



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

**Board Meeting Minutes for October 4, 2019  
First Floor Conference Room 1-A  
Davy Crockett Tower**

Tennessee Board of Architectural and Engineering Examiners met on October 4, 2019, in the first floor conference room of Davy Crockett Tower in Nashville, Tennessee. Mr. Parker called the meeting to order at 9:00am and the following business was transacted:

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

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Roxana Gumucio, Jennifer Peck, Stuart Huffman, Wanda Garner

**ROLL CALL / AGENDA**

Mr. Parker provided the notice of meeting and Ms. Garner called roll.

Ms. Gumucio introduced Jennifer Peck as the new Executive Director of the Board.

Mr. Parker asked to report on his trip to the CLARB Meeting during the Landscape Architect Committee Report.

Ms. Gumucio asked that the Definitions Committee be moved to the top of the list of Committee Reports.

Guests were acknowledged.

**MINUTES** (attached)

Mr. Bursi asked for follow up regarding reminder notices being sent to registrants who are in the grace period for renewing their license. Ms. Gumucio stated that she has been given approval to send reminder notices and the first ones will go out in the next few weeks.

Motion was made by M. Wagster and seconded by Mr. Campbell to approve the August 8, 2019 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

**PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORTS**

Kasey Anderson, Tennessee Society of Professional Engineers/American Council of Engineering

Companies of Tennessee (TSPE/ACEC-TN) provided a brief summary of the general activities of

TSPE/ACEC-TN. She reported on the following topics:

- Successful online exam review classes given jointly with Lipscomb University;
- A new committee has been formed to study decoupling;
- Another committee is looking at the merits of allowing a master's degree in engineering plus twenty (20) years of experience as being acceptable as meeting the education requirement toward licensure;
- There is continuing discussion regarding the acceptability of a technology degree as meeting the education requirement toward licensure.

Nathan Ridley from the TN chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA-TN) provided a brief summary of the general activities of ASLA-TN including:

- The CLARB Annual meeting will be in San Diego in November;
- Nashville will host the meeting in 2021.

Don Baltimore from Tennessee Interior Design through Education and Advocacy (TN IDEA) announced that October has been designated as Interior Design Awareness Month by Governor Lee.

Ashley Cates, American Institute of Architects Tennessee Chapter (AIA-TN),) provided a brief summary of the general activities of AIA-TN and reported that awards were given to firms that encourage emerging professionals. She thanked the Board for putting QBS information on its website.

**LEGAL REPORT** (presented by Shilina Brown)



**STATE OF TENNESSEE  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INSURANCE  
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL  
500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243  
TELEPHONE (615) 741-3072 FACSIMILE (615) 741-4000**

**CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

---

**TO: Tennessee Board of Architectural and Engineering Examiners**  
**FROM: Shilina B. Brown, Associate Counsel, Legal Department**  
**DATE: October 4, 2019**  
**SUBJECT: October 2019 Legal Report**

---

**1. 2019066431 INVENTURE DESIGN**

**First Licensed: 10/11/2016**

**Expiration: 10/31/2020**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity # 1156592**

Respondent was recently denied registration by the Ohio Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Surveyors based on Respondent's plea of guilty to one count of injury to a child which is a misdemeanor. This plea was reduced from the original charge of Indecency with a Child, a felony of the third degree. The Board denied Respondent's application based on no person is eligible for registration as a professional engineer, or professional surveyor, who is not of good character and reputation.

The incident occurred in December 2001. Respondent included this information on his application dated 10/4/2016 which was approved on October 11, 2016.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Stephen King.**

Mitigating Factors: Occurred in 2001 and Respondent's was approved in 2016 for licensure.

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Close.**

**Board Decision: CONCUR**

2. 2019068341

**First Licensed: 01/01/1993**

**Expiration: 08/31/2021**

**Type of License: Professional Architect**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity # 1487**

Respondent self-reported that he had practiced on an expired license. Respondent's license expired on August 31, 2017. He was expired for almost two years. Respondent explains that he had not knowingly practiced on the expired license and learned of it when he submitted a project through the Tennessee Fire Marshal's office for an education occupancy project. Respondent lists seven (7) projects that he stamped while his license was expired.

