

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS

F I N A L M I N U T E S

MEETING OF:

STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY

TIME: 10:31 A.M.

Held at

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE

2525 North 7th Street

CoPA HUB, Eaton Conference Room

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

as well as

VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Thursday, December 11, 2025

1 ***

2 State Board of Optometry

3 December 11, 2025

4 ***

5 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act,
6 at 10:00 a.m. the Board entered into Executive
7 Session with Shawn J. Jayman, Esquire, Board Counsel,
8 for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial
9 deliberations and to receive the advice of counsel.
10 The Board returned to open session at 10:31 a.m.]

11 ***

12 The regular meeting of the State Board of
13 Optometry was held on Thursday, December 11, 2025.
14 John A. Godfrey, O.D., Chairperson, called the
15 meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

16 ***

17 Roll Call of Board Members/Introduction of Attendees
18 [Thomas Leech III, Board Administrator, provided a
19 roll call of Board members and an introduction of
20 attendees. A quorum of Board members was present.]

21 ***

22 [Shawn J. Jayman, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted the
23 meeting was being recorded, and those who continued
24 to participate were giving their consent to be
25 recorded.]

1 Mr. Jayman also noted the Board entered into
2 Executive Session for the purpose of conducting
3 quasi-judicial deliberations on a number of matters
4 currently pending before the Board and to receive the
5 advice of counsel.]

6

7 Approval of Minutes - August 7, 2025

8 CHAIR GODFREY:

9

 Have the Board Members had an
10 opportunity to review the August 7,
11 2025 minutes? And if so, is there any
12 discussion regarding any additions or
13 subtractions?

14 [The Board discussed changes to the Minutes of August
15 7, 2025.]

16 CHAIR GODFREY:

17

 The Chair would entertain a motion to
18 approve the Minutes for August 7th.

19 DR. UMLAUF:

20

 I move to accept the minutes for August
21 7th.

22 CHAIR GODFREY:

23

 Thank you, Dr. Umlauf. Do I have a
24 second?

25

DR. BECKER:

1 Becker, second.

2

3 Dr. Godfrey, aye; Dr. Wilcox, aye;
4 Acting Commissioner Claggett, aye; Dr.
5 Becker, aye; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.
6 Umlauf, aye; Dr. Berson, aye.

7 [The motion carried unanimously.]

8

9 Approval of Minutes - October 2, 2025 (Special
10 Meeting)

11 CHAIR GODFREY:

12 Have the Board Members had an
13 opportunity to look at the October 2,
14 2025 special meeting with NBEO minutes?
15 And if so, is there any discussion?

16 [The Board discussed changes to the Minutes of
17 October 2, 2025.]

18 CHAIR GODFREY:

19 The Chair would entertain a motion to
20 approve the October 2nd minutes with
21 the additions given by Dr. Wilcox.

22 DR. BECKER:

23 I'll make a motion.

24 CHAIR GODFREY:

25 Thank you, Dr. Becker. Do I have a

1 second?

2 DR. UMLAUF:

3 Second.

4

5 Dr. Godfrey, aye; Dr. Wilcox, aye;
6 Acting Commissioner Claggett, aye; Dr.
7 Becker, abstain; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.
8 Umlauf, abstain; Dr. Berson, abstain.

9 [The motion carried. Dr. Becker, Dr. Umlauf, and Dr.
10 Berson abstained from voting on the matter.]

11 ***

12 Report of Board Prosecutor - No Report.

13 ***

14 Report of Acting Commissioner - No Report.

15 ***

16 Report of Board Chair

17 [John A. Godfrey, O.D., Chairperson, stated the 2026
18 Association of Regulatory Boards of Optometry (ARBO)
19 meeting would be June 13 and 14, 2026, in Phoenix,
20 Arizona. He stated Dr. Wilcox expressed interest in
21 attending and asked if Dr. Verma was interested in
22 attending again.

23 Dr. Verma confirmed he would attend for
24 continuity. He suggested Dr. Wilcox also attend as
25 other states have more than one board member attend.

