



State of Nevada

Board of Examiners for Social Workers

4600 Kietzke Lane, #C-121, Reno, NV 89502

(775) 688-2555

Board Meeting Minutes Friday, May 8, 2020 9:00 AM

Erickson referred to **Agenda Item 1, Call to Order and Roll**. She initiated the Board of Examiners for Social Workers meeting via teleconference using a Zoom platform at 9:06 a.m. In attendance: Vikki **Erickson**, Board President; Monique **Harris**, Vice President; Susan **Nielsen**, Public Member and Secretary/ Treasurer; Stefaine **Maplethorpe**, Board Member; Sandy **Lowery**, Deputy Director; Miranda **Hoover**, Capital Partners; Asheesh **Bhalla**, Board Counsel; and Karen **Oppenlander**, Executive Director.

Following, **Erickson** moved to **Agenda Item 2, Public Comment**. She noted that there was no public comment and moved forward to **Board Operations Agenda Item 3A, Review and Discussion of Board Meeting Minutes for March, 13, 2020**. **Erickson** asked for a motion.

Stefaine Maplethorpe made a motion to approve the Board meeting minutes for March 13, 2020, motion seconded by Susan Nielsen. During a roll call vote the motion was approved by Erickson, Nielsen, and Maplethorpe. Harris was absent at March meeting and abstained from voting. The motion passed.

Next, **Erickson** moved to **Agenda Item 3B, Review and Discussion of Current Process for Licensing in Compliance with Governor's 2020 Directives**. **Oppenlander** talked about several Emergency Directives from Governor Sisolak that had been received and focused on Directive 11 that has taken priority over specific sections of 641B during the pandemic. She commended **Lowery** and **Bhalla** for quickly getting together with her to overlay the Governor's directives with 641B with intent to get additional social workers into the work place immediately to handle the pandemic emergency. Within three working days of Directive 11, the Board had 90 new licensees in Nevada that were able to go to work.

Lowery added that once we were able to put the pieces in place and figured out all the moving parts, we were able to get 90 individuals that had open applications and moved them through to get a Provisional License which will be good until September 27th, 2020. This date was based on timeframes dictated by Emergency Directive 11.

Additionally, another piece that that Emergency Directive 11 did was to give the Board authority for Nevada to accept those with behavioral health services experience from individuals not licensed in our state. We created a waiver document and put this into effect with 19 new individuals, all LCSWs that were seeking the opportunity to provide care to Nevadans during the pandemic. These individuals have come from other states e.g. New York, Ohio, California, and Washington i.e. they have been given waiver permission to provide treatment to individuals in Nevada until the end of the Emergency Declaration.

Both **Oppenlander** and **Lowery** went on to discuss the small risk perceived in these processes. Each of the first 90 applications were missing from one to three items: transcripts that hadn't arrived yet; the background checks from the Department of Public Safety; and/ or the receipt of the score from a successfully completed ASWB exam. ASWB has taken a position on temporary licensure and has asked local jurisdictions to use ASWB's advisory to inform policy makers about the implications of implementing a temporary licensure category. Nevada and other states have implemented a temporary license as a way to increase essential workforce capacity during the COVID-19 pandemic by allowing license applicants to begin working before they pass the licensing exam and, possibly, background checks. Despite the good intentions driving this impulse to get care to those in need, ASWB believes a decision to enact such measures is shortsighted and sets a precedent that potentially puts the public at risk and will be difficult to correct after the crisis has passed. While ASWB has recognized that Boards have enacted temporary licensure measures in response to executive orders, they state that: temporary licensure is contrary to the public protection mission of ASWB and its member Boards; granting a temporary license as defined allows a person so licensed to work with vulnerable populations without first demonstrating competence; passing the licensing exam is an essential component of the application process as an indicator of entry-level competence to practice. As problems may arise if an individual continues to practice after the emergency declaration is lifted, the removal of a license by the state must therefore be governed by due process.

