

**State of New Hampshire
Board of Licensing for Alcohol and Other Drug Use Professionals
Concord, New Hampshire**

In the Matter of:
Joan DiMeglio, MLADC
License No. 0155
(Adjudicatory/Disciplinary Proceeding)

Docket No. 10-01

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

Before the Board of Licensing for Alcohol and Other Drug Use Professionals (“Board”) is an adjudicatory/disciplinary proceeding of Joan DiMeglio, License No.0155 (“Respondent”).

Background

On or about March 29, 2012, the Board received a complaint from a former client of Respondent, BP, alleging that Respondent failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with BP. The complaint prompted an investigation by the Administrative Prosecutions Unit of the Office of the Attorney General (“APU”). On December 10, 2014, the Board issued an Amended Notice of Hearing to Respondent.

A public adjudicatory hearing was held on February 5, 6, and 12, 2015. Board members present¹ were:

Peter DalPra, LADC, LCS (Presiding Officer)
Serene Eastman, Public Member
Mike Lopez, Public Member
Kelly Reardon, MLADC
Barry Timmerman, MLADC
Cheryl Wilkie, MLADC

The prosecution was represented by Hearing Counsel Attorney Matthew Mavrogeorge and Attorney Michelle Heaton of the APU. Respondent was represented by Jon Meyer, Esq.

¹ Board member Jacqui Abikoff was recused from this matter because she participated in the investigation and testified as a witness at the adjudicatory hearing. Board member Cheryl Wilkie was present for the hearing but was not present for deliberations, and therefore did not vote on this Final Decision and Order.

The following exhibits were introduced and accepted into the record:

- Hearing Counsel's exhibits: 1-31 (exhibits 6-9, 12, 21, and 31 are sealed)
- Respondent's Exhibits A-I

The following witnesses testified at the hearing:

1. BP, the complainant
2. Jacqui Abikoff, MLADC
3. Marilyn Medina, LADC
4. Joan DiMeglio, MLADC, Respondent
5. Todd Flanagan, APU Investigator
6. Kathleen McNally
7. Robin DiMeglio
8. Catherine Noonkester
9. Mary Ryan
10. Brian Houghton, LADC
11. Carol Krunklevich

Findings of Fact

In light of the testimony and exhibits, the Board finds the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

Respondent was licensed by the Board to practice, first as a Licensed Drug and Alcohol Counselor ("LADC") and later as a Master Licensed Drug and Alcohol Counselor ("MLADC"), in the State of New Hampshire during all time periods applicable to this matter.² Respondent has held a license since January 5, 1989, and had no record of disciplinary infractions prior to this matter. She is currently employed at the Community Alcohol Information Program.

Respondent was the Director of the Court Referral Program ("CRP"), an Impaired Driver Intervention Program ("IDIP") in Keene from 2000 until 2012. Respondent also had a small private counseling practice focusing on persons struggling with drug and alcohol abuse. Her private counseling office was located in the same office suite as the Court Referral Program.

² While this matter was pending, Respondent's license expired on January 5, 2015.

BP was arrested in September 2002 for Driving While Intoxicated and convicted on October 1, 2002. BP's first contact with Respondent was when she called the CRP to set up an intake interview. Brian Houghton, who was employed by CRP but not a LADC at the time, conducted BP's intake interview on September 15, 2003. Respondent reviewed BP's intake paperwork, and BP started the IDIP program on September 22, 2003. The program required 20 hours of class time, and Respondent taught at least a portion of BP's classes. Brian Houghton also taught a portion of BP's class. During the class, BP shared her personal story of addiction with the class.

After completing the required 20 hours of class time, BP participated in an "exit interview" as part of the IDIP program. Respondent conducted the one-on-one exit interview with BP, which lasted approximately an hour and was performed in Respondent's CRP office where her private practice was also located. Respondent recommended that, as a requirement of completing the IDIP program, BP undergo three individual counseling sessions, and referred BP to "Elaine" at Monadnock Substance Abuse for that counseling. *See Exhibit 6.*

Witnesses at the hearing presented conflicting testimony about who ultimately conducted BP's three required counseling sessions. BP testified that Respondent conducted the three required individual counseling sessions, and then continued to provide additional weekly counseling to BP thereafter. BP testified that these were weekly scheduled counseling sessions that lasted approximately 45 minutes to an hour, and were conducted in Respondent's office at the CRP. Respondent, on the other hand, adamantly denied ever providing any individual counseling to BP. Respondent testified that after conducting BP's exit interview for the IDIP program, she did not see BP again until months later when she was introduced to BP at a self-help meeting.

