

**PUBLIC NOTICE OF A MEETING FOR  
STATE OF NEVADA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINERS  
MEETING MINUTES**

February 10, 2023

**1. Call To Order/Roll Call to Determine the Presence of a Quorum.**

**Call to Order:** The meeting of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners was called to order by President Whitney Owens, PsyD, at 8:05 a.m. online via "zoom" and physically at the office of the Board of Psychological Examiners, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Ste B-116, Reno, Nevada 89502.

**Roll Call:** Board President Whitney Owens, Psy.D., Secretary/Treasurer, Stephanie Woodard, Psy.D., and members Monique Abarca, LCSW, Lorraine Benuto, Ph.D., Stephanie Holland, Psy.D., and Catherine Pearson, Ph.D., were present at roll call.

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward introduced himself and stated for the record that there was a quorum.

Board member Soseh Esmaeili, Psy.D., was absent at roll call, but joined at 8:06 a.m., just after roll call ended.

Also present were Dr. Sheila Young, Board Investigator; Laura M. Arnold, Executive Director, and members of the public: Lisa Scurry, Dr. James Tenney, Dr. Adrianna Zimring, Dr. Margaret Dixon, and Dr. Jonathan Campos,

**2. Public Comment.**

There was no public comment at this time.

President Whitney Owens welcomed Laura M. Arnold, the Board's new executive director, and noted that she has been training with the prior executive director, Lisa Scurry, over the past month.

President Whitney Owens also noted that there were members of the public in attendance for various items that, without objection from any other Board members, would be taken out of order.

**3. Minutes**

**A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Approval of the  
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the State of Nevada Board of  
Psychological Examiners on January 13, 2023.**

Board Member Dr. Pearson noted that the deadline for renewal stated under Item 11A should have been December 31, 2022, not December 31, 2023. There were no other comments or changes suggested for the January 13, 2023, meeting minutes.

**On motion by Dr. Pearson, second by Dr. Holland, the meeting minutes of the January 13, 2023, meeting of the Nevada Board of State Board Psychological Examiners with the renewal date correction in Item 11(A) were approved.**

(Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

#### **4. Financials**

Secretary/Treasurer, Stephanie Woodard and former Executive Director, Lisa Scurry (participating in the meeting as a member of the public) presented information on and addressed agenda Item 4.

##### **A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Recommended Changes to the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget**

In referring to the brief discussion in the January 13, 2023, meeting about how much was brought in through license renewals and what adjustments could be made to the budget, former Executive Director Lisa Scurry stated that the Board brought in a total of \$378,000 in renewals from October 1, 2022, to a renewal received that week. Of that amount, the Board could use \$332,000 up to December 31, 2022. As Ms. Scurry explained during the January 13, 2023, meeting, there is some lag time from when money comes into PayPal to when it goes to the bank and then into QuickBooks. Because of federal regulation of accounting principles (GASB), the Board cannot technically use money that comes in and is recorded in QuickBooks after January 1, 2023, which is about \$46,000. We will be budgeting off of \$83,000, and based on that, the Board is in a good spot.

The Board has brought in about 99% of what was expected. Renewals are higher because every two years there are about 100-150 new licensees, so the areas that are adjusted are where we are looking to make adjustments to the approved budget are revenue, cleaning it up and having more accurate numbers. Adjustments that were made for expenditures were:

- About \$4,000 added for part time help if the Board office hires someone in the spring, which would be wages for about 3 months.
- An adjustment to the investigators' salaries based on real numbers.
- Money added for out of state travel, which would mostly be the ASBPP conference, so we added \$2,500 back into that.

- \$1,000 added for instate travel based on a desire to have an in person strategic planning session maybe in the spring. There is now money to send the south people north or the north people south.
- There had been \$7,500 allocated for software. With the Executive Director being new, big changes to the database was something she did not need on her plate at this time, so \$2,500 was taken out. That adjustment was made with the recommendation to move that item to the next fiscal year.

The last two columns in the document, Q3 and Q4, we have drafted out to FY2024 based on those numbers. What is nice about deferred revenue is that you know the pot of money you will have for 2 years. The \$46K will be allocated to those, which means you are automatically looking at another 10k or more per quarter.

**On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the recommended changes to the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Treasurer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2023 (July 1, 2022, Through June 30, 2023).**

Former executive director Lisa Scurry stated that she, Dr. Woodard, and new executive director Laura Arnold met in the days prior to the Board meeting to discuss the Board’s financials. The Board’s checking account balance is almost \$427,500, of which \$378,000 is deferred revenue. \$332,000 is the amount of deferred revenue the Board is currently capturing to break up, which means it is broken into quarters, equaling approximately \$83,000 allocated to each quarter. That is where the total \$170,000 comes from plus the bit of extra that comes on top of it. The Board has not had any extraordinary revenues come in, so we are in line with where we are expecting to be.

Ms. Scurry explained that she had budgeted low for revenue and high for expenses so that the Board is not existing beyond its means. Another couple of thousand dollars coming in through state exams and licenses is expected, as the Board has already licensed a couple of people this week.

As for expenditures, with Ms. Scurry’s last day being February 9, 2023, she noted wages will level out to the executive director’s salary. She further explained that, because of how PERS works, the executive director’s wages will be higher than before, but PERS contribution will be lower, so that will be an offset with no additional expense to the Board. She said that would be fixed and put in next month’s budget.