1 Dr. Wilcox asked if Ms. Chappelle may want to
2 attend as she had previously attended and found it
3 useful.

4 Chair Godfrey replied Ms. Chappelle could be
5 included and a vote would be held at the February
6 meeting.

7 Chair Godfrey explained, during the October 2025
8 special meeting with the National Board of Examiners
9 in Optometry (NBEO), the Board was invited to visit
10 NBEO's exam center in Charlotte, North Carolina, for
11 a tour and to observe an actual examination. He
12 stated the next exam scheduled was in August 2026.
13 He would be in Charlotte for personal reasons in
14 February and planned on seeing the facility while
15 there. He asked everyone to keep in mind the
16 possibility of a more formal trip for the Board later
17 in the year.

18 Chair Godfrey encouraged all Board members to
19 speak with colleagues who may be interested in
20 joining the Board.]

21

22 Report of Board Administrator

23 [John A. Godfrey, O.D., Chairperson, mentioned Ms.
24 Chappelle reached out to the budget office for a
25 financial presentation to the Board.

1 Becker, aye; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.
2 Umlauf, aye; Dr. Berson, aye.

3 [The motion carried unanimously.]

4 ***

5 New Business - NBEO Exam Dates Discussion

6 [John A. Godfrey, O.D., Chairperson, noted discussion
7 would be tabled pending a future vote for a Board
8 trip to Charlotte, North Carolina.]

9 ***

10 New Business - Addition to Approved Drug List -
11 aceclidine ophthalmic solution

12 CHAIR GODFREY:

13 Is there any discussion regarding this?
14 It's a presbyopia drug.

15 Hearing none, the Chair would
16 entertain a motion to approve
17 aceclidine ophthalmic solution as an
18 addition to the approved drug list for
19 optometrists in Pennsylvania.

20 DR. UMLAUF:

21 I move to add aceclidine to the
22 approved State Board of Optometry drug
23 list.

24 CHAIR GODFREY:

25 Thank you, Dr. Umlauf. Do I have a

1 second?

2 DR. BERSON:

3 I second it, Dr. Berson.

4

5 Dr. Godfrey, aye; Dr. Wilcox, aye;

6 Acting Commissioner Claggett, aye; Dr.

7 Becker, aye; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.

8 Umlauf, aye; Dr. Berson, aye.

9 [The motion carried unanimously.]

10 ***

11 Appointments - No appointments.

12 ***

13 Miscellaneous - Election of Officers and Committee
14 Assignments

15 MR. JAYMAN:

16 This would be Number 8 on the Agenda,
17 Election of Officers. The first one
18 will be, is there a nomination for
19 Chair of the State Board of Optometry?

20 DR. UMLAUF:

21 I move for Dr. Godfrey for the State
22 Board of Optometry.

23 MR. JAYMAN:

24 Is there a second?

25 ACTING COMMISSIONER CLAGGETT:

1 Claggett, second.

2 MR. JAYMAN:

3 Are there any other nominations for
4 Chair of the State Board of Optometry?

5 Hearing none, I guess we'll take a
6 roll call on the nomination of Dr.
7 Godfrey.

8

9 Dr. Godfrey, aye; Dr. Wilcox, aye;
10 Acting Commissioner Claggett, aye; Dr.
11 Becker, aye; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.
12 Umlauf, aye; Dr. Berson, aye.

13 [The motion carried unanimously.]

14

15 MR. JAYMAN:

16 Is there a nomination for Vice Chair of
17 the State Board of Optometry?

18 CHAIR GODFREY:

19 I would like to nominate Dr. Denise
20 Wilcox.

21 DR. UMLAUF:

22 I second it.

23 MR. JAYMAN:

24 Are there any other nominations for
25 Vice Chair of the State Board of

1 Optometry?

2 Seeing none, hearing none, roll
3 call.

4

5 Dr. Godfrey, aye; Dr. Wilcox, aye;
6 Acting Commissioner Claggett, aye; Dr.
7 Becker, aye; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.
8 Umlauf, aye; Dr. Berson, aye.

9 [The motion carried unanimously.]