Respondent has since applied and been approved for licensure on August 22, 2019.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Frank Wagster.**

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported.  
No prior disciplinary action  
Violation was inadvertent  
No hazards to the health, safety of welfare of the public.

Aggravating Factors: In June 2019, the Respondent provided in his reapplication that he was ill for the past year and a half and let his license expire. He was seeking reinstatement because he was in good health.

**Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 for practicing on an expired license due to mitigating factors. Respondent is also to take and pass the laws and rules examination. Authorize formal hearing if the Respondent does not agree to informal settlement and civil penalty and/or fails to meet the exam requirements.**

**Board Decision: \$875 civil penalty and take and pass the laws and rules exam.**

3. 2019068351

**First Licensed: 04/20/2008**  
**Expiration: 08/31/2021**  
**Type of License: Professional Engineer**  
**History (5 yrs.): None.**  
**Entity # 357682**

Respondent self-reported that he had practiced on an expired license. Respondent's license expired on April 30, 2018. Respondent explains that his expiration was due to administrative error. Respondent lists one (1) small project for a trash compactor that he stamped while his license was expired.

Respondent has since applied and been approved for licensure on August 22, 2019.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Stephen King.**

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 for practicing on an expired license with consideration given to mitigating factors. Respondent is also to take and pass the laws and rules examination. Authorize formal hearing if the Respondent does not agree to informal settlement and civil penalty and/or fails to meet the exam requirements.**

**Board Decision: CONCUR**

4. 2019061821

**First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)**  
**Expiration: N/A**  
**Type of License: Architectural Firm**  
**History (5 yrs.): N/A**  
**Entity # 1309398**

Complainant is an Oklahoma architect that was going to recommend a local architect firm for his cousin in Nashville. When Complainant looked up the firm it was discovered that this firm is not licensed in Tennessee.

Respondent is an architect firm based in Houston, Texas. Respondent submitted its Secretary of State filing showing the parent company of Respondent as doing business in

Tennessee. The Tennessee architect license is under the individual owner of the parent company who is located in their Houston, Texas office.

There is no evidence that the Nashville office is licensed.

Mitigating Factors: Principal of firm is a licensed architect in Tennessee.  
Inadvertent/unaware the firm needed to fill out a firm registration.  
There has been no architectural practice/business conducted in Tennessee.  
Immediately submitted and obtained firm registration when contacted by our office.

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: **Send letter of caution to Respondent and require the Principal Architect to pass the laws and rules exam.**

### INFORMAL CONFERENCE

#### 5. 2019023531

**First Licensed: 01/01/1993**

**Expiration: 10/31/2019**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #354655**

Complaint was filed against the Respondent by the State Fire Marshall's Office for practicing outside of area of competence related to sealing plans and drawings for a church. The Respondent provided a response and stated he has considerable experience with similar projects. The Respondent has experience in design and shift support for nuclear power plants for 20 years and it was routine for the Respondent to interpret and revise structural, electrical, mechanical and HVAC drawings. The Respondent has been a structural engineer of record for shopping center upgrades, large apartment buildings and various other projects. The Respondent stated that the drawings that were sealed for this project were for building exterior elevations, basic floor and equipment plans, electrical panel and legend drawings. The Respondent is familiar with design output and an electrical contractor has looked over the distribution drawings and found them acceptable for construction and a local engineering firm has reviewed the drawing set and is satisfied by the level of detail. The Respondent stated the original drawings had been submitted without a seal and contact information and the project manager had sent the wrong files and would resubmit the correct set of drawings.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Stephen King. Also, an informal conference was conducted by Board Member King with the Respondent.**

Mitigating Factors: No prior disciplinary action during a period of licensure in excess of 35 years.  
Informal conference with Board member was held.

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Letter of Caution about practicing outside area of competence and experience.**

**Board Decision: Defer to December meeting.**

### **RE-PRESENTATIONS**

**6. 2019054991**

**First Licensed: 02/23/1996**

**Expiration: 06/30/2021**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #364317**

Respondent's registration expired on February 28, 2018 and realized it was expired on February 19, 2019. Respondent reapplied immediately and is currently licensed with an expiration date of June 30, 2021. The expired license affidavit submitted by the Respondent stated the Respondent had sealed several specifications and engineering studies, however, since discovering the license was expired, no documents were sealed by the Respondent.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Alton Hethcoat.**

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported.