Documents produced by Monadnock Family Services show that BP did not receive the three additional counseling sessions from Monadnock Family Services. *See* Exhibit 31. Respondent testified that she destroys her records after seven years; therefore, due to the passage of time, Respondent was unable to produce similar documents indicating whether or not she had provided individual counseling to BP. Respondent did offer testimony from Brian Houghton, however, regarding his observations during the months following BP's completion of the IDIP program. Houghton testified that a few months after BP completed the IDIP program, she started coming by Respondent's office occasionally for social visits with Respondent. He testified that she usually only stayed for a few minutes, to pick up or drop off a dog or keys, and that he did not recall her ever coming for what appeared to be a counseling session.

Of the three witnesses mentioned above, the Board found Mr. Houghton to be the most credible. However, the Board also recognizes that a significant period of time has passed since the alleged counseling sessions, and BP could well have come and gone from Respondent's office at times when Mr. Houghton was not at his desk, or he simply may not have noticed her or remembered after all of these years. Given that the testimony of BP and the testimony of Respondent were completely at odds regarding this issue, and that the Board did not find either BP or Respondent entirely credible as a whole, the Board relies primarily on Exhibit 7 (Farnum Center Admission Assessment) in determining this factual issue. On the third page of that exhibit, under "Treatment History (Substance Abuse and Mental Health)," it identifies "Court referral program in Keene" as Respondent's provider of services, and states, "Court referred at first, just kept going once legal involvement was concluded. *Once a week.*" *Id.* (Emphasis added). In addition, that document states on the first page that BP was "[r]eferred to the Farnum Center by her counselor, Joan Dimeglio, of Keene, New Hampshire." *Id.* (Emphasis added).

Finally, on page 5 under "Assessment of Readiness to Change," the document states that BP "had a full mental health assessment through the Court Referral Program in Keene, New Hampshire, and Rebecca Farver, RNP, followed up with the clinician." *See* Exhibit 7, p. 5; *see also* Exhibit 9, p. 5 (describing Respondent as BP's "former therapist"). The Board therefore finds by a preponderance of the evidence that following BP's exit interview for the IDIP program, she received weekly one-on-one counseling from Respondent for a period of time.

A few months after completing the IDIP class, BP also started attending the same self-help meetings as Respondent. Respondent has been active for many years in self-help groups, and in mentoring to persons with addictions as an AA sponsor. BP and Respondent quickly became close, and started getting together socially outside of self-help meetings and counseling sessions. They visited book stores together, went out for coffee or dinner, and Respondent invited BP to her home. Respondent and BP quickly developed a bond. They shared their life stories with each other, discussing their addiction histories, their pasts, and life in general. BP was not close with her mother, and began looking up to Respondent as a mother figure. She shared her personal feelings with Respondent, who was very supportive. As their friendship grew, BP began spending the night at Respondent's house occasionally. She was still struggling with her addictions, drinking several times a week and occasionally taking drugs, and Respondent sincerely wanted to help her. Respondent eventually referred BP to the Farnum Center for residential treatment on March 29, 2004, and BP participated in an admissions assessment on April 5, 2004. *See* Exhibit 7. However, there was no bed available at the Farnum Center at that time.

In early April 2004, BP got injured in a bar fight and was taken to the hospital. Respondent received a phone call from another self-help member informing her that BP was in

the hospital, and sent her husband, MD, to the hospital to pick up BP and bring her back to their house for the night. When BP was feeling better the next day, she told Respondent that she wanted to get clean and sober, and Respondent said BP could stay with her until she was able to get into the Farnum Center. This was the beginning of BP's sobriety.

