BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 N. Market Blvd., Third Floor, Trinity Room
Sacramento, CA 95834

TELECONFERENCE LOCATIONS

8920 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 334
Beverly Hills, CA 90211

Los Angeles Harbor College
1111 Figueroa Place, Suite NEA147
Wilmington, CA 90744

Ronald Reagan State Building
300 South Spring Street, Auditorium
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Friday, April 21, 2017

Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, Board President, called the open session teleconference meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. A quorum was present and due notice had been sent to all interested parties.

Members Present:
Stephen Phillips, JD, PsyD, President
Nicole J. Jones, Vice-President
Alita Bernal
Jacqueline Horn, PhD
Lucille Acquaye-Baddoo
Michael Erickson, PhD

Others Present:
Antonette Sorrick, Executive Officer
Jeff Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer
Sandra Monterrubio, Enforcement Program Manager
Cherise Burns, Central Services Manager
Jason Glasspiegel, Central Services Coordinator
Stephanie Cheung, Licensing Unit Manager
Natasha Lim, Licensing and BreEZe Coordinator
Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel
Dr. Jo Linder-Crow - Chief Executive Officer – California Psychological Association
Dr. Alpa A. Bajaj - Program Chair of Graduate Studies - School of Behavioral Sciences, California Southern University
Dr. Elizabeth Winkelman – Director of Professional Affairs - California Psychological Association
Dr. Parul Patel - Director of Clinical Training, California Southern University
Dr. Melodie Schaefer – Division II of the California Psychological Association and the California Psychology Internship Council.
Amanda Levy - Director, Government Affairs, California Psychological Association

**Agenda Item #2: President’s Welcome**

Dr. Phillips welcomed those in attendance and read the Board’s mission statement.

**Agenda Item #3: Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda**

There were no public comments.

**Agenda Item #4: Policy and Advocacy Committee Report and Consideration of Committee Recommendations on Board Positions**

a) **Legislative Update**

1) **Omnibus Proposal – Amendments to Business and Professions Code Section 2987 (Fee Schedule)**

Ms. Burns discussed the Board’s pending Omnibus proposal. She reported that since the submission of the proposal, additional changes were deemed necessary. The updated change to the psychological assistant fee, removes language that specifies that the supervisor pays the fee, and will now not specify who can pay the fee, therefore allowing the fee to be paid by anyone.

Regarding the Board’s current delinquent fee, the Board has not updated this fee since 1978. Currently the delinquent fee for a psychologist is $25.00 and a psychological assistant is $20.00. The Board is looking to update this language to change the delinquent fee to 50 percent of the renewal fee with a maximum of $150. This language is used by most other DCA boards.

Ms. Jones asked for Board discussion regarding the fee change language. No comment was received.

It was M(Horn)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to accept the recommended changes to the omnibus proposal.

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Schaefer was concerned with the verbiage in 2987(e). She wondered if the Board can be more explicit, to say the fee is to be paid by either the supervising psychologist or the psychological assistant.

Dr. Phillips advised that the fee could also be paid by the institution.
Ms. Marks expressed that the language as written is sufficient.

Dr. Schaefer withdrew her concern.

Dr. Phillips suggested addressing the change in a newsletter article to ensure that everyone understands the changes to the process.

Ms. Marks suggested to take out the word “total” in subsection (h).

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

2) AB 89 (Levine) - Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention Coursework Requirements – Addition of Section to the BPC (Coursework in Suicide Risk Assessment and Intervention)

Ms. Jones advised AB 89 (Levine) is now in the Senate. Ms. Burns stated that since the Board’s last meeting, AB 89 went through the Assembly as follows: AB 89 passed out of the Business and Professions Committee with a 14-1-1 vote; the Appropriations Committee with a 17-0-0 vote; and the Assembly Floor yesterday, with a 72-1-7 vote. She advised that no additional amendments have been introduced at this time, and that staff would be meeting with the opposition to AB 89 (Levine) shortly.