Ms. Scurry went on to explain that, as previously outlined, money was added for out of state travel, and that office expense is always high at the beginning of the year because that is when we bring in supplies we will need. She also noted that print copy is high because it did not account for renewals and budget for it, and that the professional fees are high because we just paid the auditor, which was \$10,000. She stated that everything else is in line, the total expenses coming in at 46% after seven months (below half) and already having paid some of the big expenses. Finally, she noted that although it does not look like we have paid anything for the database, we are up to date, it just has not yet shown up in QuickBooks.

Dr. Woodard reiterated the importance of everyone understanding how deferred revenue is budgeted out over quarters, and by quarters, we mean every 6 months over the biennia. They are broken up over two fiscal years, so we are budgeting at 6 months at a time.

In adding to that, Ms. Scurry explained that we spoke with the auditors about that topic and not being able to access money that comes in after January 1. The auditors offered a couple of options, and the Board office went with the one that best serves the office and how it records that, and to avoid findings on our audit. There were also discussions with the auditor about balance forward and how it is calculated. That is not included this time because the executive director is new, but the intent is to bring the balance forward from last fiscal year in next month's meeting. The Board office is working with the accountants to make sure it has those checks and balances.

**On motion by Monique Abarca, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Treasurer's Report for Fiscal Year 2023 Budget.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

Dr. Owens noted for the record that Ms. Scurry has done an incredible job, having come in with little experience in budgeting and deferred revenue and now being the Board's resident expert, and thanked her for her hard work in wrapping her head around all of that and creating a nimble budget by which the Board spends money in a fiscally responsible way that serves our licensees.

Ms. Scurry explained the deferred revenue process really brings into focus where the money is going and the amount there is to work with, and while it is confusing, it is a nice process. Going forward, the Board will have a much better handle on things.

**C. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to designate board members and/or staff to attend Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) mid-year meeting, April 27-30, 2023, in Denver, Colorado in a combined total expenditure of not more than \$2,500.00.**

Dr. Owens wanted the executive director and one other to go to the ASBPP conference in Denver in April. She wants the executive director to meet those from the ASBPP and get to know regulation at a national level and as it relates to those who want to treat in Nevada.

Dr. Young said she wanted to be able to go. Dr. Holland highly recommended the conference for the newer board members.

Lisa Scurry explained that she and the executive director had researched flights, and although there is not yet a hotel, reservations can probably be made in the name of the Board so they are available at the hotel of the conference. Ms. Scurry noted that the \$2,500 allocated for out of state travel will probably not be quite enough, but that the executive director could come back at another meeting to request funds to cover the rest. She also suggested that the earlier flights are chosen the better, so two people should be chosen to go at this meeting. President Owens said that sending the executive director is at the top of the list, and that Dr. Young would like to go.

When asked, none of the newer board members were able to travel at that time.

**On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the allocation of funds in an amount or not more than \$2,500 to send Laura Arnold and Investigator Sheila Young to attend the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) mid-year meeting, April 27-30, 2023, in Denver, Colorado.**

(Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**D. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the renewal of the 2023 Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) membership and payment of dues in an amount not to exceed \$2,300.00.**

Although we have not yet received the invoice, the ASPPB annual dues must be paid by April 1, 2023. The \$2,300 includes a flat rate of \$350 + \$3 per licensee. Dr. Owens explained that the Board must pay dues for ASPPB membership for access to, for instance, the PLUS system.

**On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the payment of the 2023 ASPPB dues in an amount not to exceed \$2,300.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**E. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve payment of the PsyPact 2022 State Assessment Fee in the amount of \$1,100.00.**

The 2022 PsyPact State Assessment Fee is now due in the amount of \$1,100. \$1,030 of that amount is for 103 APIT Providers, and the remaining \$80 is for the 8 TAP Providers. The Board has to pay an amount per person in the State registered with PsyPact.

**On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Monique Abarca, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the payment of the PsyPact 2022 State Assessment Fee in the total amount of \$1,100.00.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**F. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Executive Director Laura M. Arnold to be an authorized signatory on the Board's Bank of America checking and savings accounts.**

The bank requires approval by the Board before adding the Board's new executive director, Laura Arnold, as an authorized signatory to the Board's checking and savings accounts to access its finances.

**On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved Laura Arnold, the Board's new executive director, as an authorized signatory on the Board's Bank of America checking and savings accounts.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**G. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve a Bank of America credit card to be issued in Executive Director Laura M. Arnold's name with a \$5,000.00 limit.**

The bank requires approval by the Board before a credit card can be issued to the executive director. The standard limit for the Board's credit cards has been \$5,000.

**On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved a Bank of America Credit Card with a \$5,000 limit to be issued in the name of Laura M. Arnold, the Board's new executive director.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine

Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

## **5. Legislative Update**

### **A. Report on Legislative Activities, including the work of Interim Committees and the 2023 Session of the Nevada Legislature.**

The Board was provided with the spreadsheet of bills and bill draft requests being followed that Board Lobbyist Neena Laxalt provided. Ms. Laxalt was not present at the meeting. The executive director stated that she is tracking AB 37 and the Board's bill draft request through the legislative process. There is little to report at this time on those. The Board office has also received several fiscal note requests to which the Executive Director has responded. At this point, none of the bills with fiscal note requests have any fiscal impact.

President Owens stated that she has been working with Dr. Sarah Hunt on a proposal by Senator Gansert for funding for new post-doctoral positions in the state. They have been working on that language and trying to ensure that the legislature understands the need for the additional funding as well as the need for that funding to stay in Nevada and is represented by a Nevada organization or practice given telehealth and how things and practices have expanded to provide services in other states. President Owens said we want to ensure that if regulation goes through, it really stays here in Nevada and benefits Nevada and helps us raises post docs in Nevada that stay here. President Owens will keep the Board posted on developments.