Bhalla added that he wouldn't want to speculate too much on future disciplinary matters. We are in an emergency situation. So, in light of the Governor's Directive and the context and the need, steps that were taken by Director **Oppenlander**, Deputy Director **Lowery** and myself were appropriate to allow additional capacity into the system. And if there are any issues that come up in the future, we will be addressing them at the appropriate time and place.

Erickson moved to **Agenda Item 3C, Review and Discussion of Third Quarter Financials through March 31, 2020**. **Oppenlander** reviewed the organization's financial picture at the end of the third quarter of the fiscal year – 75% of the year. It shows that BESW is doing well. We're at 76% of income and at 72% of budgeted expenditures. **Lowery** highlighted several items: We are \$18,000 ahead of budget in terms of our net position, which gives us an adjusted net position of \$110,000 at the end of March. This is largely a reflection of fee increases. **Oppenlander** asked everyone to keep the \$18K number in mind for a conversation later in the agenda. When **Lowery** prepared the budget for this year, we thought we might be able to have fee increases begin in April, however we had fee increases begin earlier (in February) with everyone's help during the NAC process. **Erickson** asked for a motion.

Motion to approve the third quarter financials through March 31, 2020 was made by Stefaine Maplethorpe, seconded by Monique Harris. After a roll call vote the motion was passed unanimously.

Erickson moved forward to **Agenda Item 3D, Review and Discussion of Continuity Planning for 2020-2021 Budget**. First, **Oppenlander** briefly reviewed an item from the Board's March, 2020 budget discussion. At that time, the Board had discussed a budget based on a 10% reduction because of the crisis that was developing with the coronavirus. At that Board meeting, the Director told the Board that staff intended to present a customary 2020-2021 budget in May 2020 for approval.

However, the budget presentation is more complicated. The first column in light blue would be the "customary budget" if the pandemic emergency were not a factor. **Oppenlander** discussed the Governor's guidelines for general fund state agencies that include 4% cuts by June 30 2020; and additional 4%, 6%, and 4% cuts through June 30 2021 for a total 18% cut for the biennium. The BESW budget (columns three, four, and five) considers similar reductions. She explained that as a "Title 54" fee-funded Board, we aren't under the same guidelines as a state agency that receives funding from the general fund; however, staff applied the same principles to the BESW budget as though we were obligated to follow the Governor's guidelines. To accomplish this, BESW would have to institute a hiring freeze, curtail spending and depending on how deep the cuts would ultimately need to be, would need to make additional reductions spending and in work hours.

Oppenlander recommended that for the budget year beginning July 1, 2020 that the Board choose to approve the column highlighted in light yellow which represents a total of 14% cuts from the customary budget. She added that if we were a state agency that uses general funds, we would also be making cuts in the current quarter (ending June 30 2020) in the amount of \$18,000 or 4 percent of our current budget. The reality is that we made \$18,000 more in income than projected because we were able to start fee increases earlier than projected. Her budget recommendation is based on a belief that we would gather all the cash that we can.

Furthermore, staff put together a budget that would consider an additional 10% reduction if more aggressive cutting becomes necessary. However, this more "extreme" budget is not included in today's presentation. In this budget recommendation, for each column (4% cut, additional 6% cut (for total of 10%), and additional 4% cut (for a total of 14%), you can scroll to the bottom to see how we would manage to accomplish these cuts. In the customary budget, we'd have a hiring freeze, use a lobbyist for the session, we'd add our application software, and give raises to staff, increase the number of investigators so that we could clear the disciplinary backlog, and hire a part-time office administrative assistant.

With a 4% budget cut, we would not bring a Bill to the 2021 session to add the LMSW category to 641B; however we would add software modules. In the 10% budget cut column, there would also be no raises and no software. In the 14% cut column, which is the one I recommend, there is a hiring freeze, no legislation introduced, no lobbyist, no software modules, no raises, no reduction in work hours. And, because we wouldn't be traveling because of the coronavirus crisis, we'll also reflect a reduction in our ability to bring in statewide training income.