10

11 MR. JAYMAN:

12 Is there a nomination for Secretary of
13 the State Board of Optometry?

14 CHAIR GODFREY:

15 I'd like to nominate Dr. Perry Umlauf.

16 MR. JAYMAN:

17 Is there a second?

18 ACTING COMMISSIONER CLAGGETT:

19 Claggett, second.

20 MR. JAYMAN:

21 Are there any other nominations for
22 Secretary of the State Board of
23 Optometry?

24 Hearing none, roll call for
25 Secretary of State Board of Optometry.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Dr. Godfrey, aye; Dr. Wilcox, aye;
Acting Commissioner Claggett, aye; Dr.
Becker, aye; Ms. Knepp, aye; Dr.
Umlauf, aye; Dr. Berson, aye.

[The motion carried unanimously.]

[John A. Godfrey, O.D., Chairperson, stated the
Optometry Board committees had been updated in May
2025 and would remain the same.]

Regulatory Report - Status of Regulations

[Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel,
stated the Board has four pending regulations. Out
of the four, Regulation 16A-5217, was the only one
which had moved since the prior meeting. Regulation
16A-5217, Continuing Education, was delivered as a
proposed rulemaking in October 2025, and no public
comments were received. The package was sent to the
Independent Regulatory Review Committee (IRRC) and
IRRC comments are expected on December 24, 2025. Ms.
Wolfgang would review any IRRC comments with the
Board, and then the package can proceed with final
rulemaking. Ms. Wolfgang reviewed the steps of the
process.]

1 ***

2 Report of Board Counsel - 16A-5221 - General
3 Revisions

4 [Shawn J. Jayman, Esquire, Board Counsel, explained
5 the Board started evaluation of the General Revisions
6 package at the May 2025 meeting. He made changes
7 based on the Board's feedback and would review them
8 to ensure everyone agreed.

9 Ms. Wolfgang reminded everyone that the
10 regulations were in the drafting stages; and once the
11 annex was finalized, it would be sent to stakeholders
12 as an exposure draft for comments.

13 Mr. Jayman referred the Board to page four where
14 "Clinical Skills Assessment Examination" would be
15 replaced with "National Board Examination Part III."
16 The word written was also struck at the bottom of
17 page four in reference to the National Board
18 Examination.

19 Mr. Jayman next referred the Board to page ten
20 regarding visual rehabilitation under (ii) where
21 "optical or electronic devices, including" would be
22 added.

23 Dr. Wilcox was unsure of what electrooptical
24 referred to in the continuation of (ii). Other Board
25 Members agreed.

1 The Board discussed possibly language for all of
2 (ii). Dr. Wilcox strongly suggested keeping a
3 detailed list in the definition stating it should
4 read, "prescription of optical electronic devices
5 including lenses, prisms, filters, occluders, mirrors
6 and magnification and minification devices."

7 Mr. Jayman questioned the basis for the change.
8 It was suggested the reasoning could be that the
9 terminology was outdated.

10 Dr. Umlauf commented the language should be
11 broader to encompass what was currently available as
12 well as future technology. He suggested changing the
13 language to read "optical electronic devices,
14 including any means that will improve magnification
15 and minification."

16 Dr. Wilcox stated Dr. Umlauf's suggestion might
17 eliminate technology such as filters and prisms
18 rather than encompassing more technology.

19 Dr. Becker located a definition for
20 electrooptical that, according to the College of
21 Optometrists in Vision Development (COVD), was
22 related to the field of photonics where doctors use
23 light to illicit changes.

24 Ms. Wolfgang agreed a broad statement would be
25 more inclusive, especially if using "including" in

1 the statement.

2 Dr. Umlauf reiterated his concern that the
3 current language was too narrow.

4 Ms. Wolfgang stated using "including" in the
5 regulation had the same meaning as "for example,"
6 which would make the statement broader.

7 Dr. Verma suggested the definition should read
8 "prescription of optical, non-optical or electronic
9 devices, including and not limited to ..."

10 Dr. Wilcox echoed Dr. Verma and noted the
11 definition could end with "magnification and
12 minification devices."

13 The Board continued discussion as to what types
14 of devices and therapies would be included in the
15 definition. Mr. Jayman read the original language of
16 the regulation without any changes. He also reminded
17 the Board the regulatory community would have the
18 opportunity to weigh in on the changes. It was
19 decided the majority of the Board favored broad
20 language to be more encompassing.