Ms. Jones thanked Ms. Burns for the update. She confirmed that no action is necessary at this time. Ms. Jones shared that during the Policy and Advocacy Committee meeting, she and Dr. Erickson talked about writing a joint newsletter article discussing AB 89 (Levine).

Dr. Horn wanted to remind people who will be at the opposition meeting, the reasons why we are sponsoring AB 89 (Levine). She stated that it is not because there are gaps in training. She believes we have demonstrated that a majority of psychology trainees sometime in their training get exposure to suicide assessment and intervention. As suicide is a big problem in California, the Board wants to take a leadership role and highlight this issue, and make sure all of our licensees get exposure to this training and education. The Board did not specify in the language that this change would mandate additional coursework because they wanted to allow previous coursework and applied experience to count. That is the message that she wants to make sure we are taking to the meeting. That message better reflects the Licensing Committee’s thinking, not that there are gaps in the training.

Ms. Jones stated the Policy and Advocacy Committee advised that even though there is no intent language in the bill, she wanted to point out that our advocacy information has relayed that sentiment.

Dr. Phillips stated that the real moving force behind this bill, is not due to a concern about gaps in training, but of variances in the amount of training. The Board’s survey showed a certain amount of variability, and given the crisis around suicide, the Board
141 wants to ensure that all licensees have a minimal level of exposure to training, and can demonstrate this if requested.

144 Ms. Jones believed that sentiment was put in the advocacy materials.

146 Dr. Phillips also wanted to acknowledge what the Central Services Unit and Executive Officer have done regarding disseminating the information and the professionalism of their efforts.

150 Ms. Jones asked for any other Board comments. No additional comments were received.

153 Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Linder-Crow asked if first time licensees are going to be required to demonstrate this for their first license renewal, and does the Board plan on a 100 percent audit, or is the requirement going to be rolled into the Continuing Education requirements so that only those selected for a Continuing Education audit are required to demonstrate compliance.

158 Ms. Burns advised that all initial applicants will show compliance during the application process, and current licensees will show proof upon audit (which is typically ten percent of licensees).

162 Dr. Schaefer is concerned that this bill might send the message that psychologists are ill prepared, and if that is not the intent, will the Board put forth additional language for other health care professionals, as this might help show that there is not a perceived deficit.

167 Dr. Linder-Crow clarified that the Board is scheduled to meet with the authors office and the California Psychological Association.

172 Dr. Schaefer reiterated her message of having the Board expand this requirement to other health care professionals.

173 Ms. Jones thanked everyone for their comments and advised that the Board’s message will be included in the newsletter article. Ms. Jones confirmed Staff would keep the Board apprised of any changes with AB 89 (Levine).

178 Ms. Sorrick stated that the bill would most likely be referred next to the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee.

182 Dr. Erickson stated to Dr. Schaefer that he believes we do not see psychologists as deficient and believes if this does go forward as law, that we have taken a leadership role and hopefully that will spread to other professions.

186 Dr. Schaefer thanked Dr. Erickson and stated that she believes it will be good to bring others to the table.
b) Review and Consideration of Committee Recommendations on Legislation:

1) Newly Introduced Bills – Review of Bill Analyses and Potential Action

A. Recommendations for Active Positions on bills

1. AB 244 (Cervantes) – Maternal Mental Health

A summary of the bill was read by Ms. Burns. She advised that staff recommends a “Support if Amended” position, as there is the possibility of exclusion for our licensees since the bill includes psychological services as a component of the pilot program.

Dr. Horn commented that ‘perinatal’ is only immediately before and after birth. The program in the bill would extend the possibility of care for up to one year. This language does not fit with the term ‘perinatal’. Maybe the title of the program should be changed. She stated that when people do have a mood disorder prior to pregnancy and then get pregnant many antidepressants cannot be taken as they may cause birth defects. This puts women with pre-existing conditions at risk, where psychological interventions would be much more important. She also stated that research shows that medication helps get the mood in a place that it is not so disruptive and people can actually make use of psychotherapy. She supports the intention of the bill. She stated that one of the components could be called “access to perinatal psychiatric and psychological consultation.” Also, in our analysis, she wants to caution staff about saying “a lost opportunity for licensees.” She believes the loss of important services is most important.