In July, if we need to bring you a different budget with additional reductions, then we would start making personnel cuts. It would be a matter of cutting hours to make ends meet. We'd cut hours for our investigators and for the executive director and deputy director positions. Essentially, we will start to gather cash and begin to build reserves that we currently don't have. **Lowery** added a comparison of a 14% reduction for the 2020-2021 income to what we anticipated for 2019-2020 income, we still bring in more income than the prior year. This is because of the fee increases.

Erickson asked a question about reversing the budget reductions if the situation improved. **Oppenlander** answered, "Certainly" and went on to say that if during the regularly scheduled Board meeting on July 10, we might adjust the budget

either way as we may know more about the state's overall fiscal outlook, more about how the "reopening" of the State of Nevada is going, and more about how many of our social workers are going to be able to return to their jobs and how this might affect relicensing and therefore the Board's income. Another consideration in July might be to further streamline our process by adding application software.

Oppenlander introduced another consideration. Late yesterday, BESW received another line of questioning directed to Title 54 Boards. This is the third substantial request for information in the past week. This latest request is from the Sunset Committee, the previous request was from the Governor's LEAP committee that is ushering forward the "Roadmap to Recover for Nevada", and the first request was from a Legislative Council Bureau analyst. The Sunset Committee just sent us a new emergency request that is a very detailed examination of BESW. The request asks our Board to provide quite a few specifics e.g. **"Considering the regulatory body's operational expenses, are there any opportunities to consolidate or centralize certain functions—such as information technology, legal advice, lobbying, personnel, and payroll—that can be executed by personnel shared with other regulatory bodies at lower aggregate costs?"** She wanted to make the Board aware of this newest request in relation to earlier Executive Branch Audit Committee discussions (e.g. during last summer's Board Workshop/ Retreat) about merging the Title 54 Boards under Business and Industry. Also, to connect the dots, it's interesting to note that the preceding urgent request for information came from LEAP; and two of the six members of the Governor's LEAP committee are the current and immediate past directors of Business and Industry.

Oppenlander returned to **Erickson's** question about revising our budget if conditions improve e.g. to include Capitol Partner consulting services, we think that it would be very good if we were able to move forward with the legislation – just like we talked about during the March 2020 Board meeting.

Harris asked for clarification as there are statements about what must be done versus what is the Board's opinion on what should be done. **Harris** added that one of the areas that concerns her, or is the biggest flag, is that there is a possibility or the potential of being merged into a larger Board whether we like it or not. **Oppenlander** responded by saying that as the Board now has the benefit of knowing what has been happening very rapidly, she would really like to hear more about the Board's opinion about these matters.

Bhalla started off by saying that policy guidance or lobbying, is not really what his office does. So he is not really authorized to comment on what the Board should do. But, as member **Harris** has noted, there are options on the table, right? If the Legislature comes back, then the Board can decide if they want to authorize any Board member to speak on behalf of the Board at a public hearing. And the scope and parameters of that discussion would be, has to be, authorized by the Board. That authorization could be handled in an open meeting. Also, there is the other option of going along with what is provided by the Legislature. You would have the ability to give feedback which is somewhat limited without the assistance of a lobbyist.

Nielsen asked about monitoring the process. What would it look like? Would there be an opportunity for an emergency Board meeting to discuss any potential changes as things go along? It looks more like we get an update on what has been decided. I heard DAG **Bhalla** mention that there may be room for public discussion or feedback if things are headed in a direction that is concerning.

