmed. She would like the Board's opinion about whether or not she should pursue this. Practicum students do 450 hours a year, 225 per semester. Perhaps we agree on some projects that would be mutually beneficial to the field practicum student and the Board. For example, if a student agreed with us to work on three projects per semester and completed them successfully the student could be paid \$10 per hour for 225 hours. This would be similar to a reward at the end of the project, if they fulfilled the agreement. **Maplethorpe** replied that she likes the idea. It would be good for the student to offset some expenses such as books, and very helpful. She agreed that further discussion is warranted.

**Erickson moved on to 3E Capital Partners Update for Review and Discussion of the 2019 Legislative session.**

**Hoover** pointed out that she provided a fairly comprehensive report since she knows that it's not just Board legislation they are interested in. There might be other pieces of legislation mentioned in the report that might be of interest. **Hoover** instructed Board members to turn to page 4 and 5 for the main Board priorities that did pass. SB 502 regarding the fee increase passed and was effective as of July 1st.

**Hoover** went on to say there are some open meeting law legislative updates including AB 70. AB 70 doesn't become effective until October 1, 2019. It addresses subcommittees and why the Board has to be extra careful if they form committees. They have to be agendized with minutes and recordings just like we do for our current Board.

**Hoover** noted that this bill also allows, especially for Boards, if they're going to have meetings in the rural counties that they can now do teleconferencing and video conferencing much like we do. She commented that part is very positive.

**Hoover** pointed out that she put in some additional notes. There were some bills that she and the Board worked on with **Oppenlander** and Sandy Lowery (**Lowery**). They had provided fiscal notes and based on amendments they were able to remove those fiscal notes. For the most part, none of these bills have any fiscal impact on this Board,

**Hoover** advised that AB 319 was a bill that we worked very closely with, not only the bill sponsor, but also the gentleman that has been working on this bill for the past three legislative sessions. AB 319 would allow a person who is interested in pursuing an occupational or professional license to come to the Board and ask if they're even eligible for that license before they go through the education, or apply for a license. This would be based on any criminal history or anything else that they might have on their record. The Board believes that this is going to be helpful not only for individuals, from a fiduciary benefit but also hopefully for Boards. AB 319 is a bill that the Board worked on and it did pass. Originally a fiscal note was submitted, which was removed with an amendment. **Hoover** commented that there are multiple parts that take effect at different times throughout the year. She can answer any questions the Board might have.

**Hoover** advised that AB 534 is the bill she referenced during the Board retreat. She has been working very closely with Alison Combs, the main policy analyst for the governor. The Governor's office introduced this bill regarding local emergency management plans. It covers health Boards and other Boards across the state that deal directly with management plans if there is a terrorist attack, AB 534 addressed how Boards would go about working with communities to ensure the public and the community are safe. She said that the BESW has a seat at the table and she is waiting for them to advise her when they're going to start those conversations for the implementation process.

**Hoover** directed the Board to page 5, which goes over some other bills of interest. SB 37 was the marriage family therapist bill, which the Board supported all the way through and it did pass. There were some amendments to SB 37, but they're very happy with the bill. The rest of the bills are ones **Hoover** has been tracking for the Board, just in case something was to happen. She also tracks some bills because the Board submitted a fiscal note originally. **Hoover** explained that the rest of the packet is a little bit of everything. Matters regarding the Board's interests and what they might think is important. **Hoover** also said we're already trying to identify some key aspects of the Nevada Revised Statutes that we might want to start tackling for the next session. While February 2021 seems far off, it's really not. She suggested Board members contact her with ideas.

**Erickson** introduced Capitol Partners update item 2 **Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Satisfaction Survey Results as Gathered from the New Online Renewal System**. **Hoover** declared that she was extremely pleased based on the four question survey about anyone having her license renewed online. Licensees were asked how they felt about doing online renewals and an overall sense of their feelings about the Board and with staff and overall education of what they know about licenses. There was a very high percentage of "strongly agree" and "agree" answers to all of these questions. There were also a lot people that added comments saying they are excited that BESW is finally online, because it makes things so much easier. **Hoover** said she thinks this is a hugely positive impact for the Board.

