



TENNESSEE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING EXAMINERS
500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243
615-741-3600

**Board Meeting Minutes for December 7, 2017
First Floor Conference Room 1-A
Davy Crockett Tower**

Tennessee Board of Architectural and Engineering Examiners met on December 7, 2017, in the first floor conference room of Davy Crockett Tower in Nashville, Tennessee. Mr. Wagster called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and the following business was transacted:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Frank Wagster, Robert Campbell, Jr., Blair Parker, Ricky Bursi, Rick Thompson, Brian Tibbs, Kathy Ware, Alton Hethcoat, Stephen King

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Susan Ballard

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Roxana Gumucio, Liz Goldstein, Sara Page, Shilina Brown, Wanda Phillips, Wanda Garner

ROLL CALL / AGENDA

Mr. Wagster provided the notice of meeting, and Ms. Garner called roll. Mr. Wagster introduced interim Executive Director Roxana Gumucio and new board member Alton Hethcoat who has served previously. Mr. Parker moved to approve the agenda as written. Mr. Campbell seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

Carter Lawrence appeared before the Board. Mr. Thompson motioned to recognize Assistant Commissioner Lawrence in order to discuss his report to the Finance Committee. Mr. Campbell seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote. Commissioner Lawrence introduced for discussion three (3) fees to be eliminated: testing, intern, and comity application fees. Accounting Director Bill Huddleston also joined the panel to answer any follow-up questions from the Board. In addition to comity applicants, the Board indicated an interest in broadening the scope of fee reduction further to include Tennessee applicants and current licensees. They have asked Mr. Huddleston to prepare a broader analysis. Mr. Parker motioned to eliminate both the testing and intern application fees. Mr. Campbell seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

MINUTES

Mr. Tibbs made a motion to adopt the minutes from the October 6, 2017 meeting as written. Mr. Bursi seconded. The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

STAFF COMPLAINT REPORT

In regards to complaint and licensing data, Director Gumucio recommended a quarterly report. There were three complaints in need of administrative closure with letters of caution. Mr. Campbell motioned to accept administration's recommendation to close. Mr. Tibbs seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORTS

Don Baltimore from Tennessee Interior Design through Education and Advocacy (TN IDEA) reiterated their support to the Board in the upcoming legislative session.

Nathan Ridley from the TN chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA-TN) provided their meeting schedule and intent to hold elections within their organization.

Ashley Cates from American Institute of Architects Tennessee Chapter (AIA-TN) detailed their efforts regarding public education and outreach. Ms. Cates mentioned that they are working to have the Historic tax credit approved as well.

LEGAL CASE REPORT (presented by Sara Page and Shilina Brown)

1. 2017060501

First Licensed: 01/11/2007

Expiration: 01/31/2019

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): N/A

Complainant is a homeowner who made an insurance claim due to damage from a wind storm/tornado. The insurance company hired Respondent to conduct an abbreviated engineering report to determine whether certain cracks in the inside and outside of the home were caused by the storm or some other cause. Respondent produced a report based on personal observations, photographs, and measurements. The report concluded the cracks were from settlement and not related to the storm. Complainant felt certain material evidence to the contrary was left out of the report.

The report was reviewed by Robert Campbell. Robert concluded the report was sufficient and supported by evidence properly gathered.

Mitigating Factors: Extensive photography showing thoughtful analysis.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Concur.

2. 2017067341

First Licensed: 04/04/1968

Expiration: 02/28/2018 (Permanently Retired)

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): 2017 – Consent Order for permanent retirement due to incompetency and health concerns.

Previously, Respondent informally resolved a competency complaint by setting his license in retired status, without the ability to remove it. Respondent has ongoing health issues that have impaired his ability to fully practice. After retiring his license, the State Fire Marshall let the Board know he had submitted a small change order without a seal for the same project that resulted in the retired license settlement. The State Fire Marshall did not note an error, but since they knew Respondent's license status, they forwarded the change order to let the Board know it occurred. This is the entirety of the change order:

1) Mud Seals – Page S1

Drawings call for seals to be every 3 feet. Maximum spacing is 6 feet, but the seals will be on 5 feet. This is adequate.

