

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING FOR THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF ATHLETIC TRAINERS (NSBAT)

---

**DATE:** April 24, 2020

**Public Access with Zoom:**

**Meeting ID:** 842-6447-7928  
**Password:** 574018

Due to COVID-19 and Governor Sisolak's Emergency Mandate to Stay at Home for Nevada, this meeting will only take place via Zoom. The Board is pleased to invite individuals to participate remotely using ZOOM. To learn more about Zoom, go to <https://zoom.us/>. On the scheduled day and time of the meeting, visit the ZOOM website and click "Join a Meeting." You will be prompted to enter your name, along the Meeting ID and Meeting Password above.

The Board office recommends that individuals unfamiliar with ZOOM visit the website in advance to familiarize themselves with the format by viewing the online tutorials and reading the FAQs.

---

**1. Meeting called to order by NSBAT Chair, Jeremy Haas at 2:33PM.**

**Board Members Present:** Jeremy Haas, Chair; Tedd Girouard, Vice Chair; Keoni Kins, Treasurer; and Frank Sakelarios, Board Member.

**Staff Present:** Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General and Michelle Cothrun, Board Executive Secretary.

**2. Public comment.** No public members in attendance via Zoom. There is no public comment.

**3. Review and approve Board meeting minutes of November 15, 2019 and November 22, 2019.  
(For Possible Action)**

- a. **November 15, 2019 Public Meeting;**
- b. **November 15, 2019 Public Meeting and Hearing for the Adoption of Proposed Regulations of the Nevada State Board of Athletic Trainers and the Nevada Physical Therapy Board;**
- c. **November 22, 2019 Public Meeting via Teleconference.**

Jeremy Haas starts by asking if everyone has had a chance to review all three files. He states that everything looks good and if there are no complaints, he will move to approve. Jeremy motions to approve the meeting minutes for November 15, 2019 and November 22, 2019. Tedd Girouard seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**4. Update on disciplinary action reports and investigations of unlicensed activity. (Discussion)**

Michelle Cothrun advises the Board that no new complaints have been received. She also let the Board know that she had reviewed the complaint policy of the Psychology Board as Sarah Bradley suggested. Sarah had also suggested that an educative letter be sent as a first step for a complaint of unlicensed activity. Michelle tells the Board that she does not feel comfortable sending the letter on her own without it being reviewed. She also tells the Board that a cease and desist letter may not be appropriate, as she is concerned that the Board may overstep its

authority. The first step would be to send a letter to first advise them that a complaint against them has been received. Secondly, the letter would inform them that to practice as an athletic trainer, or to hold themselves out as an athletic trainer, they need to be licensed in the State of Nevada. Harry Ward then suggests that a letter may be drafted for Harry Ward, as the representative at the Attorney General's office, to sign. Michelle will draft a letter for Harry to review and possibly sign.

Michelle then advises the Board that there were zero disciplinary actions taken by the Board. The following statistics that were submitted to the LCB for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2020:

- Three (3) new licenses were issued
- There are two hundred eighty-seven (287) active licensees.

Eight (8) applications are pending, mainly from the Raiders' athletic trainers that are moving to Las Vegas. They have asked that their licenses be issued on July 1<sup>st</sup> to avoid having to pay the renewal fee of \$150.00 that would be due before June 30<sup>th</sup>.

Jeremy Haas points out that this situation leads into what the Board will discuss later in the agenda about grace periods. Michelle also advises the Board that she had one licensee that complained about having to pay the renewal fee so soon after having his license issued. Michelle reminded him that it is posted on the website that all licenses expire on June 30<sup>th</sup> regardless of the issue date. His license was issued at the beginning of April. The pandemic has negatively affected his work and it is understandable why he would be upset.