Close to 300 people took the survey since it was put out about seven months ago. **Hoover** also noted that she gets responses regularly as people renew their license.

**Hoover** commented that question 3 is the one she especially wanted feedback from the Board about how to increase our community awareness and communication. For question 4, asking for any other comments licensees would like to share with the Board, she was surprised that there was a pretty high response. Normally she gets maybe 10 or 20, and there were close to 70. **Harris** and **Neilson** asked to see copies of the comments and **Hoover** agreed to provide them. **Maplethorpe** asked if there was anything that stood out. **Hoover** said that many licensees were excited about online renewals.

**Erickson** moved on to **Item 3F, Review, Discussion, Possible Approval of Strategic Plan Update for 2019, 2023**. **Oppenlander** advised Board members that the strategic plan framework is included in their packets. As she was looking at it and had expressed during the Board retreat, she thinks there is a solid plan in place that doesn't need to be changed. **Oppenlander** went on to say that twice in the last few days she's had the opportunity to talk to the presenter for the executive branch of government regarding how this Board might be subsumed under Business and Industry some day in the future. And it's a little too early to even begin to strategize how we would incorporate some of that into this document yet. As he said, we don't even know how this is going to get legislated, so it's too early to change our strategic plan based on that information. The only change I made in this document is strip out names. For example, in this first goal, Jody Ussher's name was there and I thought it was appropriate to take her name out.

**Oppenlander** acknowledged that there are five sections in the strategic plan and one day she hopes we'll have five Board members. Rather than voting, she said today she would just like to discuss how Board members want to decide which of you are going to choose which goals to be the leader. One of the things that was done when we put this framework together is trying to figure out which two people that are interested in financial stuff, and which two people that are interested in communications. As a result of the open meeting law that passed anytime those two people would meet, it would be agendized and have to be notified to the public. We'd have to take minutes and so forth and so on.

**Oppenlander** asserted that she is struggling a bit with how to proceed. When the Board was framing this out, they were talking about having those kinds of meetings. **Oppenlander** said it seems that we're going to have to move to a different kind of a plan with each goal having a Board leader attached to it. She doesn't want to just put names next to goals. At this time there aren't even five Board members. Someone might've had their name stuck next to a goal and might not like that goal anymore.

**Oppenlander** requested some guidance on the plan that isn't even a year old until about two weeks from now. She is hoping to bring it back to the October Board meeting with some insight as to which Board members want to be attached to which goal. Perhaps Mr. Detmer can help figure out in this open meeting how board members could be attached to each of the goals. People's names have been removed, and now she doesn't know how to reattach them.

**Oppenlander** commented that she can't hold a bunch of separate meetings and go around polling everybody and asking each person, if they are interested in communications? And then I go to the next phone call and ask if a Board member is interested in the communications goal that Jody is no longer on? I don't know how to do that.

**Detmer** replied that he needs to review the new amendment before he gives any kind of advice and he will review open meeting law, discuss it with another DAG, and get back to the Board in the next week or so. **Nielsen** asked about new open meeting law passed as she would like to read it. **Oppenlander** answered that there might be more than one open meeting law that's affecting the Board because there were several presented. After the DAG's office provides interpretation of the new law(s), the Board can size up the strategic plan and how it interrelates.

**Erickson** requested that the Board members review the strategic plan framework and make some decisions about what might be of interest to each of them so they can engage in the conversation in October. Maybe by then the open position on the board will be filled. There was no action required.

**Erickson** moved on to **Agenda item 3G (for possible action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval contract for Albertson Consulting company, maintenance of online renewal software and additional software classes.** **Oppenlander** explained that Albertson Consulting Group is the group that handles the Board's online software. A lot of the process the board went through initially predicated **Oppenlander**. During the bid process with several vendors, the least expensive vendor to get us to where we needed to go on the mandates from the government was to about \$150,000. Regular maintenance costs, would not be included in the bid. We found Albertson Consulting who helped us get the first portion of the process in place. That was the \$24,900 contract from last year to get the online renewals in place. Maintenance for the online software for calendar year of 2019 was included in the Board's budget.