Ms. Jones thanked Dr. Horn for her comments. There were no other Board comments or questions.

It was M/(Erickson)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to take a “Support if Amended” position on AB 244 (Cervantes).

Ms. Jones asked for public comment:

Dr Schaefer recommended the term: perinatal and postpartum psychiatric and psychological consultation.

Dr. Horn agreed.

Dr. Erickson approved of the friendly amendment, Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo also agreed.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

2. AB 710 (Wood) – Department of Consumer Affairs: Board Meetings
Ms. Jones introduced AB 710 (Wood), and asked Mr. Leitzel to go over the bill. A summary of the bill was read by Mr. Leitzel. Ms. Sorrick advised that the Board currently can meet in a rural areas but does not necessarily need to be required to.

Ms. Jones pointed out that the Board does have a live webcast for all of its meetings.

Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked how the Board can put out advocacy information explaining how those in rural areas can participate in Board meetings.

Ms. Burns advised that we can include that information on our position letter.

Dr. Horn asked if there is any way we could also offer a call in number at all meetings.

Ms. Burns said that staff could look into having a call-in option available at all meetings.

It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to oppose AB 710 (Wood).

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. No public comment received.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

The Board took a 10-minute break.

3. AB 1116 (Grayson) – Peer Support and Crisis Referral Services Act

A summary of AB 1116 (Grayson) was read by Mr. Glasspiegel.

Dr. Phillips stated that he believes this is a wonderful way to have peer support, as many in this line of work do not seek psychological services. Dr. Phillips believes the recent update correctly illustrates the appropriate privileged communication without expanding the term psychotherapist. No other Board comments were received.

Ms. Jones advised that due to the most recent amendment, the bill should now be a “Watch” bill. Dr. Phillips agreed.

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. No public comment received.

4. AB 1188 (Nazarian) – Health Professions Development: Loan Repayment

A summary of AB 1188 (Nazarian) was read by Mr. Leitzell. He advised that the Policy and Advocacy Committee took a “Support” position, and recommended that position to the Board.
It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to support AB 1188 (Grayson).

Ms. Jones asked for Board comment. No comment received.

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Schaefer is concerned that money collected from psychologists will be supporting LPCC interns and other license types.

Ms. Burns clarified that funds collected by each license type go towards loan repayment grants for the same license type.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

5. SB 572 (Stone) - Healing Arts Licensees: Violations: Grace Period

A summary of SB 572 (Stone) was read by Mr. Glasspiegel. Ms. Monterrubio advised that there are multiple situations where we cite people for infractions which, it could be argued, do not cause irreparable harm.

Ms. Marks added that the Board has prosecutorial discretion on any infraction.

Dr. Phillips sees where this may be beneficial, but not for the Board of Psychology.

It was M/(Phillips)/S(Erickson)/C to oppose SB 572 (Stone)

Ms. Jones asked for Board comment. No other board comment received.

Ms. Jones asked for public comment. Dr. Winkelman had a question regarding the Board’s current Continuing Education citation and fine practices.

Ms. Burns advised of current practices. Dr. Winkelman thinks that this could arguably make sense for psychologists.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

6. SB 798 (Hill) – Healing Arts: Boards (Research Psychoanalysts Registration Program)

A summary of the SB 798 (Hill) was read by Ms. Burns. She advised of the current staff concerns. The bill has no delayed implementation language for this new licensure population. Board staff would like a one-year extension for implementation of this population. Staff are also concerned that the bill does not have language to allow rulemaking authority to transfer from the Medical Board to the Board of Psychology. Additionally, staff would like a clarifying amendment to have any funds from the registration program go the Psychology Fund.
Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo asked if a year is enough time. Ms. Burns went into additional
details regarding breakdown of the anticipated implementation timeline.