Tedd Girouard asks Michelle if there are other outstanding applications. She explains that there are two (2) new applicants that will be working for the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) that have also asked that their licenses be held until July 1<sup>st</sup>. Tedd wants to make sure that the request to hold on to their application is from the applicant's end. They may need their license right away for employment. Michelle explains that when she receives an application this close to renewals, she asks the applicant if they need their license right away for employment. If they do not need it right away, she advises that they can wait to have it issued on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Tedd states that he wants to be sure that the licenses are being issued as soon as possible, especially if they are waiting for their license to start a new job. Michelle clarifies that she does not hold on to applications unless the applicant requests it. Once the results of the fingerprint background are received, the license can be issued that same day.

Michelle reminds the Board that the fingerprint background check takes the longest time. One possibility that Michelle wants to investigate is establishing a credit account with the Department of Public Safety. Right now, applicants submit payment for their background check either with a money order or cashier's check, and Michelle forwards the payment along with the fingerprint cards. If a credit account can shorten the processing time by a few days, Michelle will add it to a future agenda.

Tedd adds that it cannot hurt to look into the possibility because shortening the process time by three (3) days can make a difference for some. Jeremy agrees but expresses reservations about how the Board could end up paying the bill if a check bounces for some reason. It could cause financial problems, but it is worth looking into. Keoni Kins also agrees but has the same reservations as Jeremy. Jeremy goes on to say that the process is much shorter now than it was in the past. Michelle explains to the Board that live scan fingerprints are taking longer than normal. The Department of Public Safety is having to split shifts to allow for social distancing, so there may be delays. Michelle is grateful that the Department is still open and processing fingerprints. There is no further discussion.

**5. Review and discuss an updated letter drafted by the BOC in support a California Senate bill to license Athletic Trainers and possibly add support to their updated letter by adding the Board's name to the signature. (For Possible Action)** Jeremy Haas begins by asking Michelle Cothrun if she sent the Board the letter to review. Michelle confirms that the updated letter was included with the meeting materials. Tedd Girouard asks if this is an update to the letter that was considered in a previous Board meeting. Michelle explains that the previous letter was for a bill that did not pass, so the BOC is pursuing another avenue. Jeremy does not see any reason not to sign the letter, especially coming from the BOC. Tedd agrees that the Board need to support the BOC any way they can. Keoni Kins also agrees.

Tedd Girouard motions to update the drafted letter by the BOC in support of the California Senate bill by adding the Board of Athletic Trainers' name to the signature. Jeremy Haas seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**6. Review and discuss lending support to the BOC drafting a letter to Colorado, whose athletic training board is going through sunset, to support the continuation of licensure in Colorado by adding the Board's name to the signature. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun explains to the Board that Shannon Fleming from the BOC has not drafted a letter yet. She wanted to know if the Board was interested in lending support to a letter that would be very similar to the one that they wrote for California, but this would letter would be for Colorado. Jeremy states that the Board would want to lend support because our Board would want these same states to offer their support in return. If any state like Colorado would allow unlicensed athletic trainers, it could start a snowball effect. The Board would want to support any State Board up for Sunset Review. Jeremy questions if the Board should vote today since the letter has not been drafted. Harry Ward advises the Board that they can say they will approve any letter that is similar to the ones submitted previously in support of Colorado or this can be added to the next meeting agenda.

The Board discusses the issue and decides that it is better to wait until a letter has been drafted. Michelle will tell the BOC that the Board would be in support; however, the Board would like to review the letter first. And once the letter is available for review, the Board will call a meeting for this one agenda item. Harry adds that the only delay would be the three (3) days' notice that is required by Open Meeting Law. There is no action taken.

**7. Review and discuss status of LCB File No. R053-19 regarding proposed dry needling regulation. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun advises the Board that at the end of 2019, the LCB Commission reviewed the Physical Therapy Board's draft of their regulation and it did not pass. The Commission requested more clarification on needle retention and the disposal of needles. The Physical Therapy Board is in the process of getting a re-draft and once they receive it, we can review it and possibly request the same re-draft.