**Oppenlander** went on to say that a lot of development work was done in January, the system was tested, the cost for maintenance for 2019 was \$8,500 total. We paid the \$24,000 and the \$8,500 for the year of 2019. The next payment is due in January of 2020 for maintenance of the software. Included in the Board packets are pages one and two of the updated contracts. The budget liaison in the state asked for an overview of how much it was going to cost us for the next couple of years **Oppenlander** directed Board members to the excel sheet containing the details regarding costs for the software build and future maintenance. The budget liaison requested the contract be amended through 2023.

**Oppenlander** proceeded to explain that the Board will have the funds for software for the online applications process in fiscal year 2021 and funds available in fiscal year 2022. The disciplinary software patches require much less money because it's inward facing. It's not an external document that licensees are able to get into, so it has a different cost attached to it. The contract in the packet is a contract amendment to extend the contract for an additional 3.42 years, through December 31, 2022 and increase the contract authority by \$53,600 for a new contract, not to exceed \$78,500. This fits in our budget with the fee increases we're asking for. The contract is now agreed to and inked by the vendor. **Oppenlander** has agreed to these terms, and the Board Counsel signed the contract. The last place it goes is to the Board of Examiners for the State of Nevada. **Oppenlander** said she is trying to get on their calendar probably for October, to get this approved. **Oppenlander** requested a motion for the Board's approval on record.

**Nielsen** asked if the contract amount is the actual fee to be paid. There won't be any increases later? **Oppenlander** confirmed that is correct.

**Maplethorpe made a motion for the approval of the contract for Albertson Consulting Company for maintenance of online renewal software and additional software patches. Harris seconded the motion. Ayes: Erickson, Nielsen, Harris, and Maplethorpe. Passed unanimously.**

**Erickson turned to agenda item 3H (for possible action) Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of Computer Software Purchase to Meet Mandated Windows 10 Compliance Requirements.** **Oppenlander** indicated that the next section in 3H shows quote confirmation for computers that have been discussed in prior Board meetings, as well as budgeted for. We've been working with Business and Industry. These are quotes for us to replace Board staffs' computers so that we are Windows 10 compliant with the State of Nevada's mandate for December 31, 2019. Because the staffs' computers are not at that level, this is a mandate that we've had to budget for. Our IT tech asked that the Board move forward, so he can get it done in a reasonable timeframe. If this is approved now, then we can move forward and schedule with him in a way that works for everybody. **Nielsen** asked if this is for the software alone. **Oppenlander** replied that it is the software and the hardware. We put in the budget \$12,000 and the grand total is \$12,030.60. We came in \$30.06 over what we budgeted for.

**Harris made a motion for the approval of the equipment and software purchase. Maplethorpe seconded the motion. Ayes: Erickson, Nielsen, Harris, and Maplethorpe. Passed unanimously.**

**Erickson turned to Agenda item 3I Review and Discussion of Fiscal Year End June 30, 2019 Compliance Unit Report.** **Erickson** observed that the report is an update of discharged cases number G9-33, G10-09, G10-13, G18-03, and G18-32. **Oppenlander** noted that those cases were discharged by the compliance unit with the help of Mr. Miller and Board counsel **Detmer**. There was also a disciplinary action this quarter that went to a consent decree. We expect to be meeting (as discussed in the last Board retreat), the goals of the Board to reduce the backlog of cases by 75% by the end of 2019. She thanked Mr. Detmer for all of his help. We are making progress and have the cases more organized. Since Mr. Detmer started working with the compliance unit it's amazing how organized we are in our thinking and how we're processing and moving forward and prioritizing cases. It's a difficult process because our backlog is so high and we do have 92 cases right now. She stated that that number won't be going down until the next fiscal year when we have funds to hire a full time investigator.

**Erickson moved on to Agenda item 3J Review and Discussion of Fiscal Year End June 30, 2019 Licensing Report.** **Oppenlander** advised Board members that the licensure statistics are in the packets. There are now over 3,200 licensees and our numbers are trending upward consistently. Last year we hit 3,000 and now we're at 3,252 now.