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 for unlicensed practice to be settled informally by Consent Order with authority to proceed to a contested case proceeding if the Respondent does not agree to the informal settlement.

Board Decision: **DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING**

**New Board Decision: Authorize \$500 civil penalty and require Respondent to take and pass the laws and rules exam.**

**7. 2019055791**

**First Licensed: 01/23/2018**

**Expiration: 01/31/2020**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #994561**

A complaint was filed against the Respondent by the former employer. The employer claims the Respondent lied about working in an “engineering firm,” copied hundreds of confidential files and proprietary information to an external drive and loaded them onto the new employers’ computer system, conspired with other former and soon to be former employees to extract other proprietary information, stole customer drawings from the complainant employer, changed the login credentials for the complainant employer’s auto desk vault workgroup which gives access to the complainant employers’ computer systems from the new employers system and locking out complainant employer from vault server, used photos of the complainant employer tests to mark the Respondent’s LinkedIn account, stole vendor pricing files, stole job invoicing logs for engineering and testing projects going back seven years, wiped a laptop clean and reset it to factory settings, and destroying company property. The complainant employer had to hire a third-party forensic IT professional to restore the laptop and to show file paths to confirm all computer activity engaged in by the Respondent. The IT professional confirmed that information was transferred to the new competitor employers’ computers. The complainant employer has filed a civil suit against the Respondent for these actions.

The Respondent provided a five-page detailed response and stated that the complainant employer misrepresented facts and circumstances surrounding the departure of the Respondent. The Respondent stated all licensed engineers working in the Memphis, Tennessee office of the complainant employer resigned in March 2018. The Respondent stated that the complainant employer manager that filed the complaint made it a “miserable work environment” for all employees. The complainant employer had legal proceedings instituted against his new employer, also a former employee of the complainant employer’s firm and the Respondent. The civil lawsuit filed against them alleges conspiracy by the new employer by taking confidential information to be used to obtain a competitive advantage against the complainant employer. Also, it was routine for the “[m]y documents” folder to be routinely backed up to the Respondent’s laptops while they were working for the employer. Also, because of the lawsuit and the court ordered IT audit of whether or not there was confidential information, etc., the Respondent and the new employer agreed to voluntarily delete certain documents. The Respondent stated the lawsuit was baseless and malicious. The complainant employer has been unable to prove any confidential information was stolen. In fact, the parties had settled the matter, but now the complainant employer is demanding the payment of \$31,000 for the costs associated with the IT audit ordered by the court. The Respondent



has refused to settle the case and rejected the offer to pay \$31,000 to the complainant employer. The Respondent provided a detailed response to each allegation by the complainant employer and there is nothing to substantiate or corroborate the allegations in the complaint. There was no proof of any confidential documents being stolen and the IT expert confirmed the documents were not stolen. Also, there were no documents on the laptops that were deemed to be confidential information. The Respondent also provided letters from his attorney confirming many of the facts and detailed responses made by the Respondent.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Robert Campbell, Jr.**

Mitigating Factors: The Respondent has no history prior disciplinary action or any prior complaints filed against him during the licensure period.

The complainant employer waited 16 months to file the complaint with this Board against the Respondent.

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation:** The complaint should be placed in a litigation monitoring status until the civil case is resolved or concluded.

**Board Decision: DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING**

**New Information:**

**New Board Decision: Place in Litigation Monitoring status.**

**8. 2019055801**

**First Licensed: 01/07/2014**

**Expiration: 01/31/2020**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #374053**

A complaint was filed against the Respondent by the former employer. The employer claims the Respondent lied about working in an "engineering firm," copied hundreds of confidential files and proprietary information to an external drive and loaded them onto the new employers' computer system, conspired with other former and soon to be former employees to extract other proprietary information, stole customer drawings from the complainant employer, changed the login credentials for the complainant employer's auto

desk vault workgroup which gives access to the complainant employers' computer systems from the new employers system and locking out complainant employer from vault server, used photos of the complainant employer tests to mark the Respondent's LinkedIn account, stole vendor pricing files, stole job invoicing logs for engineering and testing projects going back seven years, wiped a laptop clean and reset it to factory settings, and destroying company property. The complainant employer had to hire a third-party forensic IT professional to restore the laptop and to show file paths to confirm all computer activity engaged in by the Respondent. The IT professional confirmed that information was transferred to the new competitor employers' computers. The complainant employer has filed a civil suit against the Respondent for these actions.