Michelle goes on to explain that Jay Henke at the University of Nevada, Reno has a dry needling course scheduled for May. They submitted their agenda and waiver to see if they comply with the guidelines of the new dry needling regulation. The course would probably need to be cancelled. Keoni Kins questions why the course would need to be cancelled because the language of the regulation has not been worked out. Jeremy Haas adds that it is not for the Board to review and approve every dry needling course agenda and waiver.

Tedd Girouard asks if other Board members have been approached about dry needling and what the procedure is if they do. Some who currently practice want to know whether they can continue to perform dry needling. Michelle advises the Board that if they are approached with questions, they can refer that person to the Board office. The Board's position is still the same that if a licensee is trained in dry needling, they can practice dry needling according to their training. Michelle reads NRS 640B.037, which gives the definition of dry needling. The practice act for athletic trainers in Nevada now includes dry needling.

Tedd states that the questions he gets center around the 125 hours of didactic training. The Board discusses possible scenarios with training and documenting that training. They agree that the procedure for documenting the training will need to be discussed in detail at the next Board meeting. By then, the Physical Therapy Board may have an example of a documentation process that the Board can consider. There is no further discussion and no action is taken.

**8. Review and discuss status of AB 319 that requires professional licensing boards to develop and implement a process by which a person with a criminal history may petition the regulatory body to review the criminal history of the person to determine if it will preclude them from a license. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun advises the Board that the FBI reviewed AB 319 and concluded that the statute, as written, violates their privacy laws. An individual cannot request a background check to submit to a licensing board for review. The FBI's policy is that the request must come from the State entity directly. Sarah Bradley, the Board's previous DAG, informed the Board that a background check is not required per AB 319. The request for a petition to review a person's criminal history can come with a person's statement alone. Michelle reminds the Board that they had decided at a previous meeting that the background check is necessary to determine eligibility. The Attorney General's office is reviewing the situation to see how to satisfy both the requirements of the FBI and AB 319. In the meantime, Michelle has collected a few examples of policies from different boards to consider as a model for our own policy. That policy and a statement advising potential applicants about the policy, once

approved, will need to be added to the Board's website. Harry Ward advises the Board that they are not the only ones having to draft a policy, so there is no need to reinvent the wheel.

Tedd Girouard states that he will be discussing this point in his report on agenda item number nine (9). This policy was discussed at great length at the Regulatory Conference and it can be a protection for the Board. An applicant may spend \$30-40K on their education, be denied licensure based on criminal history, and state that the website did not list the crimes that could preclude them from licensure. Harry Ward advises the Board that many boards have a list of questions on their application regarding their criminal history, with an attestation at the end of the application. If an applicant is found to have lied on their application, the Board would have justification to deny that applicant licensure. Tedd clarifies that the applicant would be petitioning the Board before they begin their education. Harry then advises that many boards are reviewing petitions on a case by case basis.

Michelle explains to the Board other healthcare boards have addressed AB 319 on their websites with a link on their homepage. The dedicated page on their website has a brief statement about the procedure of petitioning the Board, along with an application to be submitted. She has not found boards that have addressed this procedure in their NACs. Harry agrees that the Board may follow the lead of the other boards. Keoni Kins states that he thinks the example from the Nevada State Board of Dental Examiners is a good starting point.

For now, Michelle will add a link to the Board's website regarding petitioning the Board to review criminal history, with instructions to email the Board for more information. She will draft a document with the Dental Board's document as a basis that can be reviewed and approved at the next Board meeting. There is no action taken and no further discussion.