Bhalla: How the Board wants to schedule updates during this process is really up to the President and Director **Oppenlander**. If you want to have a meeting, we are in an emergency session right now. So technically, we can have meetings on an emergency basis. I do advise Boards to follow the Open Meeting Law though the normal procedures as much as possible so that we can give the public three days' notice of a meeting ahead of time. We will know that the Legislature is meeting, that they are having hearings. So, if there is an emergency that comes up, during this emergency time, then obviously the Board can engage in an emergency meeting with less than three days' notice per the Open Meeting Law. However, I would ask that the Board try to adhere to as much of the regular Open Meeting Law processes as possible. If the Board does feel that it's necessary to designate a Board member to speak on behalf of the Board at a Legislative hearing, then the Board would need to authorize that per an agenda at an open meeting. There would be discussion and approval by the Board to basically designate a Board member to speak on behalf of the Board.

Nielsen asked, "How can we say at this point, what will trigger our decision to go into any one of these later budget columns? Is that dependent upon a ruling by the Governor, the Legislature or is it our own sense of security in terms of making sure we always have money "above the line"? As **Bhalla** did not have that information at this time, he offered to connect after the meeting if we want him to connect with the Governor's Finance Office to get more direction. **Oppenlander** inserted that the questionnaire coming from the Sunset Committee may be a trigger point for changing how we will operate at this time. Secondly, regarding the other question about having money above the line; she stated that she thinks it's a good idea to have "cash on hand" or "money above the line".

Lowery said she thinks that there are two factors that would trigger an emergency Board meeting at this time. During the 2008 recession, the Governor at the time looked at sweeping any extra monies that the Title 54 Boards had. While the state did not touch monies at this Board, she doesn't know if they touched monies at other Boards. There is a possibility that the current Governor could come in and say that he wants whatever reserves we have. While the fact that we don't get any money from the general fund was the reason that **Lowery** believes that the majority of Boards were not impacted in 2008, this currently is a different set of circumstances and that we have to prepare for the real possibility that 14% isn't as low as we are going to be expected to go. If they go into a special session with a statement that that all state agencies must take 25% off the top, we have to be able to respond to that. **Lowery** thinks an emergency Board meeting would be triggered if the Governor or the Legislature came back saying you have to do more than 14%. And, if the Executive or Legislative branches say, "We are going to place your agency under Business and Industry" that would also trigger an emergency Board meeting.

Bhalla: If the Board wants to think about engaging with the Sunset Committee, then it's probably prudent to agendaize the designation and discussion and approval so that the Board is prepared with the designee given that we can anticipate that this is coming up.

Oppenlander added that she is an authorized speaker on behalf of the Board and realizes that it's much more advantageous to have a Board member join her. **Bhalla:** My best advice given the context and landscape, particularly of ethics rules, really do require Board members to speak within their capacity as authorized by the Board since they're part of a public body. Agendaize simple matters that authorize a Board member to attend the Sunset Committee hearing with you (the Director) and answer questions if that's how you prefer to proceed. There are options that can be on the table in light of not having a lobbyist. That is up to you and the Board members as to how you want to proceed with that.

Oppenlander added that BESW will continue to have a lobbyist at the table with us as we have a contract in place with Capital Partners through June 30th, 2020. **Bhalla** wanted to answer member **Harris's** question about options. And these are the options on the table. So however the Board wants to proceed within those options, sounds reasonable to **Bhalla**.

Harris asked if there has been any dialogue with the National Association of Social Workers. **Oppenlander** stated that we've been responding to the Legislative and Executive Branches during the past week as they pursue us for considerable information about BESW. They wanted to know if we have contact with any national associations or other groups that were calling for changes for our licensees. We responded and shared about how we work with NASW and ASWB working behind the scenes with both groups. We quoted the president of NASW who has issued a statement about the importance of social workers in a number of venues and the types of essential services that social workers offer. We also shared about our work with ASWB and how we've been part of a group looking at commonalities in North America, both in the United States and Canada, about what's going on with social workers right now during the pandemic. So, I made certain that the State of Nevada is aware of NASW – the largest association of social workers in the country; and aware of ASWB which represents every jurisdiction in North America. Also, in a response to the Governor's LEAP committee, we once again used the quote from the NASW President about what we do as social workers, why we're essential, and the kinds of things that we're doing during the pandemic, etc. So, we have given those in the government that are asking us questions, a very general awareness of NASW and ASWB. However, your question is more about, "Are we talking to NASW"? There hasn't been a lot of time for that as yet. For us it's been more of a call and response. We're getting called to give out a great deal of information and we're responding as quickly as we can. We definitely see the value in reaching out however we've primarily been scrambling to keep up with the extra workload around the pandemic.

