

Steve Sisolak, Governor



Steve Nicholas, *President*
John Nixon, *Vice President*
Sara Pelton, *Secretary/Treasurer*
Jenny Stepp, *Member*
Jennifer Ross, *Member*
Marta Wilson, *Member*
Hal Taylor, J.D., *Public Member*
Sheldon Jacobs, *Member*
Lauri Perdue, *Public Member*

MINUTES OF TELEPHONIC WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENTS ON PROPOSED REGULATION

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 2022, at 9:00AM

Teleconference

**Nevada Board of Examiners
For Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors
7324 W. Cheyenne Avenue, Suite 10
Las Vegas, NV 89129**

Please Note: The Board may (a) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Board or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; (b) combine agenda items for consideration by the public body; and (c) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. The Board may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person. (NRS 241.020, NRS 241.030).

Public comment is welcomed by the Board. Public comment will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and comments based on viewpoint will not be restricted. A public comment time will be available prior to any action items on the agenda and on any matter not specifically included on the agenda prior to adjournment of the meeting. At the discretion of the President, additional public comment may be heard when that item is reached. The President may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and at his/her sole discretion. (NRS 241.020, NRS 241.030) Prior to the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or a quasi-judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual, the Board may refuse to consider public comment. (NRS 233B.126)

Action by the Board on any item may be to approve, deny, amend, or table

The Public Workshop is being held prior to the scheduled Board Meeting, which will begin immediately following the conclusion of the Workshop discussion.

PUBLIC WORKSHOP – PROPOSED NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHANGES

1. Introduction – Open Public Workshop. Workshop discussion opened at 9:00 AM.

The purpose of the Workshop is to solicit comments on the proposed revisions to NAC 641A. The proposed regulation may include the following and other matters properly relating thereto.

2. Open Public Comments: Proposed Regulations

| |
|--|
| No vote may be taken upon a matter raised during a period devoted to public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020) |
|--|

- Board members present: Steven Nicholas, John Nixon, Sara Pelton, Marta Wilson, Jenny Stepp, Sheldon Jacobs, Lauri Perdue, Jennifer Ross, Hal Taylor
- Staff present: Joelle McNutt
- Members of the public: Michele Langholz, Vanessa Humphrey, Shari Andreasen, Jessica Goicoechea-Parise, Stacey Lance, Vincent Hartman, Emily Hartman, Kimberly Schwartz, Kiera McGillivray, Valerie Haskins, Toni Garguilo, Grettel Beltran, Meri Shadley, Michael Horn, Dave Willborn

Open Discussion Items

- Steve: Today we have the opportunity to solicit comments on those revisions to NAC 641A. This has been a lot of hard work over the last three to four months, especially by Joelle and Steph in the main office to really go over the last three board meetings. We tirelessly kicked these balls around to come up with some language that could be presented to all of you. We will go through these proposed changes one at a time and if anybody from the public would like to offer their thoughts, you are most invited to. I think signal by raising a hand and then we'll call on you.
- Valerie Haskins: Thank you so much. I am the Rural Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator. I work on behalf of the Rural Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board, and I just wanted to thank Joelle and the Board for their participation during the last legislative session, as we were working on SB 44 and for Joelle's presentation to the Board last month. It was very helpful when we're looking at one of the concerns. I think that I heard individually from my Board members since that meeting was, across the board there's differing opinions of what remote supervision really is. And when SB 44 was built, remote supervision to them meant we can get someone to practice in the community in which they live, if it's rural et cetera, and they can access their supervisor remotely, which is in place for you guys, but ultimately having to have another mental health provider on site as a secondary supervisor, is incredibly challenging for a lot of communities. We do have a lack of available mental health providers who can be supervised. I want to encourage the Board to consider maybe other solutions or options moving forward because that was something that I think my Board wasn't super happy about. I understand that it's probably more normal, but we are in an unnormal place right now with the incredible lack of providers that we have across the state, but more poignantly in remote Nevada. If there's something that we can do outside of the legislative session, I think that would probably be really preferable.
- Steve: We'll be at all ears moving forward. If you have any those suggestions for us, that's a big part of our opportunity today is to field some suggestions for consideration.
 - NAC 641A.146 paragraph 5, subsection 2 & 5 – increases the maximum allowable supervised experience hours in group therapy and training categories for licensed interns.
 - Joelle: This increases the maximum allowable supervised experience hours in group therapy and training categories for licensed interns. The proposed language is such that we are increasing the maximum allowable hours for group psychotherapy from 300 to 600. We are increasing the allowable hours of training approved by the primary supervisor from 50 to 200. We are adding clarifying language of psychoeducational groups to the teaching subsection.
 - Steve: Are there any members from the public that would like to offer comments for this?
 - Valerie Haskins: I'm not a provider, but I have a question. What about being able to utilize some of that time for the participation in mobile crisis response