**9. Report from Tedd Girouard regarding his attendance at the 2019 BOC Athletic Trainer Regulatory Conference. (Discussion)** Tedd Girouard relates to the Board the main points discussed at the Regulatory Conference:

- 1) Petitioning boards to review criminal history. The BOC has received complaints of people not being licensed after being certified, because of their criminal history when those disqualifiers were not disclosed to them. They gave several examples.
- 2) Promoting competition in regulated occupations. Boards should not be precluding other boards or regulating other industries. For instance, athletic training boards cannot regulate what dentists do or prevent personal trainers from doing their job. Boards were advised that the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) would find those actions unacceptable.
- 3) License portability and working across state lines, including telemedicine. Since the conference was in Omaha, NE and across the river is Council Bluffs, IA, they gave an example of an athletic trainer that lives in Council Bluffs but works in Omaha. If a patient calls them and they were to give them advice, the AT would have to be licensed in both states. Other national groups, for example nurses and physical therapists, are trying to put together a compact for working in several states. The BOC will be working with state boards to start a compact in the future.
- 4) Athletic Trainer model language. Participants had to bring their practice acts, along with their mission statements, to review and compare. Ours received a lot of positive feedback, which Tedd credits to Steve McCauley and his work at the Board's inception. The groups were using our language as model language to specify what athletic trainers can and cannot do. Our practice act also specifies that whatever the Board of Certification (BOC) says is in the curriculum is ultimately what athletic trainers in the state of Nevada can do. Other states were surprised that Nevada had a specific bill that lists athletic trainers as healthcare providers that can diagnose concussions and return to play
- 5) Sports medicine licensure clarity act. This part was more about being covered with liability insurance than it was about the ability to practice across state lines. And it is directed more for physicians traveling with teams and malpractice insurance.
- 6) Surviving a regulatory review. The main point to remember with a regulatory review is educating the reviewers and the people around the reviewers as to what athletic training is and why it is important.

Receiving support from other states is also important, as well as utilizing professional sports since they are in the public eye.

Tedd relates that it was good to hear and get confirmation that our practice act is in good shape. Jeremy Haas added that the Boards before us and our current Board have done a great job doing the best possible for athletic trainers and for the people in our state. The Board thanked Tedd for his report and there was no further discussion.

**10. Review and discuss possible new regulations: (For Possible Action)** Jeremy Haas starts by saying that it would be a good idea to review each possible new regulation one by one.

**a. Adding a grace period for graduate students who graduate in May and apply for licensure, waiving the immediate renewal fees due by June 30;** The renewal period starts on May 1<sup>st</sup>. If a new graduate applies for licensure and pays the initial fee of \$300.00, they pay the renewal fees of \$150.00 before June 30. The Board considers the possibility of prorating fees for new graduates and discusses the various ways the fees can be calculated. Harry Ward advises the Board that he knows of no other board that prorates their fees. The Board decides that a grace period may be the right way to go instead of waiving the renewal fees. The Board decides not to go forward with Item 10.a.

**b. Adding a grace period for new licensees who obtain licensure 60 to 30 days before the renewal period;** The Board decides that a grace period is a good idea. They discuss when graduates get their degrees and can get their certification. The Board decides on a 30-day grace period and that they will go forward Item 10.b.

**c. Adding a grace period for renewals when June 30 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the license will expire on the following Monday;** The Board has historically been of the opinion that it is the professional responsibility of the licensee to renew their license before June 30<sup>th</sup>. The Board decides not to go forward with Item 10.c.

**d. For renewals, instituting a brief grace period or late fee instead of licenses expiring on June 30;** Again, the Board is of the opinion that it is the professional responsibility of the licensee to renew their license before June 30<sup>th</sup>. The Board decides not to go forward with Item 10.d.

**e. Adding a license status of “retired” instead of “expired” for those licensees retiring from the profession with a license in good standing;** The Board agrees that this is a good way to honor Athletic Trainers that are retiring. The Board decides to go forward with Item 10.e.

**f. Adding the ability to apply for licensure by reciprocity if license in other state is current and in good standing;** The Board has considered licenses by reciprocity and the reduction of fees in the past. The Board decides not to go forward with Item 10.f.

**g. Removing fee of \$25.00 charged for change of name on a license;** The Board decides to go forward with Item 10.g and remove the fee charged for a name change.