Harris asked if it would be beneficial to inform or reach out to NASW. **Oppenlander** shared that the current head of NASW Nevada Investigator Durante who is an occasional contract investigator for BESW. Durante is somewhat aware of what's going on at the Board at this time. So, I think we have a good doorway for communication with NASW at the moment. However, **Oppenlander** didn't really want to get too far into these kind of discussions with other individuals and associations as she was waiting to have this discussion with the Board first.

Erickson circled back to the budget and asked if the Board was ready to take a vote on a motion to approve the budget for fiscal year 2020-2021 with a 14% reduction.

Monique Harris motioned to approve the fiscal year 2020-2021 budget with a 14% reduction, seconded by Stefaine Maplethorpe. After a roll call vote the motion was passed unanimously.

Erickson turned to **Agenda Item 3E, Review and Discussion of Process for Nomination of Board Officers**. **Oppenlander** introduced this item. Last year, there were five Board members until June 30th, 2019. At that time, we had an opening that the Governor did not replace although we understand that there were applicants for the open position. This year, there are two Board members that are graduating on June 30th, 2020 (both **Maplethorpe, Nielsen**). **Oppenlander**

requested that both Board members reapply to continue on as Board members. Next, she indicated that she doesn't know what the process for the nomination of Board members is going to look like. The process to decide who is going to be the president, vice president and secretary/ treasurer will need to take place at the July 10th Board meeting.

Lowery explained that as a former Board member the expectation from the Governor historically was that you would remain on the Board until you were replaced. When she was on the Board and due to leave the Board on June 30th, she stayed on the Board until the early part of November when she was replaced. So, what happened last year when a Board member left on June 30th was atypical.

Erickson asked **Lowery** about how elections had gone in the past. **Lowery** replied that the Board operates with what you've got and would be looking for an agreement about the officer positions. **Maplethorpe** stated that she would reapply. **Nielsen** indicated that she is comfortable with agreeing to stay as long as is necessary to make sure we have the right number of people. To clarify the process for nominating, **Bhalla** described that a Board member would put forth a name for a specific position and then that would need to be seconded by another Board member and then a full vote would take place. And then so forth for each open position. Or the motion could be framed for multiple positions as well. After **Bhalla** described the general process as laid out in Robert's Rules of Order (informal guidebook for parliamentary procedure) the Board took a vote on a motion to approve the Board nomination process

Monique Harris made a motion to approve the nomination process for Board officers in which a Board member could nominate themselves or other Board member(s) and then a vote would be taken on bringing that person(s) into office. Seconded by Stephanie Maplethorpe. After a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Erickson moved on to **Agenda Item 3F, Business Impact Survey Presentation by Miranda Hoover from Capitol Partners.** **Hoover** reviewed the results of two impact surveys that were included in the Board packet. And then she reviewed the conclusions from the licensee impact survey and also the business licensee impact survey. **Hoover** stated that we had 750 responses and she broke those responses out into percentages. We had 85% say that their employer does not currently pay for their license renewal. 69% say their employer does not pay for their continuing education units (CEUs); 3% said their employer would pay for their LCSW or LISW exam; 16% said they aren't in a postgraduate clinical or independent internship. In conclusion, she added that we hope to find ways to incentivize students and new licensees by increasing support from providers across the state. This was an identified issue that came out of our Board retreat/ workshop last summer.