While waiting for a bed to open up at the Farnum Center, BP went on a trip to Florida with Respondent. Respondent paid for BP's plane ticket in exchange for BP helping her with renovations on a home Respondent and her husband had recently purchased in Florida. The trip was also for pleasure, and during the trip Respondent told BP that if she completed treatment at the Farnum Center, then BP would never have to worry again about having a home. BP took that statement as inviting her into Respondent's family. BP was not convinced at the time that she truly needed residential treatment, but she desperately wanted Respondent in her life and was willing to do anything to have the family that she felt she had never had.

BP was admitted to the Farnum Center on May 13, 2004, after a short stay at The Phoenix House. *See* Exhibit 7. BP completed treatment at the Farnum Center and was discharged on June 12, 2004. *Id.* When BP was discharged, Respondent gave her a card congratulating her, signing the card, "With much love, 'Mom & Dad.'" *See* Exhibit 10-b. BP moved back in with Respondent and her husband, and continued to live with them until sometime in 2005.

While living with Respondent and her husband over the following year, BP became even more attached to Respondent. She idolized Respondent and thought of her as a mother. She began calling Respondent "Mother" or "Mom," and Respondent never asked her to stop. In fact, Respondent gave BP personal cards, often signed "Mom," or "other Mom." *See* Exhibits 10-a through 10-i. Respondent knew about BP's abusive upbringing and thought allowing BP to call

her “mom” would help BP to fill a void that had been created in her childhood. Respondent and BP developed a mother-daughter relationship, and BP began to feel as if she was part of Respondent’s family. She helped with chores around the house, vacationed with Respondent, and was invited to join in DiMeglio family functions.

As the months passed, Respondent’s husband, MD, became less happy about BP continuing to live in the home. Despite his wanting BP to leave, however, Respondent allowed BP to stay. MD suffers from post traumatic stress disorder (“PTSD”) and occasionally experiences episodes associated with his PTSD. As part of those PTSD “episodes,” MD goes into verbal rages. And apart from those PTSD “episodes,” MD has anger management issues generally. He gets angry easily when frustrated, and often yells at people. MD was verbally abusive to both Respondent and BP.

Sometime in the spring of 2005, BP told Marilyn Medina, a friend of Respondent’s and also a LADC, that MD both physically and sexually abused her. Ms. Medina did not believe BP, and told her to speak with Respondent about it. After BP told Respondent about the abuse, Respondent spoke to MD, who denied the allegations. Marilyn Medina encouraged Respondent to ask BP to leave her home, but Respondent still allowed BP to continue living in the home for a period of time, against MD’s wishes. BP began receiving counseling through the Keene State College Counseling Center in September 2005, *see* Exhibit 9, and eventually moved out of Respondent’s home sometime in late 2005.

In 2006, BP moved back to Pennsylvania to live with her family. She enlisted in the Army for a short period of time in early 2007, but was discharged for medical reasons after approximately a month. While living in Pennsylvania, BP kept in touch with Respondent, and continued to consider Respondent her family. BP and Respondent spoke to each other regularly

over the phone³, and BP eventually moved back to New Hampshire to live with Respondent sometime in 2008.

In 2008, Respondent wrote a Client Assessment/Evaluation Form regarding BP to assist her in trying to re-enlisting in the Army. *See* Exhibit 12. At the hearing, Respondent testified that she did not write the document. The Board did not find Respondent's testimony on this issue credible, and finds that Respondent did in fact write the Client Assessment/Evaluation Form, and that she wrote the assessment as BP's counselor. At the same time, Respondent also wrote a personal letter of recommendation for BP. *See* Exhibit 13.

BP continued to live with Respondent and MD, essentially as a member of their family, for the next few years. There was no lease agreement between BP and Respondent, and Respondent incurred expenses on behalf of BP, such as veterinarian bills. MD did not like that BP continued to live with them, but Respondent wanted to help BP until she could become more independent and find her own place to live. In 2011, Respondent hired BP to work at the CRP, doing administrative work and training to become an instructor. Respondent paid BP to do secretarial work, observe programs, and teach segments of the classes while being observed.