**h. Removing fee of \$25.00 charged for the issuance of a duplicate license;** The Board decides to go forward with Item 10.h and remove the fee charges for a duplicate license.

**i. Changing the fee for the restoration of an expired license to a flat fee of \$300;** Michelle Cothrun explains that the language regarding the restoration of a license contradicts itself. The fee of \$300.00 is charged with an additional \$150.00 for each year the license was expired. The Board agrees that a flat fee of \$300.00 for the restoration of an expired license is sufficient and would like to go forward with Item 10.i.

**j. Adding that after a licensee has had their license expired for over 10 years, they must reapply for licensure;** Michelle Cothrun explains that she saw that other Board required that someone with a license that was expired for more than 10 years required that they reapply, which means submitting to another fingerprint background check. The Board agreed that was a good policy and would like to go forward with Item 10.j.

**k. Adding the requirement that a licensee must submit for a fingerprint background check after 10 or 15 of being licensed;** Again Michelle Cothrun explains that she saw that another Board required that their licenses go through a background check after 10 years of being licensed. The Board discusses the possibility of auditing some licensees but ultimately decides that the attestation the licensees provide on an annual basis on their renewal applications suffices. The Board decides not to go forward with Item 10.k.

**l. Adding the ability for the Board to issue citations and fines for unlicensed activity.** Michelle Cothrun reminds the Board that Sarah Bradley had suggested that the Board consider adding the ability to issue citations and fines. The Board discusses how to process of investigating and issuing fines would work. Harry Ward advises that usually an investigator would need to be hired to conduct the investigations and be given the authority to issue citations and fines. Keoni Kins agrees that the cost of these investigations may outweigh any possible benefit they may provide. The Board always has the recourse of seeking an injunction if necessary. The Board decides not to go forward with Item 10.l.

After discussing all the possible new regulations, Michelle advises the Board that she will draft language for the Board to consider at the next Board meeting. There is no further discussion.

**11. Review and discuss the Sunset Subcommittee's review of the Board, scheduled for Monday, May 4, 2020 with required information submitted by Monday, April 27, 2020. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun informs the Board that she is still putting together all the required documents. She wants to know if someone could help with one of the requirements, which is a copy of the most recent strategic plan of the board, with the effective date of the plan and achievement of any goals set out in the plan. Michelle is either looking at the answers that that Stacy Whittaker put together for the 2012 Sunset Subcommittee Review or pulling the actual reports from the three previous years as requested.

Michelle also asks if any of the board members will be able to attend. If so, there may be questions for the Board members after the presentation There are only going to be a few boards reviewed on May 4. The Sunset Subcommittee still wants all documentation submitted on the 27th, to plan out their reviews for the rest of the year.

The Board members explain that they have previous commitments. Michelle informs the Board that the Subcommittee meetings are always recorded and can be reviewed afterwards. Our goal with the review is to educate the committee members on what athletic trainers do. Michelle found a few articles that she wants to include that clarifies the difference between an athletic trainer and a physical therapist. Jeremy does not think the articles are written from the best point of view.

Michelle says she talked to Harry about the review and it is an opportunity to show off our Board. In that respect, Michelle feels that Tedd has given some good talking points about our practice act. Tedd adds that he can send a document from the US Bureau of Labor that talks about the future and the growth of athletic training that is expected in the next 10 years. Michelle does want to highlight the progress of the Board. In 2012, a recommendation was given to work on the reserves, which were low. Now we have the opposite problem, but we have a plan to work on changing that. In addition, the numbers of licensees have grown since the last review. Growth is worth highlighting. There is no further discussion.

**12. Review and discuss financial status of the Board, including approval of all claims, expenses, and budget from last Fiscal Quarter, October 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019, and January 1 through February 29, 2020. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun asks if there are any questions about the financials.