Dr. Woodard stated she had no updates, but noted that there is a lot of action when it comes to workforce related bills and finding new and innovating ways to continue to support and fund any range of policies as it relates to encouraging workforce to continue to grow or to attract and retain qualified professionals in the state.

President Owens asked Dr. Woodard to advise if the Board can help in writing letters of support or provide testimony.

### **B. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action on the Proposed Revision of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 641.390, Representation or Practice Without License or Registration Prohibited, During the 2023 Session of the Nevada State Legislature**

There was no discussion on this item.

## **6. Board Needs and Operations**

### **A. Report from the Nevada Psychological Association.**

Dr. Tara Borsh gave the Nevada Psychological Association's report. She stated that the NPA just finished two legislative retreats, and are moving on with their lobbyist with meeting with the Health and Human Services Committees in both houses. Dr. Borsh explained they have a desire to have a solution to our chronic shortage in services and helping with accessible care. Dr. Borsh said the NPA will be at mental health day February 16. She also highlighted an email that the Legislative Committee sent to NPA members welcoming students, early career psychologists, and experienced psychologists to help with the Legislative Committee now and in the future.

As far as Continuing education, the NPA does not have any for the month of February. There was a CE scheduled for March 10 - Supporting Professional Women and Professional Women of Color in the Field – that has moved to September due to the presenter not being able to do the March date. There will be another Continuing Education program on March 24 – Psychedelics in Treatment of Psychiatric Disorders – and the NPA's annual conference is on May 5.

### **B. Report From the Executive Director on Board Office Operations.**

Executive Director Laura Arnold provided a brief rundown on applications that the Board office received and licenses issued. She stated that the office had received several applications this month that have been processed and information forwarded to the applicants.

Ms. Arnold stated that six licenses were issued last month, and 2 psychological assistants were registered. She said she looked forward to being proactive in the applicants' efforts of moving through the process to registration and licensure, and that she enjoys working with the applicants. She also enjoys the continuing education approval process and helping the outfits that provide those services be able to do so.

President Owens noted that it was nice to see six new licenses in January.

## **7. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to approve the employment agreement of Laura M. Arnold.**

Dr. Owens stated that as of Thursday morning, the Board had not received the draft employment agreement for the executive director, so this item may be moved to the March meeting.



Deputy Attorney General Ward did not have any updates. He explained that because he does not review employment contracts, he sent the contract out to those that do. He said that he may have to come back with any changes.

Dr. Owens noted the importance of having an agreement with the new executive director.

#### **8. (For Possible Action) Discussion, and Possible Action on Pending Consumer Complaints:**

Deputy Attorney General Ward began by noting that, prior to the beginning of this meeting, he requested a brief post-public hearing meeting excluded from the open meeting law requirements in regards to litigation with the Board. In giving his update on Complaints A and B identified in the agenda, Mr. Ward stated that he hoped to have the first two complaints listed resolved in the very near future. He talked with one of the respondents and he/she is more than willing to resolve it, and the resolution would be non-disciplinary action. On the other, there is an attorney involved, so it is a slower process, as the client wanted to proceed so there may be a need for a hearing officer. Mr. Ward had no further updates on the other three pending complaints.

#### **9. (For Possible Action) Review and Possible Action on Applications for Licensure as a Psychologist or Registration as a Psychological Assistant, Intern or Trainee. The Board May Convene in Closed Session to Receive Information Regarding Applicants, Which May Involve Considering the Character, Alleged Misconduct, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of the Applicant (NRS 241.030). All Deliberation and Action Will Occur in an Open Session.** *Note: Applicant names are listed on the agenda to allow the Board to discuss applicants when necessary to move the applicant through the licensure process. The listing of an applicant's name on the agenda indicates only that an application for licensure/registration has been received. It does not mean that the application has been approved or that the applicant must appear at the meeting in order for the applicant's application to move forward through the licensure process. If an applicant needs to attend the meeting for the Board to take action, the applicant will be notified in writing prior to the meeting. Please, direct questions or comments regarding licensure applications to the Board office.*

President Owens presented the following applicants for licensure, pending completion of licensure requirements: Allison Faris, Stephen Francis, Dov Gold, Lisa Hazelwood, Kelly Hughes, William Kaiser, and Gina Mire.

**On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Stephanie Holland, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the following applicants for licensure, pending completion of licensure requirements:** Allison Faris, Stephen Francis, Dov Gold, Lisa Hazelwood, Kelly Hughes, William Kaiser, and Gina Mire. (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**A. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Recommendation of the ATEAM Committee to approve the application of Dr. Jene Edwards, contingent on the completion of all licensure requirements.**

President Owens stated that Dr. Jene Edwards is an applicant for licensure as a psychologist, previously licensed in California. She explained that in reviewing Dr. Edwards' application, it was found that she earned less than the required 2,000 training hours during her internship. However, she earned enough hours during post-doctoral training to make up the deficiency. In the end, she completed more than the total 3,750 training hours, and also completed the individual and group supervision hours during the internship and post-doctoral hours. President Owens stated that Dr. Esmaeili reviewed the application and found that the training requirements for licensure had been met.

**On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Catherine Pearson, the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Recommendation of the ATEAM Committee to approve the application of Dr. Jene Edwards, contingent on the completion of all licensure requirements.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**10. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Request of Dr. Jonathan Campos for a Change of Supervisor as a Psychological Assistant to Dr. Brian Norensberg.**

(This item was taken out of order)

Dr. Campos has requested a change to his supervisor to Dr. Norensberg, which was heard last month, but the agreement between Dr. Campos and Seven Hills, where Dr. Campos would be working, had not yet been received, so this item was moved to today's board meeting. After receiving additional documentation, the only thing missing is how Dr. Norensberg is to be compensated for supervising Dr. Campos at Seven Hills.