Dr. Erickson asked about a history of discipline for research psychoanalysts. Ms. Burns advised there is was one case of discipline reported in the prior year, but clarified that staff have not met with the Medical Board staff yet.

Dr. Horn asked how many of the research psychoanalysts are licensed in other states.

Dr. Phillips advised most are not licensed elsewhere. The challenge is that many of these folks may not have any grounding in psychopharmacology. Additionally, there may be no ethics code applied to the group of registrants. He believes there has not been a lot of scrutiny of the group, and it is not unusual for more than one third of their time to be spent in clinical practice. He believes many are highly trained, and frequently publish their research. They are highly respected but there may be holes in their regulations. He expressed agreement that this population be under the auspices of a mental health board.

Ms. Marks advised section 2930 of the Business and Professions Code (BPC) might be sufficient to cover the regulatory authority for adding the additional section within the chapter. From her review of the language, she is not sure how to revoke an exemption or issue a registration exemption. Additionally section 92 of the bill references section 2950 of the BPC for unprofessional conduct, which lists section 726 of the BPC and the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law, and section 2951 of the BPC, but also might need to reference section 2953 of the BPC. She also questions whether a revocation can be stayed.

Dr. Erickson commented that it sounds like we want a year before we take the group under our jurisdiction. He questioned if we would use existing regulations they have to administer the program until we promulgate our own. He also asked if this population would fall under the same disciplinary guidelines as psychologists. Dr. Erickson also agreed with Dr. Phillips on the level of respect for these found in the profession.

Dr. Horn believes the Board might want to start the ad-hoc committee within the first year.

Ms. Sorrick explained a committee could be created similar to how the ABA Taskforce was created.

Ms. Jones would like to have staff illustrate the anticipated timeline.

Ms. Burns advised staff recommends a “Support if Amended” position on SB 798 (Hill), with requests to add in a delayed implementation, the transfer of rulemaking authority, and a clarifying amendment of a transfer of funds.
Ms. Sorrick said that staff can bring more information back to the June Board meeting.

Dr. Erickson asked who will create the new committee.

Ms. Sorrick believes Dr. Phillips would nominate those for the committee, which would include one person from the registered population and one Board Member.

Ms. Burns believes it would be good to bring these questions back to the June meeting.

Ms. Jones stated that she believes this should be larger than a two-person committee or, at a minimum, post all meetings and have teleconference availability if it is not a three-person committee.

It was M/(Horn)/S(Erickson)/C to take a “Support if Amended position on SB 798 (Hill) with staff’s requested amendments.

Ms. Jones asked for public comments. None received.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

Ms. Marks requested that the Board delegate the authority to express the positions taken at the meeting to the author.

It was M/(Erickson)/S(Horn)/C to delegate the authority. Ms. Jones asked for Board and public comment. No public or Board comment received

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

**B. Recommendations for Board to Watch Bills**

Ms. Jones gave an overview of the Board’s reason for watching bills and spot bills, and advised that the Policy and Advocacy Committee thinks the Board should continue to watch the attached bills in case additional action becomes necessary.

Ms. Jones asked the Board if any members have concerns regarding any of the watch bills.

Dr. Horn stated that she had concerns regarding item #41 ACR 8 (Jones-Sawyer). She was unsure of the purpose of this resolution. She was aware that if signed, it would not become a new diagnostic code. She was wondering if the purpose of this resolution would be to name post-traumatic street disorder as a problem.

Ms. Jones indicated that they talked about this in the Policy and Advocacy Committee.
Ms. Burns advised that this is not a bill that would be codified in statute. The purpose of a resolution is to bring an issue to light. She does want staff to connect with the author’s office to get more information.