teams, if it is a co-response with law enforcement? They would have the protection of law enforcement, there's a growing need and desire for these programs across the state particularly in our smaller communities amongst police departments. It's more difficult for the share rural Sheriff's offices but that maybe provide another opportunity to fill some of those gaps while keeping the interns safe.

- Hal: We've had a couple instances across the country where we felt that the police reaction to the mental health situation in fact was wrong. They just didn't have the qualifications for it. Sometimes those have resulted in deaths. I think there is a strong movement here to get people on scene who have a mental health background to assist the police in deescalating these situations.
- Steve: It seems to me that a primary supervisor would have latitude to allow an intern to count those as hours when they were working mobile crisis work.
- Valerie Haskins: So, then my question would be, could that police officer count as their secondary supervisor for those hours, or would they have to correspond with yet another mental health provider?
- Joelle: I know that NAC has changed to allow for mental health professionals to be available by phone so not necessarily on site. If there is someone on site, that would be great. They could have a primary and secondary supervisor of record with the office and of their internship, but then a mental health professional just needs to be available by phone for consultation.
- Valerie Haskins: That really does help. If an intern is working outside of regular business hours, would they need to be able to access that secondary or primary supervisor while they are working? So, which would essentially kind of keep them from working overnight if that was the case? I know there's a push at the state level to have 24/7 mobile crisis response teams. I'm wondering if that would be a hang up there.
- Joelle: There isn't any restriction in the language.
- Steve: When an intern is working, they are essentially working under the license and liability of their primary supervisor. If that intern were working after hours, it still holds true that they are working under the license and liabilities of their primary. It seems to me that their primary and secondary would be endorsing this and therefore being accessible after hours. There are quite a few supervisors on our Board right now. I'd love to hear what you all have to think about that
- Marta: I'm available 24/7 to my supervisees, and to answer the first question about training, it's always been under the primary supervisor's discretion to approve what type of training that they're receiving.
- Steve: That is what is articulated very specifically in this NAC change of training approved by the primary approved supervisor. It's simply just increasing the hours from 50 to 200 for the training.
- Hal: Who we should be talking to is law enforcement to see how they see this situation and how they would like to see situations in the field. Do they need to ask to supervise and those sorts of things? Let's have them have a voice in

this so that we can do a better job to support our licensees, for the work they do with them.

- Steve: These are good thoughts. Let's keep it in the realm of this workshop of soliciting any other feedback for 641A.146.
- Kimberly Schwartz: I just wanted to say that I support the changes in this proposal, and I support increasing any of those hours.
- NAC 641A.146 paragraph 6 – removes the restriction that no credit be given for supervised practice hours gained prior to becoming an intern in the state of Nevada.
 - Joelle: This change would allow for interns specifically to transfer in hours that they accrued as an intern in another state.
 - Steve: And it specifies how many of the hours that somebody can transfer in from out-of-state internship.
 - Joelle: The language now states the Board may approve credit for experience gained by a person prior to application for a license as an intern pursuant to the provisions of NAC 641A.156. The board may approve the transfer of a maximum of 750 direct client hours, a maximum of 150 hours of credit for supervision and then a maximum of 100% of hours pursuant to paragraph 5, which is all of the indirect hours. This would need to be submitted at the time of application along with verification of hours of experience form the state of licensure, where applicable and a letter from the board approved supervisor that the person had in the other state, or its equivalent.
 - Steve: We kicked this around quite a few times for quite a while. We came up with these numbers of allowing the transfer of 100% of the non-direct client services. And we settled currently on the number of 50%. So, half of what would be the direct to client service hours and half of the supervision hours and how we settled on those or the rationale behind settling on those numbers was it is our job as the Board of Examiners to protect the public and also regulate the caliber and the quality of our practitioners, of our professionals. This allows the vetted folks, clinicians, and supervisors in Nevada to have at least half of that opportunity.
 - Vincent Hartman: I had submitted all my information to humbly request that I'd be grandfathered in and credited for previous experience hours, so that I may get my intern number as I've been offered two positions in the state of Nevada. I was given the idea that my requirement for practicum hours, which would be pre grad experience and I have several years' worth of work that I've done in the field after my graduation. I've held an intern number in California as well as in Colorado, but I had a disability. I had an amputation that took me out of the field in 2018. I came to Nevada, and I've been trying since to be able to work within the system and get back to work. Um, so I'm not sure how those hours might be applicable towards my situation.
 - Steve: As our regulations read and what we are bound to is currently, we are not, by statute, allowed to consider out-of-state internship hours. That has been an oversight in Boards of past, but we are aware of what the regulations truly are, we are bound by them. We can't deviate from those because we now know what the current regs are. Our opportunity today is to reconsider some of those out of state hours to be considered. But in no way, are we able to who give the blessing of saying now, as of today's conversation, we can