Dr. Campos stated that Dr. Norensberg is providing supervision pro bono. He explained that he had moved to the area before COVID, and he experienced various personal and other complications. He said he asked Dr. Norensberg if he would be willing to supervise him during his time at Seven Hills, and Dr. Norensberg agreed to do so. Dr. Campos also explained the toll COVID had on him and his family around the two times he took the national test.

Dr. Holland inquired about the combination of supervision as it was stated in the agreement. Dr. Campos clarified that he would meet with Dr. Norensberg as needed for questions and they would meet regularly to follow what the Board requires for supervision, and that the combination refers to how they would meet, not to individual

and group supervision. President Owens also noted that clarification in the individual supervision agreement.

Because the Board had all of the documentation except a document stating that Dr. Norensberg was providing supervision pro bono, President Owens proposed that they move to approve the change in supervisors to Dr. Norensberg contingent on getting that document from Dr. Norensberg. In response to Dr. Campos's question about Dr. Norensberg not being allowed to be compensated, President Owens explained that he is not allowed to be compensated by Dr. Campos. In response to what document Dr. Norensberg needed to provide, President Owens stated that the Board needed a letter from him and the Board Office would put it in his file so he can proceed with employment with Seven Hills.

**On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Monique Abarca, the Board of Psychological Examiners approved the application of Dr. Jonathan Campos to change his supervisors as a Psychological Assistant to Dr. Brian Norensberg contingent on receiving a letter from Dr. Norensberg regarding his compensation for supervision.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**11. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Establish an Ad Hoc Committee of the Board to Consider Registration of Supervisors of Psychological Assistants, Psychological Interns, and Psychological Trainees, and Associated Concerns. Discussion and Possible Approval may include:**

(The proceeding portion of this item was taken out of order)

The Board seeks to create an ad hoc committee of the Board to consider changes in regulations for supervisors and to further clean up regulations around supervision. While the Board has done a tremendous job of that so far, the goal of the ad hoc committee is to dial down the finer points that the Board has had difficulty dialing in.

The Board received a lot of applications for this Ad Hoc Committee. President Owens suggested that each Board member put forth her top two or three choices of the applicants, not including board members, to determine where there is agreement or disagreement, and dial in candidate selection from there. President Owens explained that when it comes to public members, the Board should balance between those in the university setting, those in community, and board members because how things are done in larger settings is different than in the community. She stated that good representation from both will better create cohesion in regulation that supports protection of the public while making things nimble enough for good supervision to happen.

**A. Establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee and Committee members from the following individuals: Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Whitney Owens, Catherine Pearson, Stephanie Woodard, Ben Adams, Gretchen Arian, Andrew Bertagnolli, Yvonne Fritz, Christopher Fyfe, Steven Klee, Paul Kwon, Cynthia Lancaster, William O'Donohue, Michelle Paul, Ashley Taylor, and Adrianna Zimring.**

A document showing the ad hoc committee applicants was shared for ease of reference. The applicants identified were: Ben Adams, Gretchen Arian, Andrew Bertagnolli, Yvonne Fritz, Christopher Fyfe, Steen Klee, Paul Kwon, Cynthia Lancaster, William O'Donohue, Michelle Paul, Ashley Taylor, and Adrianna Zimring.

President Owens suggested that each Board member provide her three top choices to get better cohesion.

Dr. Pearson identified the Board members who were interested in being on the ad hoc Committee (Dr. Owens, Dr. Benuto, and Dr. Holland), and asked for their respective settings. Dr. Pearson knew that Dr. Benuto is in the university setting. Dr. Holland clarified that both she and President Owens are in private practice.

Investigator Young asked to confirm that the Board was creating a five member committee with two Board members and three from the Public. President Owens confirmed.

Deputy Attorney General gave a friend reminder for those who speak to identify themselves for the record.

Investigator Young inquired as to whether the Board members know all the applicants, to which President Owens said they have their CVs and letters of interest in the meeting packet. Dr. Holland deferred to President Owens being on the committee since there would be only two Board members on the Committee. President Owens deferred a decision on that until after deciding on the public members.

President Owens confirmed with the Board that the ad hoc Committee would consist of two Board members and three members of the public. She explained that with the increase in interest, they have some great potential public members to choose from in a way that might create a more robust discussion. She also emphasized that Board members can attend the ad hoc Committee meetings and provide input because they are public meetings, and that they want to choose a committee that can make decisions with public input.

President Owens started the selection process by stating her top three choices – Dr. Paul, Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Zimring.

Dr. Benuto chose Dr. Adams (a good representative of the rural areas), Dr. O'Donohue (a university professor and in private practice), and Dr. Lancaster (a recently licensed assistant professor).

Dr. Holland, looking at diversifying the group, selected Dr. Adams (who works for a government agency), Dr. Taylor (who works for the VA), and Dr. Paul (who is a UNLV professor).

Dr. Pearson and Dr. Woodard chose Dr. Taylor, Dr. Paul, and Dr. Adams.

Dr. Esmaeili selected Dr. Zimring, Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Adams.

After the Board members made their selections, President Owens asked to speak to Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward offline. Mr. Ward confirmed that Dr. Owens could pause the meeting and call him offline. Prior to President Owens pausing the meeting to speak with Mr. Ward, Dr. Benuto wanted to note that there was not good representation from the north in those the Board members had chosen so far. President Owens agreed, and then went off the record to consult with Mr. Ward.