2) Truss Spacing – Page A3

Drawings call for one foot spacing. The trusses were designed by Truss Manufacturers to be placed on 2 foot centers. The decking will be ¾” decking but will not be treated. The decking will be covered with Synthetic Roofing Underlayment and Metal roofing. This will result in less total load on the foundation.

Respondent responded and stated that the owner of the building contacted Respondent to let him know of the truss spacing problem. The owner sent Respondent the sealed plans from the truss manufacturer to see. Respondent said he informed the client of his license status, but the owner asked if he could send a letter to the fire inspector to let the inspector know Respondent did not object to the change to Respondent's previously submitted plans. Respondent states he purposefully did not seal the change order for those reasons. Respondent states he also knew that the fire inspector was fully aware of Respondent's situation, so he did not feel it was deceptive or that he was trying to be sneaky in any way. Respondent stated he wanted the plans examiner to be aware Respondent did not have problems with the changes everyone was going to make to his original plans.

Mitigating Factors: Limited scope of work
Did not use seal
All parties aware of license status
Client is a non-profit religious organization with limited resources to hire a new engineer for a small change, so Respondent was attempting to not cause further harm/expense to the client.

Aggravating Factors: Disciplinary history
Change order was on same project that resulted in license status being set to retired

Recommendation: Close upon issuance of a letter of warning.

Board Decision: Concur.

3. **2017056721**

First Licensed: N/A

Expiration: 09/06/2005 (Closed)

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): N/A

An anonymous complaint was filed containing only plans without comment. The plans were sealed by a Tennessee Engineer with an active registration. Respondent is the firm for which the engineer is employed.

Respondent is no longer registered in Tennessee; however, it has submitted the proper disclosure compliant with the following statute, Tennessee Code Annotated § 62-2-601:

(a) A corporation, partnership or firm offering architectural, engineering or landscape architectural service to the public may engage in the practice of architecture, engineering or landscape architecture in this state; provided, that at least one (1) of the principals or officers of the corporation, partnership or firm is in responsible charge of the practice and is registered as required in this chapter for architects, engineers and landscape architects or is otherwise by this chapter authorized to practice. The same exemptions shall apply to corporations, partnerships and firms as apply to individuals under this chapter.

(b) Corporations, partnerships or firms offering engineering, architectural or landscape architectural service to the public shall file with the board, on a form prescribed by the board, a listing of names and addresses of all principals and officers, as well as the principals or officers duly registered to practice architecture, engineering or landscape architecture in this state who are in responsible charge of the practice in this state. The corporations, partnerships or firms shall advise the board in writing within sixty (60) days of any change of status.

The disclosure is old, and could be updated to ensure better protection for Respondent in the future.

Mitigating Factors: None.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Close, but issue letter requesting updated disclosure.

Board Decision: Close upon the issuance of a letter of instruction.

4. 2017067871

First Licensed: 03/16/1982

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Professional Engineering Firm

History (5 yrs.): N/A

An engineer is the Complainant. Complainant alleged the father of a young recent graduate stated his employer let him stamp plans. The young graduate is employed at Respondent firm. Respondent and the graduate had no knowledge that his father said this, and deny the allegations. No evidence of any wrongdoing was located.

Mitigating Factors: None.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Concur.

5. 2017056361

First Licensed: Unlicensed

Expiration: Unlicensed

Type of License: N/A

History (5 yrs.): N/A

Consumer complaint filed against Respondent concerning duplicate and multiple billings for retainer and design services for residential design. Upon further review, the Respondent has been identified as possibly holding themselves out as an architect due to firm name. Respondent has a full-service design team and offers a full range of services for residential building. The main issue is the actual name of the firm which uses the word “architectural” in the firm name. The website provides further details on services provided and states firm provides architectural services and customized pre-drawn house plans and developed custom home designs for over 20 years. The Respondent states on website it supports architects, builders and developers, however, they do not employ any licensed architects. The Respondent provides residential architecture services. Respondent’s manager handling the house plan transaction for the Complainant identifies himself as an Architectural Manager. The Respondent is located in Minnesota. Respondent indicates it provides services across the country and operates in the Southeast.

Mitigating Factors: Website specifically states not architects and refers to themselves on the website as providing residential design services.
No violation of architectural laws in home state of Minnesota.