begin considering those, this is a long journey and to today's hearing is a formality to be able to then have language drafted and sent to the Legislative Counsel Bureau to see if it is in line or in conflict with, with current statutes. So, do you have any thoughts that you would like us to consider in the drafting of language to accept some out-of-state hours?

- Vincent Hartman: I haven't really considered that. I had a lengthy discussion with Mr. Stoll, over at Heads Up, who's giving me the opportunity. I went ahead and put on the Certemy website. I'm used to the term grandfather in California in Colorado, it's just a request of grandfathering in.
- Hal: He's on the agenda.
- Steve: We will be able to talk about your case specifically in our Board meeting, which will happen after our public workshop.
- Meri Shadley: I really appreciate the hard work you guys have been putting into this because I think it is an oversight that none of us would've been expecting to sit with. I have pooled my interns as I have two interns that this ruling would impact. One of them feels comfortable that this is a fair compromise from no hours to all the hours. The other night she said, "this is better than what I was hoping for. So, I'm positive". The other intern is so close and had her hours been accepted, then when you guys looked at the laws and said, oh my gosh, we can't do this. Certainly, I think that there's a need for us to have some oversight here in Nevada and for an intern to have a sense of the community for us to be able to monitor and make sure that they have had the quality training, that we would hope that they had the quality supervision, but we wondered why 50%? Why not a third? Why not two thirds? How did you come up with the 50%? Is it just 50/50 that works well? Or did you have some justification for that particular amount? I wouldn't go with a hundred. I would personally think in specific cases it could be a waiver. I know that there might be unusual situation where someone could get a waiver for a 100%, but in general, I just didn't know why you came up with the 50%.
- Steve: Thank you for all that contribution and that final question is huge. It was several months of us talking about what is appropriate and moving it off of zero credit given seems to be appropriate. That's a hard line going to a 100% and giving that is akin to internship portability. As a Board, we weren't comfortable with full portability of internship hours. That's different than reciprocity of full licensure. Uh, and so it was goodness. For last three to four months of talking about what would that number be and to move forward, we needed to get a number. Uh, and so we settled on 50%. Board members, what was your experience or thoughts on that?
- Jennifer: My understanding of that is really that 50% represented a nice middle ground between Board members who wanted more and those who wanted less. It was lots of conversations to negotiate and compromise something that everybody was comfortable with.
- Meri Shadley: When it says at least 1500, at least 300, at least 1200, there was a little bit of a concern on the 1200 because it says, at least. It feels like there needs to be another line added that says or clinical hours. I don't know if that fits into this conversation at this moment, but I want to throw that in while I have the floor, that there needs to be something that would allow extra

clinical hours beyond the 1500, because at this point it does, wouldn't allow that because it says at least 1200 in those other categories. Some people don't do group for example.