In the business licensee impact survey, **Hoover** stated that we had 38 respondents that stated 73% of businesses are not currently paying for their staff's licenses or certificates. And this includes clinics and employers that employ not just social workers but other staff as well. 71% of businesses are not paying for their social workers renewal fees. 47% of businesses are not paying for their social workers CEUs. And 61% of businesses say they do not look out of state for qualified social work candidates. And as previously discussed, to increase collaboration, the Board may want to continue to work with the schools of social work and employers of social workers to identify a plan that would incentivize students and new licensees.

Hoover was very impressed by the number of responses we have and hopes this helps to increase the collaboration that we will have with these employers and licensees. As part of our communication strategy is improve our relationship with licensees and potential licensees by reaching out more frequently, she thinks that these were very successful surveys.

Harris thanked **Hoover** for the reporting update. **Harris** also asked for clarification about the two things that we had wanted to incentivize. **Hoover** replied that those two items are to have employers either help to pay or fully cover costs of license renewals and also to help pay for CEUs. **Harris** asked, "If we would do what, what are we trying to accomplish in making that a goal"? **Hoover** answered, "We are looking to incentivize social workers and potential social workers to increase the number of licensees that we have in the state; also to hopefully retain our current social workers". She went on to state that it's always an incentive from at least the employer's perspective to be able retain their employees if they're able to offer any of those types of benefits. **Harris** asked if we looked at the number of the respondents that are employees versus contracted employees because she wondered if we are comparing apples to apples. From her understanding, some of the larger mental health clinics (not inpatient) hire independent contractors. It might be good to refine the question to understand the difference between employed versus independent contractors. **Hoover** agreed and added that we did ask the licensees about their primary employer and that guided the person filling out the survey towards responses about employers and employee benefits, etc. In this analysis about specific incentives that are provided, we had 20 licensees skip that question. **Hoover's** assumption was that their primary employer hired them as a contractor which is why they did not respond to this question. **Openlander** thanked **Hoover** and **Lowery** for working collegially to put the survey questions together. These surveys have created a good baseline of understanding for those involved in

hiring employees in a competitive market as well as those social workers that are looking for work. Employers trying to attract social workers may have not known that paying for a license would make them more competitive. **Maplethorpe** added that employers that have offered this are going to continue even during the pandemic. They are not going to cut any of that out. This information is great for some of the new people as well as for some of the interns. She has one individual that just got her temporary license. For an incentive, we will continue to pay for the license renewal and even will pay for the test once the test becomes available for her LSW.

Next, **Erickson** moved to **Agenda Item 3G, Review and Discussion of BESW “Safe and Healthy Workplace Policy” Updates.** **Oppenlander** provided an overview of this item. In response to questions that came to the Board from the Governor’s LEAP planning committee, she realized that we were in phase zero of the Nevada United Roadmap to Recovery (Roadmap). So, we added an additional page to our Safe and Healthy Workplace Policy that was developed and approved by the Board in January 2020. We amended the policy utilizing CDC and OSHA recommendations as well as a series of Emergency Directives that have been issued by the Governor to add a pandemic section to our policy on page six that outlines additional safety and health precautions that we are taking. Last week, the Roadmap was issued and tomorrow Phase One will go into effect on May 9th at 12:01 AM. We plan to revise page six as the State announces its progress through the phases of the Roadmap.

She proceeded to give everyone a sense of steps being taken. Right now, everyone works from home some of the time. By staggering the shifts, some of our staff members are working in the office Monday through Thursday during 10 hour work days that permit us to provide coverage while following social distancing guidelines. We have a little overlap when somebody’s leaving and someone’s coming in, but they are very mindful of social distancing and disinfecting and all those things that one must do. As we move into the next phase – Phase One tonight at midnight, all state and county government offices will remain closed through May 30th, 2020. Also, of the six people that work for the Board, two are viewed by the state as vulnerable employees and are not in the office until after May 30th.