**Erickson turned to Agenda item 3K for (possible action) review discussion and possible approval of Board President as the Board Member that is Selected to Attend the ASWB Delegate Assembly to be Held November 7<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup> 2019.** **Erickson** said she asked **Oppenlander** to put this on the agenda as she is interested in participating in this delegate assembly to collaborate with folks throughout the country and up into Canada on the Board processes. **Oppenlander** responded that if there is more than one person that wants to go to the delegate assembly, we only have one position that's paid for. She wanted it on the agenda so that everybody's aware of it. **Erickson** asked if anybody else is interested in going. As an alternate, **Harris** indicated that she might attend.

**Maplethorpe made a motion for Approval of the Board President as Delegate to Attend the ASWB Delegate Assembly to be Held November 7<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup> 2019. Harris seconded the motion. Ayes: Erickson, Nielsen, Harris, and Maplethorpe. Passed unanimously.**

**Erickson** moved on to agenda item **3L Executive Director Report**. **Oppenlander** first discussed an extension of contract for audit services. She had indicated that she wanted to bid for a new auditor eventually. She went on to say that after seeing the results of the 34 audits that the executive branch looked at, she has changed her mind and would like to extend the contract with our current auditor for one more year. She thinks having the same auditor working with us through the change from Quicken to QuickBooks, and the new online renewals would be helpful. This vendor agreed to do so at a slightly increased price (from \$5,000 to \$5,750). Last year our auditor lost money due to the many changes in process. **Oppenlander** stated that she would like to move it forward to the budget liaison so she can get the contract moving and we can go in to audit right now. She thinks there are more reasons to continue with our auditor, including a fair price. **Erickson** responded that she thinks it sounds very responsible to stay with somebody who already has knowledge of our process.

**Oppenlander** moved forward to the small business impact survey. **Hoover** worked with **Lowery** to create the small business impact survey. We are going beyond what we have to do for NAC changes to also find out more about what larger businesses think. We are quite happy with how this looks. She went on to thank **Hoover** for working with us to design the survey. It will be similar to how she designed the survey instrument that we used on the renewal software satisfaction survey.

**Oppenlander** advised Board members that she has public meeting dates scheduled now. Before they are posted on the website she wanted to let them know that, a public workshop is scheduled for the morning of September 12<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 AM at United Way of Southern Nevada. **Oppenlander** said she will need to have a Board member there with her. It will be from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 am at the United Way of Southern Nevada on Flamingo Road. If somebody could be there at nine o'clock, she'll meet you there. **Harris** indicated that tentatively, she will be able to attend.

**Oppenlander** went on to say she has a public workshop scheduled on September 11<sup>th</sup> at South Valley's Library in Reno, Nevada. It is a driver friendly location at the south end of town which will help with some of the people coming from other counties. The workshop is from 12:30 pm to 2:30 pm on Wednesday, September 11th. She asked that a Board member attend with her. **Erickson** said that, tentatively, she can attend.

**Oppenlander** commented that we already have an "R" number for NAC changes from the LCB after changes were reviewed by **Detmer** and **Lowery**. Everything regarding the workshops, the small business impact survey etcetera will be online on Monday.

The next Board meeting date for everybody is Friday, October 11<sup>th</sup>.

**Oppenlander** stated that the future agenda items she knows about now include a contract for bookkeeping services that she'll want to put together; will be coming back with the strategic plan and asking Board members to look at the goals that they're interested in.

**Erickson** moved on to **agenda item 4 Public Comment**. **Detmer** announced that he has been asked to take on a different board assignment. He went on to say it has been an honor and a privilege and a learning process with the Board. **Detmer** said the new DAG is very good, he is often the one he confers with when he has questions. **Detmer** advised the Board that he will transition out and in a relatively short time the new DAG will take over. Board members expressed their appreciation **Detmer's** hard work.

**Maplethorpe made a motion for Adjournment. Harris seconded the motion.  
Ayes: Erickson, Nielsen, Harris, and Maplethorpe. Passed unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Meeting Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Caroline Rhuys, Legal Secretary II.