- Joelle: Operationally, there are people that have no hours in these subcategories that make up the 1200 categories. I think that language is in there to make it clear that the 3000 hours comes from somewhere. So, if a person does wants to utilize those indirect hours or other categories, they can, but they're not necessarily bound to do so.
- Meri Shadley: I would recommend you put another line in there. I think we are supportive of this, even though some people would prefer it to be more. I'm assuming that if we asked for 70% of the hours, that it would have to go back to the drawing board and that seems like a delay that really is not good at this point. It's a great idea. And I think you guys made a good catch and I'm really pleased that we can assist getting more interns into the field working with us. So, thank you.
- Kiera McGillivray: Is there a waiver for military spouses who are coming in from another state who've accumulated hours and have been forced to move to the state of Nevada?
- Joelle: Not currently, no.
- Kiera McGillivray: I'm in full support of the hours being approved and I would also recommend more and possible waiver. There are extenuating circumstances where many spouses, I'm using the military for an example, but there are other circumstances where people have to move not by their wish. Me, being a military spouse, I have been there, and other states have military waivers. I would like to propose that and thinking of those people to work so hard and not have those hours appreciated. The work they've put into it is very difficult. I fully support the hours approved and I would fully support more as well.
- Steve: I really appreciate that contribution. That is an interesting consideration to offer military displacement, deployment or moving to folks affiliated with the military.
- Valerie: I would just like to echo that I know that there is a major concern about the wellbeing of our service members, veterans and their family members is a concern of my Board and has been for some time. So, anything we can do to help military families stabilize in a new location because as family structures are stressed during those types of transitions particularly if the spouse is set back quite a bit, that also leads to more stress for the service member. This would be one way that we could kind of help support those families and maybe reduce some of the emotional and mental stress.
- Steve: We have been put in a position to streamline the process for military affiliated practitioners and potential practitioners to become licensed to practice in the state in Nevada. We have been tasked with making that easier. One of the considerations is changing the fee structure for military affiliated people, but also consideration of these hours, I believe is a pretty good idea. Anybody else?
- Stacey Lance: My 20 years background has been in social work with the county and overseeing childcare licensing and foster care licensing. I just

wanted to point out maybe mirroring or using some similar language, that under certain circumstances when the licensing authority or this case, the Board, believes that it's in the best interest of the public to allow a waiver. So, I just wanted to give you the reference of NAC424.800. Adding that ability then that leaves room for this kind of unique situation that maybe you don't think of during regulation development. Um, I've been through two cycles of reg regulation development, this process for foster care. As soon as you get done, you think, I wish I would've said that, but now I have to wait years to do it again. This gives that little opening for you guys under your experience and your knowledge, for you to say, yes, I can do this and I'm not breaking the law.

- Steve: Thank you, Stacy, that's very helpful. So, for us to add some sort of language that says, there's an opportunity to appeal for extenuating circumstances, that could be a catchall for military. Military would probably get a real quick look from the Board and probably a thumbs up. We could then take into consideration like we currently do, but it could be in the regs that there's that option.
- Grettel Beltran: I am a current intern and coworker to another intern who is going through this issue and the uncertainty of what's going to happen with her hours. So, I wanted to come and advocate for her and also to advocate for some of the interns that are coming in from out of state for just an increase in the areas that are required for out of state interns. Based on her recently having an approval on her hours and consider some the damage that that's being done with stripping some of those away and the hard work that has already been put in.
- Steve: Any other people that would like to contribute their thoughts? I want to remind all of the Board members that we do have several letters in support of increasing these hours as written.
- Kimberly Schwartz: I have spoken on this issue times before and I'm in full support of allowing transferring of out-of-state hours, as several others have already stated. I just want to continue to echo that a lot of hard work and effort gets in time. As someone who graduated in 2017 with her masters, I've worked in substance abuse, in co-occurring facilities primarily, done several thousands of hours of groups, several hundred hours of working with individuals too and to get credit for that would mean so much, especially as someone who did her research and reached out and contacted the Board prior to making the huge move all the way across the country and was told that they could be accepted and just the battle that it's been over the last several months of trying to get some change with that, some major change so no one else has to go through this ever again. I noticed that you have to submit these with your application. So, what would that look like for those of us who have already gone through the application process? Do you mean your application for, um, full licensure or application as an intern? Like what would that mean for me, I guess.
- Joelle: You're reading that correctly. Moving forward, this is the process that the Board would like to see before someone is licensed as an intern. There are people that are past this point in the process and once the language is approved by the legislature and adopted, then what the Board would have ability to look at individual cases and decide separately because there are people that that this impacted retroactively. The Board will have an

opportunity to handle those cases specifically on a case-by-case basis after the language has been approved.