21 Also on page ten, section (iii) was changed from
22 "central and peripheral visual field defects" to read
23 "any visual impairment secondary to traumatic brain
24 injury and neurological defects." Board Members
25 agreed the word "defects" should not be included.

1 Dr. Wilcox suggested using "deficits" instead of
2 "defects."

3 Mr. Jayman directed the Board to the bottom of
4 page 11 where section (12) would state "An
5 optometrist may perform intraocular lens calculations
6 upon the written order of an ophthalmologist. The
7 ophthalmologist shall make final selection of lens
8 implant power."

9 Dr. Verma questioned why the language regarding a
10 written order was included. It was noted comments
11 from ophthalmologists in 2005 had necessitated the
12 language. The Board discussed the procedure in
13 question and agreed the entire line could be struck.

14 Ms. Wolfgang pointed out, if the line was
15 deleted, then the Board had to provide an explanation
16 of why it was deleted. She added the language was
17 added in response to comments from IRRC and the
18 Medical Association in 2005. She asked that the
19 Board review the preamble with the rationale prior to
20 the next meeting and send her individual emails with
21 possible explanations for removing the language.

22 Chair Godfrey stated the argument could be made
23 that the procedure and language is antiquated and
24 outdated. He noted no one used A-Scan for IOL
25 calculations and optical biometry or ultrasounds are

1 now used. The Board agreed with his reasoning.

2 Dr. Wilcox asked about page 11 section (14). She
3 noted she thought "at the request of an
4 ophthalmologist" had been eliminated.

5 Ms. Wolfgang noted the line had been extensively
6 discussed in the preamble in 2005.

7 Dr. Umlauf and Dr. Verma stated the line should
8 be eliminated. Dr. Umlauf suggested the line should
9 read that optometry "can do angiographic studies of
10 ocular vasculature and blood with non-invasive
11 methods." Board members agreed with his statement.

12 Mr. Jayman directed the Board to page 12 to
13 discuss the National Board of Examiners in Optometry
14 (NBEO) pass results. He stated it was written to be
15 in line with 48 other states, which was if a
16 candidate has an overall PEPs result of pass, but
17 fails one of the components, the candidate is still
18 eligible for licensure.

19 Dr. Verma stated candidates must pass all parts
20 of the NBEO exam. Dr. Umlauf agreed.

21 Ms. Wolfgang clarified the regulation meant a
22 candidate could fail a subcomponent and still pass
23 the exam but could not fail part one for example.

24 Dr. Becker confirmed, when the Board last met, a
25 candidate could fail on the skills section and still

1 pass parts one, two and three. He questioned
2 allowing an optometrist to practice in Pennsylvania
3 who does know how to correctly examine a patient.

4 Dr. Verma echoed Dr. Becker and added clinical is
5 the most important part of the exam. He added the
6 regulation should specify that the candidate must
7 pass all parts of part three of the exam.

8 Dr. Wilcox noted Ms. Wolfgang stated in the
9 October 2025 meeting that the Governor is trying to
10 remove impediments to licensure in Pennsylvania.

11 Dr. Becker pointed out the Board took an oath to
12 protect the people of Pennsylvania.

13 Dr. Wilcox questioned how reciprocity would work
14 if the regulation was changed and if someone from
15 another state would be allowed to practice in
16 Pennsylvania if they did not pass the clinical skills
17 exam. She added the current administration would not
18 agree with impeding a person from practicing.

19 Ms. Wolfgang stated specifying a candidate had to
20 pass all parts of part three would create a barrier
21 that 48 states do not have in place and do not intend
22 to have in place. She added the change would have to
23 go through an internal review process under Executive
24 Order 1996-1, which would require approval from
25 Office of General Counsel (OGC) and the Governor's

1 Policy Office. She agreed with Dr. Wilcox that the
2 current administration has worked to remove barriers.
3 She also added the reason Act 41 was passed was to
4 remove barriers.

5 Dr. Wilcox agreed with the other doctors and did
6 not appreciate someone not being able to practice
7 clinical skills but being allowed to practice in
8 Pennsylvania.