Board member Monique Abarca stated that she was not familiar with the candidates, but chose Dr. Adams, Dr. Zimring, and Dr. Paul. Dr. Woodard inquired with the executive director about whether all the candidates are licensed in Nevada and in good standing, which the Executive Director confirmed.

President Owens went back on the record and reiterated that Dr. Benuto's comments regarding the lack of representation from the north of the candidates selected by the Board members was accurate. The executive director noted on the document identifying the candidates who was from the north and who was from the south and, with the help of some Board members, provided a brief description of their respective settings. President Owens stated that Dr. Adams, Dr. Paul, Dr. Zimring, and Dr. Arian are all in the south. Dr. Pearson stated that Dr. Lancaster and Dr. O'Donohue are in the north. President Owens noted that Dr. Bertagnolli appears to be in California, and stated that Dr. Taylor, Dr. Klee, and Dr. Fife are in the south. Dr. Fritz was also identified as being in the south.

President Owens requested that the executive director remove the applicants from the south and the applicant in California who did not have any votes, and for those candidates from the north and the southern candidates with votes, indicate where they are working.

President Owens asked Deputy Attorney General Ward if the Board could proceed with another item while the executive director works on filling in that information, which Mr. Ward confirmed.

(the proceeding portion of this agenda item was resumed in order)

President Owens stated that, out of the candidates in the south, one is at a detention center, one is at UNLV, and one is at the VA. President Owens also noted that Dr. Paul is a past president of the Board and would be an excellent addition to and an invaluable member of the ad hoc Committee based on her knowledge of regulations and her extensive knowledge of training. President Owens also noted Dr. Paul's knowledge of ASPBB, as she was on its equivalency task force, and is a tough decision maker in training and supervision in the national landscape.

President Owens asked Dr. Benuto if she had any insight into or recommendations of those candidates from the north – Dr. Kwon, Dr. O'Donohue, Dr. Lancaster. Dr. Benuto stated that Dr. O'Donohue is the director of training at UNR and also in private practice, so he would see through both lenses. She said he also has a lot of experience related to supervision. Dr. Benuto said that Dr. Lancaster is newly licensed, has been doing supervision for shorter period of time, and has more recently been supervised. As for Dr. Kwon, Dr. Benuto stated that he is the current director of clinical training.

Deputy Attorney General Ward stated that he was not sure if it was clear to the Board how many on the ad hoc Committee were going to be from the south and from the north, or whether the top three candidates would be selected.

President Owens stated there were a few different factors, and the Committee needed representation from both the north and south. She said that with an odd number on the Committee, they could probably have either one from north and south and then however the other shakes out. In terms of expertise in what the candidates are bringing to the table, President Owens noted that there are some great candidates with different roles in the community that could be valuable.

President Owens also offered to represent the Board on the Committee as a member in private practice, if that was alright with Dr. Holland. She recommended Dr. O'Donohue as a Committee member representing the north, and noted that it would be an interesting discussion regarding the differences between the candidate from the VA and the candidate from the detention center.

Deputy Attorney General Ward noted that he is not usually at committee meetings, as he would have to bill for being there, which is why it is important to have board representation at those meetings to ensure compliance with open meeting laws. President Owens added that the Board's sub-committees make recommendations the Board and the Board makes the decisions, in response to which Mr. Ward explained that sub-committees are an arm of the board – they are the fact finders and make recommendations.

Investigator Sheila Young asked whether there is a concern that those representing the Board in the Committee be familiar with accreditation standards, especially for pre-docs. President Owens answered that the Board wants committee members who understand those standards and, based on the top candidates, they do. President Owens also stated that having committee members who have different perspectives is important to

make sure the Board establishes regulations that make sense for what is happening in our state.

In stating that Dr. Benuto is willing to represent the north and the Board on the Committee, President Owens explained that it would be optimal if she is not the only person from the north. She asked if anyone else on the Board from the north would like to be on the Committee. Hearing none, she said to put Dr. Benuto as a Committee member from the north. With those two Board members being named to the Committee, President Owens noted that there is some momentum in putting the Committee together, and asked if there were any strong votes for the three members from the north – Dr. O’Donohue, Dr. Lancaster, and Dr. Kwon.

Dr. Holland stated that, in looking at Dr. O’Donohue’s CV, he is very seasoned and brings a combination of working at a University and in private practice. Dr. Woodard also endorsed Dr. O’Donohue.

In response to President Owens’ question about whether there are strong opinions about the other two candidates from the north, Dr. Pearson said she did not find any materials in the meeting packet for Dr. Kwon. The executive director said she would look to see what the Board Office received from him, and that it may have been overlooked in preparing the meeting materials.

Deputy Attorney General Ward clarified and President Owens confirmed that the Board was electing three from the list of Committee applicants.

Dr. Benuto stated that Dr. Kwon is the director of clinical training and a full professor with a history of clinical supervision and is new to Nevada in August. President Owens noted that, as they think about how Committee representation will break down between the north and the south, most from the north are in a university setting, and they want at least one other from a non-university setting. She suggested maybe two from the south and one from the north.

President Owens inquired with the executive director about whether Dr. Kwon’s CV is available. The executive director said she has downloaded it and was copying it to the meeting materials for the Board to access.

In proposing a discussion on the candidates from the south—Dr. Paul, Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Adams – President Owens asked if there were any strong opinions, and stated her strong opinion for Dr. Paul. Dr. Benuto’s only thoughts were that Dr. Adams is in Pahrump and would have a rural perspective. Dr. Holland thought having someone from a governmental agency would be helpful. She said she could not speak for Dr. Paul, but imagines she would be willing to attend at least some of the meetings and provide her input. Dr. Taylor and Dr. Adams would round out different perspectives with the VA and governmental agency, and the rural part as well. President Owens stated that, in addition to working at UNLV, Dr. Paul runs the practice and UNLV, which

is a community based mental health program that provides a lot of training, and she thinks that perspective of a community training clinic would be very helpful.