The Respondent provided a five-page detailed response and stated that the complainant employer misrepresented facts and circumstances surrounding the departure of the Respondent. The Respondent stated all licensed engineers working in the Memphis, Tennessee office of the complainant employer resigned in March 2018. The Respondent stated that the complainant employer manager that filed the complaint made it a "miserable work environment" for all employees. The complainant employer had legal proceedings instituted against his new employer, also a former employee of the complainant employer's firm and the Respondent. The civil lawsuit filed against them alleges conspiracy by the new employer by taking confidential information to be used to obtain a competitive advantage against the complainant employer. Also, it was routine for the "[m]y documents" folder to be routinely backed up to the Respondent's laptops while they were working for the employer. Also, because of the lawsuit and the court ordered IT audit of whether or not there was confidential information, etc., the Respondent and the new employer agreed to voluntarily delete certain documents. The Respondent stated the lawsuit was baseless and malicious. The complainant employer has been unable to prove any confidential information was stolen. In fact, the parties had settled the matter, but now the complainant employer is demanding the payment of \$31,000 for the costs associated with the IT audit ordered by the court. The Respondent has refused to settle the case and rejected the offer to pay \$31,000 to the complainant employer. The Respondent provided a detailed response to each allegation by the complainant employer and there is nothing to substantiate or corroborate the allegations in the complaint. There was no proof of any confidential documents being stolen and the IT expert confirmed the documents were not stolen. Also, there were no documents on the laptops that were deemed to be confidential information. The Respondent also provided letters from his attorney confirming many of the facts and detailed responses made by the Respondent. The Respondent stated the complainant employer manager has a vendetta against certain former employees.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Ricky Bursi.**

Mitigating Factors: The Respondent has no history prior disciplinary action or any prior complaints filed against him during his engineering career.

The complainant employer waited 16 months to file the complaint with this Board against the Respondent.

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation:** The complaint should be placed in a litigation monitoring status until the civil case is resolved or concluded.

**Board Decision:** DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING

**New Information:**

**New Board Decision:** **Place in Litigation Monitoring status.**

9. 2019027861

**Unlicensed**

**Type of License: Architect**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #1289136**

Respondent and Respondent firm engaged in providing services as an unlicensed architectural/engineer firm, architect and engineer. Complainant stated that the Respondent provided two estimates for proposed projects with the totals exceeding \$25,000. An investigation was conducted by the Department and the Respondent was non-cooperative, however, admitted to the Investigator that the Respondent was unlicensed.

**This complaint was sent to the Investigations Division, Department of Commerce & Insurance for an investigation.**

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Brian Tibbs**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors: Respondent refused to cooperate with our investigation.

**Recommendation:** Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,000 for unlicensed practice for the individual and the firm by informal settlement by Consent Order and authorization to file a formal contested case proceeding against the Respondent.

**Board Decision:** DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING/CEAST AND DESIST ORDER

**New Information:**

**New Board Decision:** **Set Formal Hearing**

**10. 2019046431**

**First Licensed: 12/18/2015**  
**Expiration: 12/31/2019**  
**Type of License: Interior Designer**  
**History (5 yrs.): None.**  
**Entity #1119094**

Complaint filed by an interior design firm against an employee who began working for a new employer and used pictures of work done by the Complainant architectural firm's on the new employer's website without giving proper credit for work or proper credit for work to the firm and/or explanation of responsibilities, exaggeration of responsibilities, and use of photography without permission/license. The Complainant claims the Respondent only worked on projects indirectly while employed with the Complainant and the role was indirect because the Respondent was a supervisor of the employees doing the actual design, technical and project management. The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent prior to filing the complaint.