We have examined the office configuration. It’s only 1,250 square feet which would be enough for us theoretically but it actually isn’t because of all the nooks and crannies. The floor plan makes it hard social distance successfully. We are discussing adding a mail slot to the door, adding partitions (aka sneeze guards) that are made of Plexiglas. **Lowery** is in the midst of reorganizing the furniture to create additional spacing between employees; we would change the staff entry to the back door and let the public use the front door as an entrance. We will move out copy machine into a different location, get rid of our break room to further change our traffic flow. We will also use face masks and currently understand that they are required in state offices at this time. In terms of making these things happen between now and the next time we have a Board meeting, I’d like to ask for a budget that will give us the ability to make this happen. I would like approval to spend up to \$5,000 to make modifications that we will need to open our business back up as the Governor rolls the Roadmap to Recovery in its different phases.

Erickson asked for clarification about staffing plans. **Oppenlander** stated that we intend to continue with flexible scheduling. We may keep fewer people in the office at any given time by using shifts to accomplish our workload while being mindful of restrictions and safety. The entire staff team has been involved and understands what the situation is. And we plan to maintain social distancing and face masks and all those things that we must do to make this work. It’s also important to remain mindful that our customer base, in part are social workers who are in various kinds of work situations and that they are face-to-face with patients in the hospitals, they are face-to-face with clients in their homes, and so forth. So we come into close proximity to those who have COVID-19. So, it isn’t just about what we do among the six of us, it’s about what we do and how we interact with the public. And so as we start to reopen, we’re trying to set ourselves up to remain safe. And that’s where the sneeze guard or safety partitions up that the front will come into play. And this is where some of the costs will be incurred to partition safely.

Lowery described the corridor that goes from the front door straight back to the back door; however, it’s not a wide open space and it’s not completely six feet for social distancing. So she had just finished was to switch the desks around by 90 degrees and move one of the file cabinets that’s in the main office area out of the way.

Erickson thanked the staff for figuring out what to do as this is new territory and this makes it hard to know what to do.

Nielsen said, “What comes to my mind is the likelihood that we will be staying in that office for a certain period of time. If we are talking about adapting the office and expending as much as \$5,000, we wouldn’t want to do that if in January we would merge with another Board. Do we have any kind of visibility into that issue”?

Oppenlander responded by layering on another level of concern before answering **Nielsen’s** question. What concerns her is that the Board has an expiring lease contract with its landlord. And if all things were normal, we would have started negotiating with the landlord for another five year period starting back in April. That way, we could get the new contract

ready by August when the lease expires. So to attempt to answer the question, that's why we've been looking at movable Plexiglas partitions. We imagine that if the potential scenario of a merger becomes a reality, then the partitions would go to the State of Nevada. So, the short answer is that the partitions that we're looking at are not going to be installed as permanent fixtures. And **Lowery** added that since we don't get any money from the general fund, the State of Nevada is not likely to come up with any money to help us out.

Erickson asked for a motion to approve the update to the Safe and Healthy Workplace Policy as well as up to \$5,000 to augment the office as needed to align with the safe and healthy workplace policy plan.

Stefaine Maplethorpe made a motion to approve the Safe and Healthy Workplace Policy with Updates as well as to approve expenditures of up to \$5000 to augment the office in order to safely phase staff back into the office secondary to COVID-19. The motion was seconded by Susan Nielsen. After a roll call vote the motion was passed unanimously.

Erickson turned to **Agenda Item 3H Executive Director's Report**. **Oppenlander** reviewed the future agenda items that were discussed to include: revisiting the budget at our July Board meeting, next phase updates to the safe and healthy workplace policy, to agendaize a Board member designee to attend upcoming Sunset Committee or interim sessions along with the Executive Director; the nomination for Board officers. Also, we may have further information on contracts e.g. our lease and if things change to the positive -- another contract with Capital Partners. Our next Board meeting is **Erickson** asked for **Public Comment in Agenda Item 4**. As no one else had joined the meeting, there was no public comment. Last, **Erickson** asked for a motion for **Agenda Item 5, Adjournment**.

Stefaine Maplethorpe made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Susan Nielsen. After a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:17 a.m.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Karen Oppenlander.