In returning to the candidates from the north, President Owens confirmed that the Board had an opportunity to look at Dr. Kwon's Vita, and asked to take a quick poll from the north candidates. Dr. Woodard, Ms. Abarca, Dr. Esmaeili, Dr. Holland, and President Owens chose Dr. O'Donohue. Dr. Pearson chose Dr. Kwon.

President Owens asked the executive director to note Dr. O'Donohue from the north. Deputy Attorney General Ward asked the Board to put that in a formal motion for who would be the selection from the north. President Owens stated that they would take a formal vote once they have made their Committee member selections. Mr. Ward confirmed that they did not have to make a formal motion for each committee member selection and could make the motion at the end.

Looking at the candidates from the south, President Owens asked if the Board members were alright with Dr. Paul, or if there were any strong dissenting opinions about her. Hearing none, she went on to ask whether there were any strong opinions between Dr. Adams and Dr. Taylor, and took a poll of the Board members. Dr. Benuto, Ms. Abarca, Dr. Woodard, Dr. Pearson, Dr. Esmaeili, and Dr. Holland voted for Dr. Adams. President Owens voted for Dr. Taylor. For the Committee member representing the community, President Owens stated it would be Dr. Adams.

**On motion by Stephanie Woodard, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Board of Psychological Examiners appointed President Whitney Owens, Dr. Lorraine Benuto, Dr. William O'Donohue, Dr. Michelle Paul, and Dr. Ben Adams to the Board's Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Registration of Supervisors of Psychological Assistants, Psychological Interns, and Psychological Trainees, and Associated Concerns.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**B. Charge of the committee to revise Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 641.1519, Qualifications of Supervisors, and 641.158, Limitations on Number of Assistants, Interns, and Supervisors.**

(President Owens addressed the purpose and charge of the ad hoc Committee in her introductory comments to this agenda item).

**C. Consideration of up to 2 continuing education credits for each committee member for the renewal period ending December 31, 2024.**

In consideration for the committee members' participation in the ad hoc Committee on supervision, which is anticipated to be no more than three meetings of one hour each, President Owens stated that each committee member would receive two continuing education credits for the renewal period ending December 31, 2024.



**On motion by Soseh Esmaeili, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Board of Psychological Examiners approved two continuing education credits for each member of the Ad Hoc Committee for the renewal period ending December 31, 2024.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

President Owens offered to take on the role of Committee Chair, which Dr. Benuto accepted.

**On motion by Catherine Pearson, second by Monique Abarca, the Board of Psychological Examiners named President Whitney Owens as the Chair of the Board's Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Registration of Supervisors of Psychological Assistants, Psychological Interns, and Psychological Trainees, and Associated Concerns.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

President Owens instructed the Board's executive director to send a letter to all who applied telling them that they are welcome to attend the Ad Hoc Committee's meeting and provide input during the meetings as well as written feedback. President Owens also invited the Board members to attend and provide feedback, and stated that the Board would be providing updates as the meeting progress.

## **12. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Revise the Policy on Complaints and Discipline.**

Lisa Scurry stated that the Policy on Complaints and Discipline has been in the works for three to four months. She and Dr. Lenkeit initially revised it, it has been reviewed by Deputy Attorney General Ward, and has been sent out for review a couple of times. Ms. Scurry explained that the only change from last month is at the top of page 2. Because they have gone through and removed the executive director's role from working within the complaint itself, the policy makes it clear that the executive director retains oversight of the process itself.

Dr. Holland asked about whether there are time frames for the executive director to assign a case to an investigator and for the investigator to review it, noting that people have brought up the length of time it takes to investigate complaints. Lisa Scurry explained that the Board office is covering that within desk top procedures but it would not be a bad idea to put in a soft timeframe. When the executive director receives the complaint, she might have to get back to the complainant to obtain additional information, such as a release. Or maybe the investigator requests additional information after receiving the complaint. Sometimes a complainant will continue to send information over several months. That process delays it from the date it comes in. Ms. Scurry noted that has happened and she assigned a number to the case too soon. She explained that because there are factors that go into it, she hesitates to put a hard deadline on it. Ms. Scurry went on to highlight that where there is a hard deadline is

when the complaint is assigned to an investigator and then goes to the respondent, who has 30 days to respond unless the respondent and/or the respondent's attorney request additional time, which is usually granted. Subject to Deputy Attorney General Ward's input, Ms. Scurry offered to put those timelines in and maybe a soft timeline on a complaint being assigned. Mr. Ward stated that he does not like drop dead deadlines on a complaint coming in and getting to the investigator because a respondent will argue that policy, wanting the complaint to be dismissed if the policy in proceeding on the complaint was not followed. He said there is no problem with a response deadline, however. He also noted that the executive director is usually on top of receiving and processing complaints that come in.

Lisa Scurry stated that if we put something in, it is a "generally this is what we do." Because there are a myriad of cases that come in, it is case by case and difficult to put deadlines in. Dr. Holland said that made total sense.

President Owens explained that there are also internal controls, and that Ms. Scurry has been talking with Deputy Attorney General Ward and investigators Gary Lenkeit and Sheila Young about having monthly meetings to make sure complaints are moving along. She said it will be an ongoing conversation moving forward on who is in charge and what is going on. There is some control for some of those timelines.

Investigator Young noted that the monthly meetings will not be very long, but rather just to touch base, as it is important to be mindful of the budget. She said everyone knows whose court the ball is in.