The Respondent provided a response and stated all projects and photographs were removed from the current employer's website and all computing equipment has been returned to the Complainant, as requested in the cease and desist letter. The Respondent stated this was a misunderstanding and the Respondent's understanding was that the Respondent would continue to work with the Complainant architectural firm as a consultant. The Respondent stated there were no stipulations or limitations imposed by the Complainant after leaving the firm and during the period the Respondent was consulting for them and understood that the Respondent was free to pursue other contract opportunities. The Respondent claims the projects listed on the new employer's website were approved by the Complainant's Communications Manager.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Frank Wagster.**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close upon issuance of a letter of caution to the Respondent for potential violations of Rules 0120-04-.10(4) (not engage in any form of false or misleading advertising) and 0120-.04-.10(5)(not use photographs or specifications of the project without the express permission of the client), 0120-.04-.10(11) (not misrepresent or exaggerate the registrant's degree or responsibility in or for the subject matter of present or prior assignments).

Board Decision: DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING

**New Information: Board Member Susan Ballard should recuse herself from a vote for this complaint because she was contacted by a party.**

**New Board Decision: Send Letter of Caution and Respondent must take the laws and rules exam.**

**11. 201905680**

**First Licensed: N/A**

**Expiration: N/A**

**Type of License: Engineering Firm**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #380168**

Complaint filed against the Respondent for damage caused to homeowner's foundation that was not properly disclosed by Respondent structural engineering company to the Complainant. The Complainant purchased the home and was told to get a structural engineering firm to check the foundation. The Respondent issued a report and stated there was nothing to be concerned about and stated the only thing necessary was to remove the tree in front of the house that was causing the basement wall under the office to bow. When the complainant got a quote, the Complainant was told the same company had been there before and there was a report by the Respondent issued a month prior to when the Complainant purchased the home and the report was much more extensive and had substantially more information, including that it would cost much more than the \$4,000 for the installation of the steel piers to correct the problem with the basement wall. The Respondent issued a prior report just one month prior and never shared the more detailed report with the Complainant. Upon obtaining the quote or the structural repairs, it was going to cost the Complainant \$30,000 to fix the foundation.

The Respondent provided a response and stated the Complainant was informed of the problems with the foundation in the report that was issued. The report clearly identified that there were problems with the foundation walls and they were failing due to extensive lateral pressure being applied to the walls. The report also stated there was water intrusion in the crawlspace area that it was affecting the elevation of the interior piers. The Respondent stated that the Complainant was not told it was a solid home and there is no reference to a tree or installation of steel piers. The Respondent does not provide estimates for the cost of repairs and directs all clients to contact a licensed general contractor to obtain an estimate for the work recommended in a report. The Respondent stated that if there was any mention of cost, it would have been clearly stated in the report as a range of potential cost. According to the Respondent, the allegation concerning another prior report being issued by the Respondent was misconstrued by the Complainant because the Respondent discussed this with the Complainant and explained that a prior report was issued by the Respondent firm, however, it was by a different engineers. Both reports identified the foundation walls were failing and there was

movement and settlement along the interior piers. The first report included a different scope of work and referenced floor levelness. The Respondent was not asked to evaluate the doors and separate of floors by the Complainant and these conditions may not have existed at the time of the inspection in June 2017. Also, the Respondent could not share the previous report with the Complainant because their contract for professional services includes a confidentiality clause that prevents them from sharing the information from a previous site visit and report without written permission from our prior client. Also, the scope of work for the prior client rendered by a different professional engineer was not the exact same as for the Complainant because it included inspecting the foundation for structural integrity and checking the floor for any sloping. The Respondent stated the scope of work with the Complainant was clearly set forth in the contract and only included verifying piers in crawlspace being structurally sound, feasibility of turning garage into basement and adding garage to the back of the home and lastly, verifying whether two walls were not load bearing walls.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Stephen King.**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING

**New Information:**

**New Board Decision: Close.**

## **12. 2019038131**

**First Licensed: 01/01/1993**

**Expiration: 06/30/2018**

**Type of License: Professional Architect**

**History (5 yrs.): None.**

**Entity #7875**

The Respondent self-reported practicing architecture on an expired license. The Respondent explained that the Respondent was not aware his licensed expired until the Respondent attempted to access the State Fire Marshal portal and post a project.

**This complaint was reviewed by Board Member Frank Wagster.**

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported.  
No prior disciplinary action  
Violation was inadvertent  
No hazards to the health, safety of welfare of the public.

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 for practicing on an expired license due to mitigating factors. Respondent is also to take and pass the laws and rules examination. Authorize formal hearing if civil penalty and exam requirements are not met.**

Board Decision: Defer to August 2019 meeting.