In the fall of 2011, BP's relationship with Respondent broke down and Respondent asked BP to move out of her home. BP still idolized Respondent and loved her like a mother and did not want to leave. She also did not want to leave the animals that they shared. Between September 2011 and February 2012, Respondent provided BP with three written requests for her to leave the residence. *See* Exhibits 17, 19, and 20. BP ultimately moved out of Respondent's home in February 2012.

³ BP also claims that she flew to New Hampshire on numerous occasions to visit Respondent during this time period.

On or about March 29, 2012, BP filed a complaint with the Board regarding Respondent's failure to maintain appropriate boundaries. *See* Exhibit 1. The Board sent a copy of the complaint to Respondent and asked her to submit a response to the Board. *See* Exhibits 2 and 3. Respondent's attorney submitted her response by letter dated June 9, 2012. *See* Exhibit 4. In the response, Respondent stated that the only professional contact she had with BP was teaching BP's IDIP course and conducting BP's exit interview, and denied ever having "anything approaching a Mother/Daughter relationship" with BP. *Id.*

Rulings of Law

RSA 330-C:27, III provides in pertinent part:

III. Misconduct sufficient to support disciplinary proceedings under this section includes:

- (a) Violating any provision of this chapter or any substantive rule adopted under this chapter or order issued by the board.

RSA 330-C:10, I(d) and RSA 330-C:11, I(d) provide that the practice of alcohol and drug abuse counseling includes, "[a]dherence to professional and ethical standards as determined by the board." The Board has adopted the NAADAC code of ethics. *See* N.H. Admin. Rule Alc. 502.01(b). Alc. 502.01(b) provides:

- (b) Licensees and certified recovery support workers shall be bound by the 9 numbered principles of the NAADAC code of ethics, together with the bulleted sub-principles, as updated December 8, 2004.⁴

Alc. 502.01(b) was adopted by the Board effective April 11, 2009. Only conduct occurring after that date can give rise to disciplinary action based on a violation of that code. Prior to that time, the applicable code of conduct was set forth in N.H. Admin. Rule He-C 612.02 (now expired) (setting forth the New Hampshire Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct). In addition, all applicants for licensure or relicensing as an alcohol and drug abuse counselor sign

⁴ The NAADAC Code of Ethics, as revised in 2004, was submitted as Hearing Counsel's Exhibit 26.

assurances as part of the licensure process, agreeing to comply with the New Hampshire Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct. Respondent signed such assurances in 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010 and 2012. *See* Exhibits 27-a through 27-f. The code of conduct is set forth in a form titled “Assurances” which is part of the license application issued by the Board. *See id.* By signing that form, Respondent promised to abide by the assurances set forth in the code of conduct, and agreed to surrender her license, if necessary, for violations of the code of conduct. *See id.* Because she agreed to abide by the Alcohol and Drug Counselor Code of Conduct as a condition of licensure, violation of that code is grounds for discipline under RSA 330-C:27.

The Amended Notice of Hearing sets forth eight separate grounds for discipline. *See* Amended Notice of Hearing, ¶¶5A-H. The Board will address each charge as set forth in the Amended Notice of Hearing.⁵

A. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), Alc. 502.01(b), the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (c)(1), (d)(5), (k)(1), (k)(8) and (l)(1)), and the NAADAC Code of Ethics (2004) (*see* Principles 2, 7 and 8), by engaging in a personal relationship with BP after providing counseling services to BP as an addiction professional. From late 2003 until early 2012, Respondent engaged in a continuous relationship with BP in which the boundaries between her professional relationship with BP and her personal relationship with BP were blurred. From the time BP enrolled in the CRP in September 2003 and attended classes taught by Respondent, BP became a client of Respondent. The Board notes that the twelve core

⁵ Following the hearing, each side filed proposed findings of fact and rulings of law. Following those submissions, Respondent filed a motion to strike all of Hearing Counsel's proposed rulings of law, arguing that they assert new charges not included in the notice of hearing. *See* Respondent's Motion to Strike. Hearing Counsel objected to the motion. The Board neither grants nor denies Respondent's Motion to Strike. In deliberating on this matter, the Board only considered the charges set forth in the Amended Notice of Hearing. Because the relevant facts and law are fully set forth in this Final Decision and Order, the Board will not independently rule on each proposed finding of fact and ruling of law submitted by the parties. Any requests consistent with this order are granted, and any requests inconsistent with this order are denied.