President Owens agreed with Dr. Holland's concerns, saying she made a great point and that controls can be built in. She went on to say that as we move forward with some of those policies, she and the Executive Director can work together to help expedite the process of complaints. Lisa Scurry noted that, based on what she learned, she is very confident that there will be improvement moving forward.

Before asking for a motion to approve the revisions to the Policy on Complaints and Discipline, President Owens explained that part of the process in the strategic plan was to ensure the each policy comes in front of the Board each year for review. She said that the Board can approve the policy on complaints and discipline knowing it will be continually reviewed and updated.

**On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Soseh Esmaeili, the Board of Psychological Examiners approved the revisions to the Policy on Complaints and Discipline.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

### **13. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt the Policy on Finance: Budgeting.**

President Owens asked Lisa Scurry to take the Board through the Policy on Finance: Budgeting and for Dr. Woodard to add any comments.

In presenting the Policy on Finance: Budgeting, Ms. Scurry explained that when the Board approved the Board Expense Policy, a budget was on the strategic plan, and she was able to get around to writing it. Something she found lacking in the Board office was spending thresholds – i.e., when does it come to the Board, when does it not, and how does the Board budget. With the addition of the deferred revenue process, Ms. Scurry thought it should be documented. That is where the Policy on Finance: Budgeting came from.

Ms. Scurry stated that the Board has reviewed the policy several times, and that the auditors have also reviewed it and made suggestions. The auditors gave two options for deferred revenue and how the Board office could account for it. If there were to be an emergency and the Board needs access, it can have access, as it is not made to be absolute. The deferred revenue classification is for accounting purposes only and is generally this way for the definition.

In drafting the policy, Ms. Scurry went through the State's administrative handbook for travel reimbursement and credit card use.

Ms. Scurry explained that while license renewal fees that come in after the renewal deadline is deferred money, late fees are not. They are real time money and immediately accessible., so she added that distinction to the policy.

As for the rest of it, Ms. Scurry stated that the auditors were fine with it, only suggesting adding in that fees received outside of the normal process can be recognized. With a one person office, if you start recognizing fees, 25% now, 25% later, it becomes confusing and an accounting nightmare. While it is stated in the policy, the process with stay away from it.

Ms. Scurry also noted that the policy states that the Board will review any non-budgeted expenditures of \$1000 or more. The secretary/ treasurer will review anything that is \$500-999. Anything below that is the discretion of the executive director. However, even smaller expenditures she noted it with a board member. Ms. Scurry explained that those are the limits she came up with, and they can be adjusted. She also noted that there are not a lot of times when the Board spends money outside of normal bills, so, outside of travel, buying furniture or equipment would be an expense. There is not a lot of risk. Ms. Scurry also added in the chart of accounts and account numbers. It is an interior item, but it gives an idea of how the Board office breaks those line items up for budget to actual.

Dr. Woodard asked to go through some of the new language in red. She wanted to make sure it is clear. Dr. Woodard wanted to clarify that, under deferred revenue on

page 4, number 2, license renewal fees are not deferred revenue, and suggested language to that effect. Lisa Scurry clarified that sections 1-4 are deferred revenue, as deferred revenue is money brought in that its use will be in the future. For instance, if the Board receives a license renewal fee on January 1, that is for use over the course of 2 full years. Ms. Scurry suggested that the Policy provide a note that states that the late fees associated with a PayPal payment should be divided between late fee and deferred revenue. She said there should be a number 2 there that states that late fees associated with a renewal are not deferred revenue and the new license and registration fees collected during the fourth quarter of the biennium. She explained the reason for that is, for instance, if we a new license on December 25 during renewal, that is money that is not going forward. It is there to finish out the year and then start again. Ms. Scurry agreed that those two items are unclear and will be adjusted to be clear. License fees at any time except final quarter and registration fees are deferred revenue because they provide service into the future.

Dr. Woodard stated that cleared things up, and asked if there something else in the policy that explains how those dollars are utilized if not deferred revenue. Lisa Scurry stated that the Policy has that outlined throughout in accounts payable, how the Board office disburses cash, expenses, those various areas where the Board pays for items. The Board office does not accept cash, and that is stated in the Policy. That is best practices and security of money. Ms. Scurry noted the Policy identifies how the Board pays with a credit card, how it processes payroll, and specific items about travel expense. The Board uses the Government Services Administration's per diem rates, and does not reimburse based on what is actually spent. She explained that the Policy explains how income is brought in (checks, PayPal), and that it provides a section on how the Board budgets and how it is allocated. The Board does not spend money that is not budgeted. Ms. Scurry stated that the division of responsibilities is important, especially in reference to dollar amounts for approval (i.e., responsibilities of the secretary treasurer, independent contractors, bookkeeper).

Dr. Woodard asked whether someone who is not educated or aware of ho the board operated would be able to understand how funds are used if they are not deferred revenue. The policy should be explicit about that, and if those funds go into operating, we should have a section that reiterates that.

Lisa Scurry stated that she would work with the new executive director to add in as section B a statement of what is not deferred revenue and bring the policy back next month. She explained that for accounting purposes, the bank account looks like the amount of money the Board is using is what is in the bank, and it could potentially move monies in savings and earn a couple dollars of interest. That is also covered in the operating budget policy, so they interconnect. Ms. Scurry stated that the connected policies should have a section regarding the other policies to which they want to refer, and executive director would add that as well. Because that would just be a reference point, it would not need board approval.

Lisa Scurry stated the executive director will add the new section specifying what is not deferred revenue in the Policy on Finance: Budgeting in March for final approval. The accountants will like that as well.