Aggravating Factors: Name of firm states “architectural.” Respondent’s manager of residential design plans refers to himself as “Architectural Manager” and is not a licensed architect.

Recommendation: Discuss.

Board Decision: Defer and represent in February 2018.

6. 2017070401

First Licensed: 03/30/1979

Expiration: 07/31/2019

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): N/A

Respondent provided a chart of continued education credit in response to an audit, but Respondent failed to produce required certificates. Staff spoke with Respondent multiple times and explained a number of options on how to get proof for the hours, but Respondent stated Respondent would not be able to produce proof.

Mitigating Factors: None.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,000 for failing to comply with continued education requirements. Additionally, Respondent shall submit proof of the required number of continued education hours within 180 days of any Order settling this matter. These hours may be newly obtained, but they may not qualify both to fulfil this penalty as well as for future continued education requirements. Respondent shall also be subject to the next continued education audit, and Respondent shall complete the laws and rules examination.

7. 2017051171

First Licensed: 02/11/2004
Expiration: N/A
Type of License: Engineering Firm
History (5 yrs.): N/A

2017051831
First Licensed: 01/26/1999
Expiration: 01/31/2019
Type of License: Professional Engineer
History (5 yrs.): N/A

Respondent was retained by Complainant to draft plans for a two-part residential development in conjunction with the efforts of a hired land planner. Respondent drafted plans for the two phases, Phase 1 and Phase 2. Complainant began construction with Phase 2 in 2012 based on Respondent's plans. Complainant alleged stoppages it accounted to Respondent's plan errors resulted in Complainant ending the business agreement between Complainant and Respondent. Complainant stated it was a general dissatisfaction, and its specific example was an issue it recently discovered related to the depth of a sewer pipe. Those plans from Phase 2 were approved by the City prior to construction, and construction was completed. At that time, Respondent had drafted Phase 1 plans. The plans had been sent to City, but the city's consulting engineer identified comments it wished implemented into the Phase 1 plans. The City voted that the plans be approved after the comments/changes were made. The project was put on hold due to market conditions. In 2014, Complainant fired Respondent prior to the changes to the plans being made since the project was on hold, so the plans were never finalized.

Later, in 2016, Complainant started the project back up, and requested copies of the CAD files of Phase 1 from Respondent in order to provide them to a new engineering firm. There is a dispute between the parties regarding the timeliness of compliance to that request. Respondent ultimately sent the CAD files for Phase 1. Complainant then began construction using the Phase 1 plans that had not been approved by the City fully due to the outstanding comments that needed to be implemented. Complainant filed this complaint alleging the errors arising from the Phase 1 plans constitute a violation of its ethical duty to Complainant. Complainant indicated that since the plans had been used to solicit contractor bids, it assumed the changes needed were "insignificant." Complainant also provided a memo from its new engineering firm. The firm identified errors, but the memo was documenting discrepancies between PDF versions of plans and CAD files. The new engineer referred to the plans as approved numerous times, but the City confirmed they were not approved.

Respondent responded to indicate the Phase 1 plans were in fact never finalized. Respondent disputed that any errors occurred during Phase 2 that would be considered out of the ordinary. At no point was Respondent made aware of an error with a sewer pipe, including when Complainant brought on the ultimate replacement engineering team as a consultant.

An investigation was conducted in order to get copies of the plans and to speak with the City. The City Codes official confirmed the Phase 1 plans produced by Respondent were never finalized pursuant to minutes from the City Council meeting. The official opined that the project has had a number of issues arise, and it continued to have issues, but they expect final approvals to be completed soon.

Stephen King reviewed the plans and documents in this matter. From review of the plans, nothing arose on their face to indicate a health, safety, or welfare problem. Any errors that may exist arose as the plans were implemented, without consultation from Respondent. The complaint seems to indicate issues with implementation, but it has been confirmed Complainant attempted implementation of plans that were not finalized.