9 Dr. Verma offered a compromise that a person may
10 be able to fail a portion of part two and still pass
11 part two. He insisted the regulation should specify
12 a person must pass both parts of part three to be
13 considered eligible in Pennsylvania.

14 Ms. Wolfgang explained the intention of NBEO when
15 they presented in October 2025 was to demonstrate
16 that a person can still be competent even if they do
17 not pass part of the exam. She added that was why
18 NBEO had invited the Board to visit the exam center
19 in Charlotte. She noted the reason why the
20 regulations can separate part two of the exam is
21 because Pennsylvania law specifically requires a pass
22 on TMOD. She noted the law does not support the same
23 conclusion for part three.

24 Dr. Becker noted he was taken aback at the
25 October 2025 meeting in learning a person could fail

1 clinical skills and still pass NBEO.

2 Dr. Wilcox reminded the Board that Dr. Foley
3 explained in October 2025 how the PEPS exam score is
4 determined. She reviewed part of the minutes from
5 the October 2025 meeting. She also noted Dr. Foley
6 tried his best to explain how NBEO got to the
7 conclusion that people are still clinically able to
8 practice, even though they did not pass the clinical
9 skills exam.

10 Chair Godfrey pointed out he had directly asked
11 NBEO why the scores were split out. He noted the
12 only reason why the Board sees two scores was because
13 Florida and North Carolina needed separate scores.

14 Dr. Verma noted the issue stems from the Board
15 now knowing people can fail the clinical exams and
16 still pass. The Board had been given a single pass
17 or fail score and did not see the separate score for
18 clinical skills.

19 Dr. Berson questioned how many candidates did not
20 pass the clinical skills section. Dr. Wilcox
21 reported Ms. Chappelle stated, in Pennsylvania, 81
22 applicants passed all parts while 61 applicants had
23 failed one part and passed the other part.

24 Ms. Wolfgang noted the importance of recognizing
25 there are 12 stations within part three, ten of the

1 stations are patient encounters while two stations
2 comprise the clinical skills. She added the clinical
3 skills stations are a very small portion of the
4 overall exam.

5 Dr. Umlauf asked what was specifically tested in
6 the skills portion. Chair Godfrey stated the testing
7 was on tonometry, gonioscopy, slit lamp bio
8 microscopy, slit lamp bio microscopy through an
9 undilated pupil, and binocular indirect
10 ophthalmoscopy.

11 Board members expressed concern in allowing a
12 person to practice without being able to perform the
13 skills being tested.

14 Chair Godfrey concluded the Board generally did
15 not feel comfortable with deciding on the exam
16 portion of the regulation during the meeting. He
17 noted additional fact finding was needed in addition
18 to a visit to Charlotte. He added the skills, with
19 the exception of tonometry, cannot be delegated to
20 another person to complete.

21 Dr. Wilcox pointed out NBEO stated Pennsylvania
22 commented on the exam before it was changed, but NBEO
23 did not provide the comments to the Board.

24 Ms. Wolfgang stated the next steps after the
25 Board does their due diligence would be for a

1 decision to be made to move the regulations forward.

2 Acting Commissioner Claggett noted the Board
3 should do their due diligence by visiting Charlotte
4 and then going forward from there.

5 Dr. Umlauf noted Florida and North Carolina are
6 therapeutically more advanced in many ways when
7 compared to other states. He added Pennsylvania
8 should strive to become a state with well-trained
9 optometrists who the public can trust.

10 Ms. Wolfgang directed the Board to page 13. She
11 asked if the application process referenced where a
12 person had to apply to the Board for part three was
13 outdated. It was confirmed applicants now apply
14 directly to NBEO and the process through the Board no
15 longer applied.

16 Dr. Umlauf noted there also used to be a 100-hour
17 course in Pennsylvania if a person wanted to be
18 licensed. He added the course was no longer offered
19 as the information was now part of curriculum. He
20 asked what would happen if an applicant from another
21 state had not passed TMOD as required in
22 Pennsylvania.