President Owens thanks Lisa Scurry for her generous offer to help the new executive director in making that correction to the policy to bring it back in March.

#### **14. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt the Policy on License Renewal**

President Owens stated that the Policy on License Renewal is a new policy that former executive director Lisa Scurry wrote. She put it together in 2020 and had a smoother process in 2022. President Owens explained that the policy is now written out so that the Board has it for future executive directors who come in.

Lisa Scurry stated that no changes were made since last time the Policy was reviewed. She also stated that, as the continuing education Chair, Board member Monique Abarca has reviewed it, and that there are further desktop procedures and templates for the process to which the executive director has access. Ms. Scurry explained that the Policy is a general overview of what the board needs to know, and that, as a document the Board has not previously had, it will probably be added to over the next year or two.

#### **On motion by Lorraine Benuto, second by Stephanie Holland, the Board the Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Policy on License Renewal.**

(Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

#### **15. (For Possible Action) Discussion and Possible Action to Revise the Policy on Personal & Professional Conduct / Background Checks and Fingerprinting Policy**

Lisa Scurry presented the revisions to the Policy and Personal & Professional Conduct / Background Checks and Fingerprinting Policy based on an issue that the Board office previously faced. She explained that the Policy was written when the Board office received a background check with a finding and she realized she did not have the authority to make a determination, but that it seemed unnecessary to embarrass applicants by putting them on agendas for minor crimes that happened when they were young. The Policy established a review team to look at a background check with a finding, something that has only happened a couple of times.

Ms. Scurry stated that recently, an affirmative answer on conduct came through in the PLUS for applicant. In considering whether it needed to go before the Board, the Board office noted that the conduct item at issue was a few years ago, and the applicant had received a letter supporting that applicant's progress. Ms. Scurry explained that the question was whether the executive director has the authority to issue a license when there is an affirmative answer on conduct.

Ms. Scurry stated that while the Board office first considered updating the policies the Board has in place for Psychological Trainees, Interns, and Assistants, it decided that the review process should be included in this policy because it is the same process as for background check findings. Ms. Scurry highlighted addendum A, which is the list of all the questions on the Board's application and on the PLUS. She noted that all the questions on each document are listed because, while they are similar, the questions on those two documents are not identical. Because of that, an applicant could answer all the conduct questions on the application with "no" and then answer with a "yes" on the PLUS. Ms. Scurry noted that the differences in the questions is something that needs to be dealt with in the future.

Ms. Scurry explained that another issue the Board office discovered is that it is possible for an applicant to say that he or she went to an APA school, and then have a determination that he or she did not. In that instance, it was clear that the applicant was not lying. She really thought she had attended an APA school and did not understand what that meant.

Ms. Scurry stated that, based on those two instances, an affirmative answer on conduct or an indication that an applicant may have lied or made a misrepresentation warranted a review process. She explained that the idea is to follow the review process in place for background check findings. It is to be reviewed by the executive director, assigned to an investigator to review, and then to a board member to review. Ms. Scurry stated that by having only one board member review, it does not violate the Open Meeting Law because it takes 2 for a subcommittee. The Board members would be reviewing individually to decide whether it should go to the Board. Ms. Scurry noted that for background checks, the Board office assigns it to board president and an investigator. For affirmative conduct answers, the executive director will pick the board member because a lot of applicants are supervisees of Board members (interns, trainees, assistants) that may have to recuse. With this process, the executive director has seven people from whom to select to review. Ms. Scurry said the Board office does not get a lot of these, but it was something that should be addressed. The only change in the Policy from the previous version is letter i. It addresses whether the applicant provided false information or purposely mislead the Board.

Investigator Sheila Young said she was glad the Board office thought of that and included the review process in the Policy. She explained that the worst case she dealt with had exactly that issue, and she's glad it is in writing.

Lisa Scurry noted that the Nevada Revised Statutes have some language about lies and misrepresentations, but it is good to have plain language where the process is stated, and that was the intent.

**On motion by Stephanie Holland, second by Lorraine Benuto, the Board the Board of Psychological Examiners approved the Revisions to the Policy on Personal & Professional Conduct / Background Checks and Fingerprinting**

**Policy.** (Yea: Whitney Owens, Monique Abarca, Lorraine Benuto, Soseh Esmaeili, Stephanie Holland, Catherine Pearson, and Stephanie Woodard.) Motion Carried: 7-0

**16. (For Possible Action) Schedule of Future Board Meetings, Hearings, and Workshops. The Board May Discuss and Decide Future Meeting Dates, Hearing Dates, and Workshop Dates**

**A. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners is Friday, March 10, 2023, at 8:00 a.m.**

There were no conflicts with the next meeting of the Nevada Board of Psychological Examiners being held on Friday, March 10, 2023, at 8:00 am.

**17. Requests for Future Board Meeting Agenda Items (No Discussion Among the Members will Take Place on this Item)**

There were no requests for future agenda items.

**18. Public Comment - Public comment is welcomed by the Board and may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will be allowed at the beginning and end of the meeting, as noted on the agenda. The Board President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his sole discretion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken (NRS 241.020)**

There was no public comment at this time.

President Owens led the Board members and Board office staff in saying goodbye to former executive director Lisa Scurry and expressing their deep appreciation for her and the work she took on in her role as the Board's executive director. The Board members highlighted the extent to which Ms. Scurry has elevated the Board office and taken the Board to a much better and different place, and stated how much they will miss her. Ms. Scurry stated she appreciated the support and empathy she received with all that was going on when she began her role with the Board, and that it has been special and important getting to know the Board members.

**19. (For Possible Action) Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Board, President Owens adjourned the meeting at 10:31 a.m.