**New Information: The Respondent's registration expired on September 28, 2018 and was renewed on April 11, 2019. During the period the Respondent was unlicensed, the Respondent signed two projects while the license was expired. One project was an architectural portion on January 4, 2019 and the second project was for mechanical renovations and the architectural portion dealt with interior changes to the server room and other miscellaneous changes and it was signed on July 12, 2018. The primary function in both projects was the coordination of structural, mechanical, electrical and fire protection engineering along with partitions, ceilings, and miscellaneous interior changes.**

**Board Decision: DEFER TO OCTOBER MEETING**

**New Information:**

**New Board Decision: Authorize a civil penalty in the amount of \$500 for practicing on an expired license due to mitigating factors. Respondent is also to take and pass the laws and rules examination. Authorize formal hearing if civil penalty and exam requirements are not met.**

Break 10:40-10:55 a.m.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### *Sunset Hearing*

Ms. Gumucio and Mr. Parker attended the Sunset Hearing and reported that the Board has been given six (6) more years to function.

### *Complaint Data (attached)*

Motion was made by Mr. Wagster and seconded by Ms. Ballard to close the complaints as presented.

### *Licensing Data (attached)*

Licensing data was presented for informational purposes.

### *Financial Data (attached)*

Financial data was presented for informational purposes.

### *2020 Proposed Travel*

Ms. Gumucio requested to be provided with 2020 dates of national council meetings.

### *2020 Meeting Dates (attached)*

Motion was made by Mr. Tibbs and seconded by Ms. Ballard to accept the Board meeting dates as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

### *Application/Examination Deadline Dates (attached)*

Application/examination deadline dates were accepted by consensus.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### *Definitions Committee*

The Definitions Committee, through Ms. Ware, reported that definitions for the practice of interior designing and for landscape architecture will be presented at the December meeting. The definitions for architecture will be presented at the June meeting.

### *Landscape Architect Committee*

The Landscape Architect Committee, through Mr. Parker, reported topics discussed at the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) meeting in San Diego. The committee continues to seek flexibility in licensing.



### *Architect Committee*

The Architect Committee, through Mr. Wagster, reported that the architects will adhere to the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) requirements to disallow degrees not accredited by National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). They are also waiting for NCARB to finish writing their definitions for the practice of architecture.

### *Interior Design Committee*

The Interior Design Committee, through Ms. Ballard, requests that a letter be sent to registrants asking them not to use the title "Interior Architect."

### *Engineering Committee*

The Engineer Committee, through Mr. Hethcoat, reported that it discussed the following:

- Definitions of engineering;
- Whether to accept technology degrees for licensure and asked staff to question states that accept technology degrees about their requirements;
- Whether a Master's degree in engineering without the under graduate degree being in engineering should be acceptable for licensure;
- Topics for discussion with the Deans.

### *Grants Committee*

The Grants Committee, through Ms. Ballard, would like feedback from the Deans regarding the Meeting with the Deans which was held on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. She reported that the Committee approved expenditures requested from the schools and that a \$50,000 increase in the Grant Fund has been requested.

Mr. Wagster moved to approve the line item expenditures as requested. The full Board passed the motion unanimously.

### *Continuing Education Committee*

The Continuing Education Committee, through Mr. Wagster, reported that there is a proposed rule that requires architects to have all required continuing education (CE) hours to be related to Health, Safety, and Welfare beginning 2021. No carryover hours will be allowed. There are no changes to the CE requirements for the other professions.

### *Law and Rules/Policies Committee*

The Law and Rules/Policies Committee, through Mr. Thompson, stated that all proposed rules are making their way through the process.

*Financial Committee*

The Financial Committee, through Mr. Parker, moved that the Grants Fund be increased by \$50,000. The motion passed unanimously.

Staff will evaluate the possibility of Board Retreats being held at State Parks.

*Outreach Committee*

Outreach Committee, through Mr. King, reported that the Committee wishes to revive the newsletter.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no other business, Mr. Parker adjourned the meeting at 12:30pm.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Minutes of August 8, 2019 meeting

Financial Data

Complaint Data

Licensing Data

Financial Data

2020 Board Meeting Dates

2020 Application/examination deadline dates