functions of a LADC include “client education,” which is precisely what BP received from Respondent through the IDIP class. Even if BP had not received individual counseling from Respondent following the class, it still would be a violation of the code of conduct for Respondent to form a close personal relationship with a client within months of the client completing Respondent’s IDIP class and participating in an exit interview with Respondent. Moreover, here Respondent did not simply form a friendship with BP, she invited her into her home and took on the role of a mother-figure to BP. Throughout their relationship, from 2003 until 2012, Respondent took on the roles of counselor, AA sponsor, friend, and family, simultaneously. While Respondent appears to have meant well and believed she was helping BP, her conduct was a serious breach of the code of conduct and code of ethics and not in the best interests of BP.

B. With regard to the second charge in the Amended Notice of Hearing, the Board does not find that Respondent exploited BP for personal gain. While it is true that Respondent hired BP to house sit, to clean and organize her office, and to work at the CRP, the Board finds that Respondent did not do so for her own personal gain. The Board finds that Respondent’s intentions were to help BP, not to exploit her in any way.

C. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), Alc. 502.01(b), the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (c)(2), (d)(5), (h)(1), (k)(1), (k)(8) and (l)(1)), and the NAADAC Code of Ethics (2004) (*see* Principles 2, 7, and 8), by making personal requests of BP that did not directly pertain to treatment. Beginning with her request in April 2004 for BP to come to Florida and assist her with home renovations, and continuing throughout their relationship, Respondent made numerous personal requests of BP over a period of many years that did not

pertain to BP's treatment. While Respondent's intentions were to help BP, Respondent's failure to maintain appropriate personal and professional boundaries violated the code of conduct, the code of ethics, and was not in the best interests of BP.

D. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), Alc. 502.01(b), the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (c)(1), (c)(2), (d)(5), (k)(1), (k)(6), (k)(8) and (l)(1)), and the NAADAC Code of Ethics (2004) (*see* Principles 2, 3, 7, and 8), by failing to distinguish the counseling relationship with BP from her personal relationship with BP and failing to act in BP's best interest. Over a period of eight years, Respondent engaged in an improper dual relationship with BP in which the boundaries between their professional relationship and personal relationship were blurred. While Respondent's intention was to help BP, the dual relationship was not in BP's best interest and ultimately caused her harm.

E. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), Alc. 502.01(b), the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (c)(2), (d)(5), (k)(1), (k)(6), (k)(8) and (l)(1)), and the NAADAC Code of Ethics (2004) (*see* principles 2, 7, and 8), by allowing BP to continue to live in her home even though she knew that BP was claiming to be harmed by Respondent's husband, MD. Even if Respondent did not believe BP's sexual abuse allegations, Respondent knew that BP and MD did not get along, and that MD did not want BP living in the residence. Respondent also knew through her professional relationship with BP that BP had grown up in an-abusive home. Respondent was aware of MD's anger management issues, and observed verbal confrontations between MD and BP. The Board is not persuaded by the testimony of various witnesses who attempted to excuse MD's behavior by describing him as simply having an "Italian temper." The

Board finds by a preponderance of the evidence that MD was verbally abusive to both Respondent and BP. Respondent's dual relationship with BP caused her to become emotionally invested in her relationship with BP, and as a result, Respondent failed to make decisions based on BP's best interests, such as encouraging BP to leave an abusive and unhealthy living situation.

F. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), and the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (c)(1), (d)(5), (e)(4) and (l)(1)), by making professional representations about BP in the "Client Assessment/Evaluation Form" without professionally evaluating BP. As stated above, the Board did not find credible Respondent's assertion that she did not write the Client Assessment/Evaluation Form. The Board finds that she did write this assessment, and that she wrote it soon after BP moved back in with her in 2008. At the time she wrote the assessment, BP was not currently receiving formal counseling from Respondent, and Respondent did not perform a professional evaluation of BP before writing the assessment. Rather, she based the assessment on information she had learned about BP over the previous years through both her prior counseling of BP and their ongoing personal relationship.

G. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct and dishonest behavior in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), Alc. 502.01(b), the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (l)(1) and (l)(2)), and the NAADAC Code of Ethics (2004) (*see* principle 4), by failing to accurately report to the Board the extent of her professional relationship with BP in the response submitted to the Board on her behalf on or about June 8, 2012. In responding to BP's complaint, Respondent stated that the only professional contact she had with BP was teaching BP's IDIP course and conducting BP's exit

interview. *See* Exhibit 4. The Board finds those assertions to be false. As discussed above, the evidence supports a finding by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent conducted weekly counseling sessions with BP following her completion of the IDIP program, *see* Exhibit 7, and that in 2008 Respondent wrote a Client Assessment/Evaluation Form to assist BP in trying to re-enlist in the Army, *see* Exhibit 12. The Board finds that Respondent knowingly misrepresented to the Board the extent of her professional relationship with BP.

H. The Board finds and rules that Respondent engaged in professional misconduct and dishonest behavior in violation of RSA 330-C:27, III(a), Alc. 502.01(b), the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor Code of Conduct (*see* provisions (1)(1) and (1)(2)), and the NAADAC Code of Ethics (2004) (*see* principle 4), by denying she ever had a mother/daughter relationship with BP in the response submitted to the Board on her behalf on or about June 8, 2012. In responding to BP's complaint, Respondent stated that "at no time did [she] have anything approaching a Mother/Daughter relationship with [BP]." *See* Exhibit 4. The Board finds that the evidence presented at the hearing supports a contrary finding. It is clear from the evidence that Respondent and BP developed an extremely close bond, and that Respondent treated BP as a member of her family. Respondent knew that BP viewed her as a mother-figure, and Respondent encouraged that relationship by referring to BP as her "other daughter," and signing personal cards as "Mom" "Mother," or "other Mother." *See* Exhibits 10-a to 10-I; *see also* Exhibits 11 and 14. The Board also finds that the evidence supports a finding that Respondent intentionally misrepresented the extent of her personal relationship with BP to the Board. This finding is supported by the fact that when interviewed by the APU, Respondent denied referring to BP as her "other daughter" or BP calling her "mom," until confronted with the personal cards she had signed as "mom." *See* Exhibit 30. The Board did not find Respondent's testimony

diminishing the extent of her personal relationship with BP to be credible, and finds that Respondent misrepresented the extent of their relationship to the Board in the course of its investigation.⁶

Disciplinary Action

The Board recognizes that Respondent has committed many years of service to helping others address issues of addiction, both through her professional work and as an AA sponsor. The Board also recognizes that Respondent has no prior record of disciplinary infractions, and that her original intentions were to help BP. Nevertheless, Respondent's complete lack of boundaries between her professional relationship with BP and her personal relationship with BP, which spanned a period of eight years and had a negative impact on BP, constitutes serious misconduct. The Board is also concerned with Respondent's failure to take any responsibility for her actions and the effects that her choices have had on BP. In light of these concerns, and based on the findings of fact and rulings of law above, the Board has voted to order the following:

IT IS ORDERED THAT Respondent's license will not be renewed. *See* RSA 330-C:27, IV(f).

This refusal to renew shall continue for Respondent's lifetime.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT Respondent shall pay an administrative fine in the amount of \$8,000. *See* RSA 330-C:27, VI(h).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT this Final Decision and Order shall become a permanent part of Respondent's file, which is maintained by the Board as a public document.

⁶ The Board is not persuaded by Respondent's argument that whether a person believes that they have a mother/daughter relationship with someone is a question of subjective feeling not subject to a true or false response. Despite how Respondent subjectively felt about BP, the Board finds that Respondent intentionally misled the Board during its investigation about the extent of her personal relationship with BP.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT this Final Decision and Order shall take effect as an Order of the Board on the date an authorized representative of the Board signs it.

Accordingly, it is so ordered by the Board.

BY ORDER OF THE BOARD*

Dated: 4/14/15

Glenda Hanscom
Glenda Hanscom, Administrator
Authorized Representative of the
New Hampshire Board of Licensing for Alcohol
and Other Drug Use Professionals

*Board members not participating:

Jacqui Abikoff, MLADC, recused

Cheryl Wilkie, MLADC, not present for deliberations and did not vote