- Hal: Can I make a couple comments in the process of going through these regulations? A lot of variation with regards to individual cases. But one of the things that we tried to do was to clarify language. So, the people who were anticipating maybe coming into Nevada, a hopefully a clearer sense of what was going to be required here. So, we've tried to clarify language, which is an ongoing process. It's not the last set of regulations that we will do. We're moving forward with regards to this, and certainly we'll consider good ideas.
- Vincent Hartman: May I ask one quick question? When I'm working on this, the hours later towards in my intern hours, of course, I can wait for this body to get to the decision that you're going to be making. I am also put in a position where I'm trying to figure out how I'm going to bring income into my family household. So, the part that is hanging me up in this current situation isn't so much my intern hours, it is the requirement of the practicum or pre-grad hours. Field experience is what we used to call it. So, I'm wondering with having an approved supervisor on hand, is it possible that I can go back? I'm a University of Phoenix student graduate. So, is it possible that I can go to say my university and ask them to take another class, or course at a practicum class?
- Steve: I need to stop you because this is immaterial to what we're discussing right now. There is definitely going to be an opportunity for you during our Board meeting to discuss this more, but specifically what we're talking about right now, our licensed internship hours, not practicum.
- Joelle: May I just do a recap of what the public's changes were, just so that we're on track? Would that be okay?
- Steve: Yes.
- Joelle: Dr. Meri Shadley had made a suggestion to modify NAC 641A.146 to take out at least, or modify that in some way. Kiera McGillivray said to potentially have some type of allowance for extenuating circumstances for military families in the transfer of hours to NAC641A.146, paragraph 6. Stacey Lance suggested to look at NAC for foster care to help formulate such waiver. Those are the changes we would want to consider when we get to that agenda item in the Board meeting.
- NAC 641A.252 paragraph 1 – addition of the ACA Code of Ethics to the adopted professional associations.
 - Joelle: What we would like to do is add the ACA Code of Ethics to the adopted professional associations by reference. We made additional streamlined language for how to get the codes of ethics, free of charge. We took addresses out so that we wouldn't have to change language in the future if any of these associations moved.
 - Steve: The intent of this addition is to fill in a gap that was an oversight in the last regulation cycle. This tightens it up and I believe makes it livable moving forward because it takes out the potential for governing bodies or addresses to change. So, it makes it a more usable piece of NAC. Is there anybody that wants to add me clarification or suggestions to this language?

- No public comment.
- NAC 641A.182 paragraph 3 – addition that an approved supervisor must hold a current license in good standing in Nevada.
- NAC 641A.182 paragraph 6 – addition that an approved supervisor must adhere to the supervision standards set forth by the adopted professional associations.
 - Joelle: What we're adding here is that to be approved as a supervisor, a person needs to hold a current license in good standing in Nevada. Supervisors must consult with the Board concerning any issues related to the intern's professional record, competence and practice, and emotional and mental stability. We streamlined the language for the application process to become a supervisor. We added in that supervisors must adhere to the supervision standards outlined in the adopted Codes of Ethics.
 - Steve: The spirit of this was always embedded in our codes. This is tightening up the language to state that primary supervisors have to be licensed in the state of Nevada and it also grants the Board of Examiners the latitude to protect the public and examine and scrutinize supervisor and interns a little bit better.
 - Valerie Haskins: When we're talking about these secondary supervisors, is there a reason why they have to be also a licensed behavioral health provider in the state? I'm trying to get a better understanding of what the issue is. So instead of having that second secondary supervisor be, for example, like the Executive Director of a prevention coalition or a law enforcement officer, et cetera. Is there a specific reason for that?
 - Steve: So, a supervisor is in a position to regulate, train and assist with the intern as deemed appropriate for the professional license that they are seeking. So, a primary obviously has to be a primary in that field of training and supervision. I believe that the intent and spirit of a secondary supervisor is to add and augment to that training. That's why the supervisory hour requirement isn't nearly that of the primary supervisor. In order for us to be able to examine and regulate the profession in effort of protecting the public, this language is to tighten up that they are formally licensed in Nevada as an MFT or CPC.
 - Valerie Haskins: Thank you for the clarification.
- NAC 641A.105 – addition of clarifying language regarding the collection of fees specifically for those affiliated with the military, persons applying for a license through reciprocity and licensees requesting placement on inactive list.
 - Joelle: We wanted to give some clarifying language regarding the collection of fees, specifically those related to military affiliation, licensure by endorsement and requesting placement on inactive status. We wanted to also clarify what the length of time the inactive status is. Also, is the fee for a continuing education provider annual or is that a onetime fee?
 - Steve: And it is making an opportunity for armed forces folks to have an easier path in financially.