Since there are none, Jeremy Haas motions to approve all claims, expenses, and budget from the last Fiscal Quarter, October 1 through December 31, 2019, and January 1 through February 29, 2020. Tedd Girouard seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**13. Review and approval of an updated online initial application that will be developed using LogiForms. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun explains to the Board that she went through the initial licensure application to update the formatting. She also made sure that the page that is notarized is at the end of the application. There is now a waiver and an acknowledgement with the notary certificate.

She asks the Board if they want her to add a question about dry needling. Jeremy Haas states that it could be as simple as a checkbox if they plan to dry needle. If the question is on the renewal, then it should be on the initial application as well.

Michelle pulls up the document to confirm that the questions about military service have been added. There were three specific questions for veterans that have been added to the renewal, and now they will be on the initial application as well. With Board approval, she will start working on converting it to an online form. Then the initial application will be hosted by LogiForms and be submitted online like the renewal application.

Jeremy Haas motions to approve the updated online initial application that will be built using LogiForms. Tedd Girouard seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**14. Review and approval for continued use of AirTable for an online database. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun informs the Board that on the “Verify a License” page on the NSBAT website, she has not removed the PDF of the Active Licensees yet. She has added the link to the public view of the AirTable database. The licensee public list catalogs our licensees, their license number, the original issue date, their expiration date, license status, and disciplinary action status. Michelle has enjoyed using AirTable and would like to keep using it. It is very convenient to have all the active licensee information in one location.

Jeremy mentions that it is not costing the Board a lot and the licensee list is updated in real time. Michelle confirms and adds that, in time, she will be able to add other features, such as a link to update addresses, because there is a lot of possibility with this product. It is reasonably priced for an online database.

The Board agrees that continued use of AirTable is good. Jeremy Haas motions to approve the continued use of AirTable for an online database. Tedd Girouard seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**15. Review and approval for using Hello Fax service for e-faxes. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun informs the Board that signed up for Hello Fax on her personal credit card. With the Board’s approval, she will switch it over to the Board’s credit card. The cost is \$9.99 per month. Jeremy Haas clarifies that with e-faxes, when someone faxes the Board, it will come to the Board email. Jeremy motions to approve using Hello Fax service for e-faxes. Tedd Girouard seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**16. Review and discuss the renewal process for 2020 and approval for reimbursement for the cost of printing reminder postcards with Keystone Quality Printing. (For Possible Action)** Jeremy Haas states that the cost of printing the reminder postcards was less than one hundred dollars. Michelle Cothrun advises the Board that she paid with her personal credit card and requests to be reimbursed. Regarding the renewal process for 2020, she asks the Board if they would like her to add a question regarding dry needling to the renewal application. The Board thinks that is a good idea to add a question to the renewal application to see if the licensee plans on dry needling. If yes, the Board office will have continuing correspondence with them and soon, they will need to submit proof of their training. Jeremy Haas motions to discuss the renewal process for 2020 and approval for reimbursement for the cost of the printing reminder postcards for Keystone quality printing. Keoni Kins seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**17. Review and approval for Keystone Quality Printing to convert the current NSBAT logo to a Vector file. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun explains to the Board that a vector file is a type of file that never loses resolution. Right now, all the Board has is a very low quality and low-resolution PNG file.

She is unable to locate who created the logo or to find a higher resolution version. In a Word document, the logo looks fine but once it is saved in a PDF file, the logo become pixelated and looks very unprofessional. Keystone will convert the logo to a high-quality vector file for \$70.00.

Tedd Girouard motions to approve the use of Keystone Quality Printing to convert the current NSBAT logo to a vector file. Frank Sakelarios seconds the motion and it passes unanimously.

**18. Review and discuss terms of Board Members and upcoming Board vacancies. (For Possible Action)**

Michelle Cothrun informs the Board that the two vacancies coming up in September 2020 are Jeremy Haas and Randi Hunewill. Randi will need to decide if she will serve as second term. Jeremy Haas adds that with Tedd and Keoni both coming off next year, and Frank as well, we need to start thinking about this now. Jeremy believes that the Vice Chair role has been helpful. He believes that it would be an easy transition to have Tedd become the Chair. Jeremy suggests that this new person could be Vice Chair, so they could start getting their feet wet. So that person coming on is going to have to take a big role here. They may be the only one left standing when the whole board cycles over in 2021.