Mitigating Factors:

1. Respondent was fired before being allowed to finalize plans.
2. Respondent no longer was involved in the project when construction began, so it could not remedy/account for newly discovered issues. Also, that construction was started prior to the plans being approved and finalized by the City.
3. The number of issues arising during this project tends to lead one to believe some errors have occurred, but it is difficult to ascertain where blame lies. The City official confirmed this as well, and noted it would be very hard to point at one person as the cause of the issues.
4. The memo relied upon by Complainant as the grounds of specific incompetencies in the plans does not indicate the new engineer's list of found errors, but rather discrepancies between files sent by Complainant. Again, Respondent had not finished the plans before it was fired, so plan versions could have been in flux.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Mr. Parker recused himself from Vote. Remainder members Concur.

RE-PRESENTATIONS

1. 2017020561

First Licensed: 10/28/1986

Expiration: 01/31/2019

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 years): N/A

Complainant is a registered engineer. Respondent is an architect. Complainant and Complainant's firm were retained by the Respondent to provide professional engineering services to perform a civil site design. The civil site drawings were submitted by the Respondent on December 9, 2015, and there were subsequent revisions. On March 27, 2017, the Complainant was contacted by the general contractor for proposed plan substitutions to the landscape design of the project. The Complainant was confused since neither the Complainant nor his firm prepared the landscape design for the project. The Complainant was informed by the general contractor that the landscape design had the Complainant's PE stamp. The Complainant requested photos of the drawings with the stamp. The Complainant also requested a copy of the drawing from the city planner. The Complainant and the firm are alleging the Respondent compromised the Complainants' position by the Respondent's carelessness and are at risk for work that the Complainants' did not perform and do not have the expertise to perform.

Respondent provided a response through his attorney and stated that the Respondent and the Respondent's firm were hired to provide architectural services and there was a lead architect who was not the Respondent. The Respondent acknowledges that the Complainants were hired to provide professional engineering services regarding the civil site design and their drawings are dated back to November 30, 2015, however, the city planner requested a landscape plan be prepared and submitted after the submission of their initial drawings. The Respondent was asked to prepare the landscape plan and the Respondent prepared and submitted the landscape plan to the city planner on March 30, 2016. The landscape plan was submitted as an overlay to sheet

C-S, a civil drawing by the Complainant's firm that was originally submitted on November 30, 2015 and revised and stamped with the Complainant's engineering seal. The Respondent states the landscape plan did not revise, alter or amend the Complainant's civil drawing and was simply an overlay to the Respondent's sheet C-2 for the location and types of shrubs and accent plants to be planted to give the development a residential character and a table showing the generic and botanic names of trees and shrubs and corresponding total quantity to be planted. This was submitted as an overlay because the Respondent wanted to ensure that the landscape plan matched the elevation maps, etc. that were submitted to the city planner. The Respondent stated the Complainant unfairly suggested the Complainant knew little or nothing about the landscape plan being prepared and submitted by the Respondent until the Complainant discovered it by happenstance and unfairly suggests the Respondent somehow represented that the plan had been stamped or prepared by the Complainant. The Complainant had been fully advised regarding the landscape plan development and submission and this is evident in a review of the project e-mails, including multiple e-mails from the Complainant. In fact, the Respondent provided proof from the client to confirm whether there was any confusion concerning the preparation and submission of the landscape plan by the Respondent. In fact, the Complainant asked the Respondent directly when the Complainant will receive the landscape plan to submit to the city planner. Therefore, Respondent claims there is no risk to the Complainant. The Respondent has had over 46 years of professional experience in the field of architecture and was first licensed by the Board in 1986 and this is the first complaint ever filed against the Respondent.

The Complainant provided a rebuttal response to the Respondent's response and stated that the landscape plan used the Complainant's seal and the Complainant's firm sheet border and subjects the Complainant to appearing as responsible for work they did not prepare. Also, the Complainant reiterates that the Complainant is a licensed professional engineer and not a landscape architect. The P.E. sealed plan was used with a landscape plan actually prepared by the Respondent Architect. The P.E. sealed landscape plan was also submitted to a local permitting authority. The landscape plan was used to secure a site development permit. The Complainant was not consulted during the preparation of the landscape plan or after the landscape plan was submitted and the landscape plan was never submitted by the Respondent to the Complainant. The P.E. sealed landscape plan was used for construction and the Complainant claims to only have found out about it after receiving the call and subsequent e-mail from the general contractor to consider plant substitutions.