- No public comment.
- NAC 641A.243 – addition of language to professional responsibility that licensees must adhere to the supervision standards set forth by the adopted professional associations.
 - Joelle: This is a change that is to the professional conduct section of our NAC and to be consistent with language that we would like to add in NAC 641A.182, saying that a supervisor needs to adhere to the supervision standards set forth in the Codes of Ethics.
 - No public comment.
- NAC 641A.131 – addition of proration of continuing education credits needed for license renewal based on initial license issue date.
 - Joelle: This mainly impacts interns that have finished their hours and applying for full licensure. So, what this will do is prorate CEUs based on issue date and how long you have held a full license, will determine how many CEUs you're required to fulfill before license renewal.
 - Steve: This was essentially an oversight from the last series of regulation changes because folks who attain full licensure mid cycle were forced to get all 40 CEUs. And that was a big mountain to climb for newly licensed people. To Hal's point earlier, the regulations are living documents and evolve as our profession does. So, this proration of hours is essentially addressing the laws that went into effect in 2018.
 - No public comment.
- NAC 641A.133 – addition of clarifying language based on the proration of continuing education credits.
 - Joelle: This adds clarifying language based on the proration of CEUs. Based on the change of the language we propose in NAC 641A.131, it needs to change NAC 641A.133 because it refers to 40 CEUs required in the licensing period. And if we're changing 40, we need to change that.
 - Steve: And it really describes how many are needed for ethics, suicide prevention and cultural competency.
 - No public comment.
- NAC 641A new paragraph – addition of language pertaining to the exemption of recordings of training activities.
 - Joelle: This is in response to Assembly Bill 366, that requires the Board to create language pertaining to the exemption of recordings of training activities. There is a draft of an informed consent that a client would sign pertaining to this issue.
 - Steve: It had been a very confusing topic, especially for folks in graduate programs and for supervisors who ask their interns to film and record sessions. There was shortsighted language that came out and sent us all into

a flurry because it said it was now part of a medical record and they needed to be retained for the same periods of time. So, this clarifies that they can be destroyed, that there's an informed consent process and I believe it really specifies with some clarity, the intent and essentially the process for training videos

- John: I would just say that video recording and review is the supervision and training gold standard. It allows for faculty and supervisors to be able to do that without our institutions forbidding that because of an aversion to possible problems because it becomes a medical record. If institutions said, "you can't use videos anymore", that really creates a problem in terms of training and producing entry level capable practitioners. If you're sitting in the room as a supervisor, that's limited too, because that changes the chemistry of the counseling session itself. So, you're not really seeing something as, as naturalistically as if it would be if it was on video when you're there in person. I applaud this initiative and I feel like this is really going to take care of our ability in training to use video for training and for supervision purposes. It's still protected by HIPAA. So, you still have to destroy those recordings once you're done with them and within a reasonable length of time. By asserting that it is not intended to be and should not be part of the medical record is essential and I'm glad that we're doing it.
 - No public comment.
- John: We have a letter from the public that makes reference to the qualifications for a primary supervisor. So, is that part of the public workshop or is that something we're covering in the agenda?
 - Steve: The letter that Dr. Nixon is referring to is a letter hoping for another profession to be added to the regulations pertaining to supervisor qualifications and that's just not up for discussion today. That's not in any of these proposed regulations. I am grateful to you all. This is the process that allows us to be better. It allows us to serve the public and our profession better. Hats off to everybody that took time out of their day to join us and offer your thoughts. They have been noted and I think they echo the directions that we're going in. So again, many, many thanks.

3. Close Public Comments: Proposed Regulations. Workshop discussion closed at 10:04 AM.

Meeting agendas are available for download at the Nevada State Board of Marriage Family Therapists & Clinical Professional Counselors website: <http://marriage.nv.gov>. Anyone who needs the agenda or supporting materials for this meeting is invited to call or email Joelle McNutt at (702) 486-7388 or mftbd2@mftbd.nv.gov. The agenda and supporting materials may be provided by email or can be arranged to be picked up in person. This agenda has been sent to all members of the Board and other interested persons who have requested an agenda from the Board. Persons who wish to continue to receive an agenda and notice should make a formal request to Joelle McNutt at mftbd2@mftbd.nv.gov.

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify Joelle McNutt at (702) 486-7388 or mftbd2@mftbd.nv.gov no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. Requests for special arrangements made after this time frame cannot be guaranteed.

THIS MEETING HAS BEEN PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED IN THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC LOCATIONS AND WEB SITES:

State of Nevada Administrative Website: <https://notice.nv.gov/>

State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors: 7324 W. Cheyenne Ave. Suite #10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129

State of Nevada Board of Examiners for Marriage & Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors Website: <https://marriage.nv.gov/>