Tedd adds that the Board needs to be actively looking for people. The Board agrees. Jeremy states that he has a couple people in mind and adds that Keoni will be key in recruiting someone that is dual-credentialed. Keoni states that there are some in the PT community that will help him find candidates, although there are few who have not already served on the Board.

With that in mind, Jeremy knows someone he thinks will do a great job. She is an AT/PT and he will talk to her to see if she might be interested. She might be a good person to replace him because she is dual-credentialed.

Michelle informs the Board that the Sunset Subcommittee has encouraged boards to make an effort to look for diversity. The Chair of the Sunset Subcommittee wants to be sure that Boards reach out to the LGBTQ community, that they look for racial diversity and for more women to serve on the board. When thinking of people to reach out to, think about a wider spectrum of people to have on the Board. We want to make sure that people that the board wants diversity. A diverse candidate my think this is not for me based on the current makeup of the Board.

Jeremy add that his staff of Athletic Trainers are about 80% female. He thinks that the majority of athletic trainers in the state are female, but this Board is made up of mostly men. Tedd asks at what point do we have him move to the chair position. Does there have to be a vote and possibly in September? Michelle reminds Jeremy that he is on the Board until he has a replacement. Harry Ward confirms that the vote for the next Chair can be on a separate agenda. Harry adds that other boards that have board members that have not been reappointed, and they will be continuing in their position until the Governor does appoint a board member to fill the position. The Governor can act very slow on these things and his focus is the COVID-19 pandemic.

Jeremy asks Michelle to add the vote for a Chair of the Board on the next agenda. There is no action taken and no further discussion.

**19. Elect a Board member as Treasurer to review financial statements. (For Possible Action)** Michelle Cothrun advises the Board that Randi Hunewill has new, additional responsibilities at work, so she needs to step down. The Treasurer is necessary to review monthly financial statements and for added controls. Keoni Kins volunteers to be the next Treasurer. Jeremy Haas motions to make Keoni Kins the Treasurer of the Board. Tedd Girouard seconds the motion. Keoni abstains from voting. The motion passes unanimously.

Michelle Cothrun thanks Randi for all that she has done as Treasurer. Randi expresses thanks for not having the added responsibility of the role of Treasurer. She must confirm with her new director but believes that she will be able to serve a second term with the Board. There is no further discussion.

**20. Report from Executive Secretary, Michelle Cothrun. (Discussion)** Michelle Cothrun tells the Board that she does not have anything more to report. There is no further discussion.



**21. Report from Deputy Attorney General. (Discussion)** Jeremy Haas starts by welcoming Harry Ward and extends the Board's appreciation for helping us out. He asks if Harry has anything to report. Harry states that he has nothing to report. He provides the Board with a background of his experience as way of introduction and says that he is looking forward to working for the Board. There is no further discussion.

**22. Future agenda items. (Discussion)**

- A. Update on dry needling and process for providing proof of training
- B. Follow up regarding the BOC letter for Colorado
- C. Update on the vector file of the NSBAT logo
- D. Report on the Sunset Subcommittee's review of the Board
- E. Update on the initial application via LogiForms
- F. Elect a new Board chair
- G. Draft language on the new proposed regulations from agenda item number ten (10)

**23. Discussion, possible decision on date of next meeting. (For Possible Action)** The Board discusses possible dates for the next meeting. It is decided that the next Board Meeting will be held on Friday, July 17, 2020 at 3:00PM. There is no further discussion.

**24. Public comment.** No public members in attendance via Zoom. There is no public comment.

**25. Adjournment. (For Possible Action)** Jeremy Haas adjourns the meeting at 4:45PM.