Mitigating Factors:

- (1) It does appear at least Complainant's firm had some knowledge Respondent was preparing the landscape plans. It is possible a communication breakdown led to the issues with the landscape plan overlay.
- (2) While Complainant alleges potential harm, no harm occurred from the landscape plan overlay.
- (3) Respondent has a 46-year career and no disciplinary history.

Aggravating Factors: (1) Because the Respondent Architect never sealed the portion of the plans they produced, it appears Complainant produced all aspects of the stamped plan, even though Complainant did not work to prepare the landscape overlay (misleading).

Original Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 for Respondent's failure to properly seal a design to which Respondent contributed (TCA § 62-2-306(b) and Rule 0120-02-.08). Respondent is also required to take and pass the laws and rules examination.

Original Board Decision: Approved. Additionally, the Board voted to send a Letter of Warning to the Complainant because they should have ensured that the plans provided by Respondent were properly sealed.

New/Additional Information: There was no confusion by the client concerning the preparation of the landscape plan and the client was aware of which individual was preparing the landscape plan and even requested the landscape plan directly from the Respondent. The landscape plan did not require a seal by a landscape architect and there was no expectation from the city planner that the landscape plan to be sealed. The Board's reference

manual on page 11 states that landscaping associated with new and existing construction of buildings of 5,000 square feet or more or greater than two stories requires the use of a registrant. In this case, the landscape plan was prepared for a single story residence of 2,800 square feet and a landscape plan was not necessary. The Respondent believed the permit was obtained based on the PE plans and had nothing to do with the landscape plan. Most importantly, the landscape plan was overlaid on the site and erosion control plan at the request of the Complainant and the City Planner. The Respondent did not design the landscaping plan, but prepared by another person, rather the Respondent overlaid the plan onto the site grading and erosion control plan that had been prepared by the Complainant. The Respondent overlaid it onto the drawing because the Complainant wanted to make sure that it matched the elevation maps, etc.

Respondent submitted the landscape plan at the request of the city planner for an informal submittal to the city planner and the Respondent was merely asked to draft the landscape plan from the designer's sketches. The Respondent was not aware that if a permit was being obtained or any permit was being obtained for the site/civil portion of the work of the Complainant. The Respondent states the role of the Respondent was merely as a draftsman.

The Respondent has asked the Board for reconsideration of this matter. The Respondent has 47 years of experience in the industry and an impeccable record with no history of complaints. The Respondent has never been sued civilly and there has never been a building failure on any work performed by the Respondent. The Respondent requests that the Board take into consideration that the Respondent's business partner recently retired and the Respondent closed the business and had to liquidate the business after 30 years of building the practice. The Respondent plans to start a new business and would like to start on a clean slate for the last few years of practice. The Respondent did not intend to cause any confusion or miscommunication by any actions he undertook in this instance and had no intent whatsoever to harm anyone by his actions. Respondent wanted the Board to know that there had been some animosity between the firms and never thought it would rise to this level and would respectfully request reconsideration of all of the facts and reconsider the disciplinary action against the Respondent.

2nd RECOMMENDATION: **Letter of Warning issued to the Respondent.**

2nd BOARD DECISION: **Rescind letter of instruction against the Complainant and conduct an informal conference for the Respondent.**

NEW INFORMATION: **Informal conference conducted with Board Member, Stephen King.**

NEW RECOMMENDATION: **Discuss.**

NEW BOARD DECISION: **Close upon the issuance of a Letter of Warning.**

2. 2016053951

First Licensed: 01/03/2008

Expiration: 01/31/2018

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 years): N/A

ORIGINAL ENTRY:

Complaint opened following receipt of information indicating Respondent stamped architecture plans possibly outside Respondent's area of competence as an engineer. A review of the plans stamped by

Respondent shows concern regarding code knowledge and understanding of architectural process. Rick Thompson reviewed the plans, and identified numerous errors, including a lack of handrails and landings for stairs.

History: None

Original Recommendation: Authorization of a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 to be settled by consent order or formal hearing. Respondent also to complete law and rules examination.