Ms. Levy indicated that the California Psychological Association is aware of this resolution and has taken an Oppose position. She does not think the bill will move out of the Health Committee. She advised that this resolution is due to episode of a TV show, “Vice”, where the term was used.

Dr. Linder-Crow advised that this is not how new diagnoses are established and it is not appropriate for the legislature to attempt to create a new diagnosis through a resolution.

No additional Board comment was received regarding any of the watch bills.

C. Recommendations for Board to Watch Spot Bills

This agenda item was covered in the explanation for “B. Recommendations for Watch Bills” above.

c) Update Regarding the California Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA) and Mandated Reporting – Penal Code Sections 261.5, 288, and 11165.1.

Mr. Glasspiegel reviewed updates to CANRA.

Dr. Erickson asked for additional background regarding the decision that was affirmed by the Court of Appeals.

Discussion ensued regarding the different aspects of the legal decision and its current location with the California State Supreme Court.

Dr. Schaefer asked what current licensees are supposed to do.

Ms. Marks clarified that the Board does not enforce CANRA, as that is a violation of the Penal Code. The Board may, however, take action against a licensee due to a conviction based on a violation of the Penal Code.

Ms. Sorrick confirmed that we have not received complaints regarding violations of failure to report a mandatory report based on the Board’s concerns with CANRA.

Dr. Winkelman said that she appreciates Ms. Mark’s comments. She believes receiving the opinion of the Attorney General will be helpful even if it is delayed.

Dr. Phillips advised he is as frustrated as the rest of the licensees regarding lack of clarification around CANRA.
Dr. Schaefer stated that she is more than a bit concerned with the pending clarification as she is aware that a psychologist can be penalized for not reporting an act as required by CANRA. She also stated that she believes the right course should be to report an act to the Department of Children and Family Services and they will determine if action needs to be taken to protect the child.

Discussion ensued regarding what the Board should or can do regarding providing any type of guidance to licensees, and what information could be provided.

D. Regulatory Update

1) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1391.1, 1391.2, 1391.5, 1391.6, 1391.8, 1391.10, 1391.11, 1391.12, 1392.1 – Psychological Assistants

2) Update on 16 CCR Sections 1387(b)(10)(11) and 1387.1 – Verification of Experience and Supervision Agreement Forms

Mr. Glasspiegel provided an update of the pending regulatory packages the Board is working on. He advised that the psychological assistant regulatory package is to be submitted to the Board’s legal counsel for review by end of the day today or by Monday. Additionally, the Verification of Experience regulatory package was returned from the Department today and is ready to go to the Office of Administrative Law, which should be done Monday.

Dr. Linder-Crow asked whether a psychological assistant must be a W-2 employee.

Ms. Sorrick reminded the Board that the determination regarding W-2 and independent contractor status is not determined by the Board.

Dr. Linder-Crow thinks information needs to go out to psychologists to clarify that if someone hires a psychological assistant, they must be hired as an employee rather than 1099 contractor.

Ms. Cheung advised that any information provided by the Board was by courtesy and provided by the Franchise Tax Board. Any questions regarding whether a psychologist needs to hire a psychological assistant as an employee, should be directed to the Franchise Tax Board.

Agenda Item #5: Review and Approve Possible Input to ASPPB on Draft Documents

a) Draft Regulations
b) Draft Model Act
c) Draft Code of Ethics
Ms. Sorrick provided an overview of this agenda item. She stated that staff had met and had no concerns with the draft documents. Her recommendation was to have the Board provide feedback that we appreciated the opportunity to comment to ASPPB, but had no further input.

It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Bernal) to accept the staff recommendation to provide the requested to ASPPB.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0.

**Agenda Item #6: Licensing Committee Report and Consideration and Possible Approval of Committee Recommendations**

a) Consider and Possible Approval of Licensing Committee Recommendation Regarding Requests for Extension to the 72-Month Registration Period for Registered Psychological Assistants Pursuant to Section 1391.1(b) of the California Code of Regulations

1) Psychological Assistant #1 – Request for a Two-Year Extension to the 72-month registration period

Ms. Cheung reported on results of the Licensing Committee Closed Session discussion regarding psychological assistant #1.