23 Ms. Wolfgang responded that Act 41 takes care of
24 Dr. Umlauf's concerns. Act 41 gives the Board the
25 ability to consider the current licensing standards

1 of the state of an Act 41 applicant. If the state's
2 current standards are substantially equivalent to
3 Pennsylvania's, then the person would be eligible for
4 licensure in Pennsylvania.

5 Dr. Umlauf asked if Pennsylvania had ever
6 contemplated that some states require a jurisprudence
7 test. He added Pennsylvania may want to consider one
8 in the interest of protecting the public. Ms.
9 Wolfgang suggested reviewing the Practice Act as to
10 whether jurisprudence tests were permitted. She
11 added it would need to be considered as an additional
12 licensing standard.

13 Dr. Berson shared he had recently received
14 licensure by endorsement in Georgia and Nevada. He
15 explained both states require a jurisprudence exam.
16 He described the Nevada test as difficult and almost
17 impossible despite being an open book test. He added
18 the test had nothing to do with optometry.

19 Dr. Umlauf stated. in North Carolina, if you took
20 the NBEO more than ten years prior to applying for
21 licensure, you are required to take the exam again.

22 Acting Commissioner Claggett stated he would not
23 be in favor of a jurisprudence exam based on Dr.
24 Berson's experience with Nevada.

25 Ms. Wolfgang suggested, if the Board was

1 interested in jurisprudence education, it should be
2 included as a continuing education requirement.

3 Dr. Berson reiterated the Nevada exam did not
4 serve to protect the public as it had nothing to do
5 with optometry. He added one of the questions asked
6 was what part of the state budget pays for the
7 executive director of the state board.

8 Ms. Wolfgang commented there was no reason for an
9 optometrist to know the answer to a budget question.
10 She added an optometrist would need to be aware of
11 practice standards, such as office requirements. Dr.
12 Berson agreed a CE course could provide the
13 information.

14 Mr. Jayman directed the conversation back to the
15 regulations. He stated the Board's decision on
16 accepting the NBEO results will impact other
17 sections. He noted Dr. Chubb provided comments for
18 review starting on page 20. He would provide her
19 comments to the Board in preparation of the next
20 meeting. Ms. Wolfgang asked the Board to also review
21 the preamble from 2005 to provide feedback.]

22 ***

23 Report of Acting Commissioner
24 [Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner of
25 Professional and Occupational Affairs, shared he had

1 an update to the budget request from earlier in the
2 meeting. He had reached the Budget Office, and they
3 would tentatively present information to the Board at
4 the February 5, 2026 meeting.]

5 ***

6 Public Comment

7 [Ted Mowatt, CAE, Vice President, Wanner Associates,
8 on behalf of Pennsylvania Optometric Association
9 (POA), commented in the chat that POA would have
10 comments for the exposure draft when released.]

11 ***

12 Adjournment

13 CHAIR GODFREY:

14 The Chair would entertain a motion to
15 adjourn today's meeting.

16 ACTING COMMISSIONER CLAGGETT:

17 Claggett, so moved.

18 CHAIR GODFREY:

19 Do I have a second?

20 DR. BECKER:

21 I second it.

22 CHAIR GODFREY:

23 Thank you, Dr. Becker. The meeting is
24 adjourned.

25 ***

1 [There being no further business, the State Board of
2 Optometry Meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.]

3 ***

4

5 CERTIFICATE

6

7 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary
8 minutes of the State Board of Optometry meeting, was
9 reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and
10 that the minutes accurately summarize the substance
11 of the State Board of Optometry meeting.

12

13

14



15

Allison Walker,

16

Minute Clerk

17

Sargent's Court Reporting

18

Service, Inc.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY
REFERENCE INDEX
December 11, 2025

	TIME	AGENDA
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	10:31	Official Call to Order
9		
10	10:31	Roll Call/Introduction of Attendees
11		
12	10:32	Approval of Minutes
13		
14	10:41	Report of Board Chair
15		
16	10:45	Report of Board Administrator
17		
18	10:45	New Business
19		
20	10:49	Miscellaneous
21		
22	10:52	Regulatory Report
23		
24	10:57	Report of Board Counsel
25		
26	12:01	Report of Acting Commissioner
27		
28	12:02	Public Comment
29		
30	12:04	Adjournment
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		