Original Board Decision: Authorization of a civil penalty in the amount of \$6,000 (\$750 x 8 stamped pages) to be settled by Consent Order or Formal Hearing. Additionally, Respondent must take and pass the Law and Rules Examination.

NEW INFORMATION:

Respondent requested to speak informally with a Board Member in order to explain some of the deficiencies in the plans. Respondent, legal, and Brian Tibbs met to discuss with Respondent their experience, and the details of the plans. Respondent indicated that they have built similar buildings within her city's limits, and had no issues either with construction or codes. This building was the first to cross into the county itself, and therefore was subject to State review, which Respondent described as much more rigorous.

Mr. Tibbs also took time to review the plans again.

New Recommendation: Discussion.

Board Decision: Defer and represent in February 2018.

POLICY DIRECTOR ADDRESS

Policy Director Laura Martin informed the Board that the "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQ's) regarding Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) were removed from the website per an executive management decision on advice from the Legal Division. The board had questions and various members expressed objections but the board took no action.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Since a financial report and recommendations for a quarterly complaint and licensing report were already provided, Director Gumucio addressed the newsletter. Once NCEES provides written permission for reprint of one of their articles in the newsletter, the newsletter will be presented to the Board at the next meeting for their final approval.

ENGINEER COMMITTEE REPORT

The Engineer Committee, through Mr. Bursi, reported on topics discussed.

Mr. Bursi reported that comity applications and one continuing education application audit were reviewed. He stated that confidentiality of references in future applications will require a statutory change, and he reported on a rule change that was approved which allows one year credit for progressive work experience for 3 years of work experience prior to graduation. The committee edited language in the Seals rules about digitally sealed documents and sealing reports that would be more consistent with statute. The committee proposed changes to the application reference form and

discussed the possibility of allowing Associate Engineer Board Members to review and approve applications.

Regarding Rule 0120-02.08 (2)(d), the Board recommended that “electronic” be change to “digital”. In addition to the edit described, Mr. Campbell moved to approve the proposed changes and the regulatory flexibility addendum. Mr. Bursi seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

ARCHITECT COMMITTEE REPORT

The Architect Committee, through Mr. Thompson, reported on topics discussed.

Mr. Thompson mentioned that the administrative support staff will send all future applications for review as they are received. Mr. Thompson also introduced the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement and the Pre-Licensure Titling Rule for discussion.

Chief Counsel Anthony Glandorf informed the Board that the NCARB Tri-National Mutual Recognition Agreement did not address the references and attestation required of the registrants. Mr. Tibbs motioned that the Board approve the agreement with the attestation historically required of the registrants. Mr. Thompson seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Thompson informed the Board that the committee decided against using the term “Architectural Intern” in favor of the use of “Architectural Associate” when referring to Pre-Licensure Titling. Mr. Thompson motioned that the Legal Division continue to develop the definition of who would qualify to use the “Architectural Associate” designation by articulating what educational requirements are sufficient. Mr. Tibbs seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Finance Committee, through Mr. Parker, reported on topics discussed.

Mr. Parker referenced a previous motion in this meeting where the Board unanimously voted to eliminate both the testing and intern application fees.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Director Gumucio informed the Board that she will address any unfinished business in future meetings as necessary.

NEW BUSINESS

Director Gumucio provided a redraft of the program applicant reference form with edits submitted by Mr. Campbell for consideration of the Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Campbell motioned to approve the Rules Package (attached) without the proposed amendment to Rule 0120-01-.09. Mr. Bursi seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote, with Susan Ballard absent.

Ms. Goldstein provided definitions for the practice of architecture, incidental practice of engineering, and the practice of engineering to be added to either the current statute defining those terms or added by way of rulemaking.

Mr. Campbell motioned to authorize Associate Engineer Members to review applications if no additional reviews by other Engineer Members would be deemed necessary. Mr. Bursi seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Wagster appointed Alton Hethcoat to the Outreach and Finance Committees and provided updates to the chair of the Finance and Grants for Higher Education Committee which include Mr. Parker and Mr. Tibbs.

Mr. Campbell motioned to grant Emeritus status to Philip Lim and to present the certificate at the next board meeting. Mr. Thompson seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other new business, Mr. Wagster adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS

Proposed Rule(s) Package