Dr. Horn provided more details on the cases. She advised that psychological assistant #1 wanted to keep practicing past the 6-year limit but has not been able to pass the national examination.

Dr. Erickson advised the 6-year limit was created long after this person had begun practicing.

Ms. Acquaye-Baddoo confirmed with Dr. Horn that the registrant has been unable to pass the examination.

It was M/(Horn)/S(Erickson) to approve the Licensing Committee’s recommendation to deny the extension request.

Vote: 4 Aye (Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-2 (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal)

2) Psychological Assistant #2 – Request for a Three-year-and-five month Extension to the 72-month registration period

Ms. Cheung reported on the results of the Licensing Committee Closed Session discussion regarding psychological assistant #2.

There were no questions by the Board.
It was M/(Jones)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo)/C to accept the Licensing Committee recommendation to grant the request.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

b) **Consider and Possible Approval of Licensing Committee Recommendation Regarding Supervision Agreement Plans for Supervised Professional Experience in Non-Mental Health Services Pursuant to Section 1387.3 of the California Code of Regulations**

Ms. Cheung reported on the results of the Licensing Committee Closed Session discussion regarding psychological assistant #3.

The Board had no questions.

It was M/(Acquaye-Baddoo)/S(Horn)/C to accept the recommendation of the Committee to approve the non-mental health supervision agreement plan.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

**Agenda Item #7: Review and Approve Possible Input to Judicial Council on Competence to Stand Trial Draft Guidelines**

Ms. Monterrubio presented the information on the Draft Guidelines and the nine points.

Dr. Horn asked a question about point #5 which discusses treatment with antipsychotic medications and whether that is medically appropriate; if psychologists do the evaluation, is this outside of a psychologist’s scope of practice?

Dr. Phillips stated that psychologists could opine on whether someone is competent to make a determination, but we might want to say that these guidelines are primarily aimed at psychiatrists.

Dr. Horn stated psychologists could comment on items inside their scope of practice, but not point #5.

Dr. Linder-Crow stated she has never seen these guidelines before, but has a number of forensic psychologists that work in this field.

Ms. Sorrick advised the stakeholder meeting was an outgrowth of a bill last year that mandated this stakeholder meeting occur and get input.

Dr. Winkelman agreed that point #5 would be problematic for psychologists.

Dr. Phillips commented that the scope of practice is worth following-up on.
It was M/(Jones)/S(Acquaye-Baddoo) to accept staff’s report and recommendations with additional comments on item 5 about scope of practice.

No public comments received.

Vote: 6 Aye (Acquaye-Baddoo, Bernal, Erickson, Horn, Jones, Phillips) No-0

Agenda Item #8: Legislative Items for Future Meeting.

None Provided

Agenda Item #9: Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None Provided

Agenda Item #10: President’s Report

a) 2017 Meeting Calendar and Locations
b) Committee Updates

Ms. Burns advised that the Board may need an August teleconference meeting for legislative purposes, and will inform the members of this as the year progresses.

Dr. Linder-Crow asked about the June Board meeting location. She was provided with the information for the Sheraton Ontario Airport.

Ms. Sorrick thanked the Central Services Unit for preparing the Board packets and the legislative materials, and Dr. Phillips for his testimony at the Assembly Committee on Business and Professions.

Agenda Item #11: Recommendations for Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings.

Ms. Jones confirmed the custody issue raised at the February meeting was going to be agendized for next meeting

Dr. Phillips confirmed it would be included.

Agenda Item #12: Closed Session

The Board met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to Discuss Disciplinary Matters Including Petitions for Reconsideration, Stipulations, and Proposed Decisions.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board returned to open session but was unable to establish a quorum due to technical challenges and adjourned at 3:02 pm.
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