



**TENNESSEE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING EXAMINERS  
500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243  
615.741.2241**

Board Meeting Minutes for December 4, 2025  
First Floor Conference Room 1-A  
Davy Crockett Tower

Tennessee Board of Architectural and Engineering Examiners met on December 4, 2025, and the following business was transacted:

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alton Hethcoat, Blair Parker, Frank Wagster, Brian Tibbs, Melanie Doss, Jason Carder, Dr. Ashraf Elsayed, Jeff Nalley, Philip Lim, James Collins, Eddie Jett

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** Rick Thompson

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Glenn Kopchak (virtual), Laura Martin, Ariel Carter, Melanie Holcomb, Alexandria Griffey, Tammy Roehrich, Ashley Byrd

## **COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

### **ENGINEER COMMITTEE**

#### **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

James Collins called the meeting to order at 9:00 am, and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

#### **FRESH START REVIEW**

The Committee agreed that Michael Poe's felony conviction did not require a FRESH Start review as it was not directly related to the profession. It was the recommendation of the Committee that he be permitted to continue in the application process.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

Grants are awarded each year which allow for exam fee reimbursement for those students who take the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) Exam. To encourage licensure among professors, Jason Carder would like to explore the possibility of that reimbursement extending to professors as well.

## **LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT COMMITTEE**

### **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Blair Parker called the meeting to order at 9:15 am, and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

### **CLARB UNIFORM STANDARD**

The Committee reviewed the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) Uniform Standard which provides alternative pathways to licensure. Statute only permits one pathway to licensure and currently does not recognize the other alternative pathways. As a result, it was determined that there would need to be a change in statute recognizing the pathways identified in the CLARB Uniform Standard to be adopted.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Blair Parker introduced the possibility that the City of Chattanooga may soon amend their city zoning ordinance by removing the requirement that a licensed landscape architect prepare and stamp landscape designs in the city. The board will monitor this development and handle any complaints received strictly within the limits defined by rule and statute.

## **BOARD MEETING**

### **CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / NOTICE OF MEETING**

Frank Wagster called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Director Glenn Kopchak acknowledged the passing of former board member Mr. Rob Barrick and read his obituary into the record. A moment of silence was observed.

### **AGENDA**

Brian Tibbs made a motion to approve the agenda. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

### **OCTOBER MINUTES**

Jason Carder made a motion to adopt the October minutes. This was seconded by Brian Tibbs. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

### **PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORTS**

Charles Schneider, the American Society of Landscape Architects, TN Section, (ASLA-TN), reported updates to include the first strategic planning session that identified several issues of concerns that will be addressed in the upcoming year. Their annual Spring conference will be held in April.

Suzanne Herron, President of American Society of Civil Engineers, TN Section, (ASCE-TN), reported updates to include the TN Section Annual Meeting that will be held on February 13, 2026, at the Smyrna Event Center. Suzanne Herron invited a representative from the Board to address those in attendance.

Allie Bierman, representing American Society of Interior Designers (ASID) and International Interior Design Association (IIDA), provided a summary of previous meetings that were held in October and November. Allie Bierman announced updates for the organizations to include upcoming monthly meetings and events. ASID and IIDA also have a joint symposium in March 2026.

Ashley Cates, Executive Vice President of the American Institute of Architects (AIA-TN), provided updates regarding the previous legislative session. Additionally, Ms. Cates announced that the organization will collaborate with the board to send out license renewal and continuing education information to remind members of renewal requirements.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **Budget Report**

Director Kopchak presented the financial report for July – September 2025, noting technology and administrative cost-back charges related to Strategic Technology Solutions (STS) support for Reg Access/CORE, annual membership dues, travel, postal charges, and annual Division of Accounts (DOA) and Central Procurement Office (CPO) charges.

### **Comity Application Review Policy**

James Collins made a motion to accept proposed changes to Section 3 which allow for Executive Director review of reapplications expired for more than five (5) years that meet Section 1 criteria, pursuant to the statute and rules. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

### **Grant Guidelines**

Alton Hethcoat made a motion to amend grant guidelines to include eligibility for ETAC/ABET accredited programs. This was seconded by Philip Lim. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

### **Conference Travel**

Director Glenn Kopchak reviewed the 2026 conference travel schedule and reiterated that the staff is only tracking those conferences listed. He emphasized that any additional conference travel will need to be noticed well enough in advance to allow for proper preauthorization.

### **CIDQ Annual Meeting Update**

Board members Melanie Doss and Frank Wagster provided updates from the CIDQ annual meeting which included a discussion about neuro-inclusive workplace designs, legislative developments in several states, and collaborative licensing discussions across design professions.

## **LEGAL**

**Legal Report** (presented by Aerial Carter)

### **1. 2025013011 (AC)**

**First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)**

**Expiration: N/A**

**Type of License: Professional Architect**

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

An anonymous complaint was submitted against the Respondent for unlicensed activity. The Complainant alleged that the Respondent is listed on a construction company's website with the title "architectural designer." There was also an article. They stated that the title implied that the Respondent was a licensed Architect but doesn't appear in the database.

The Respondent is unlicensed and stated that they have never claimed to be a licensed Architect. They stated that they have never received any personal monetary compensation for architectural services. The title "architectural designer" was provided by the company. Furthermore, they stated that a licensed Architect in the office is responsible for all the architectural work submitted by the office.

Counsel reviewed the website of the company the Respondent works for, a digital copy of the article that was mentioned in the complaint, and the Respondent's school's website.

Based on the information provided, the company makes a clear distinction between Architects and Architectural Designers. The projects are listed and are categorized based on the type of work done ex. Design-Build, Commercial, Institutional, Healthcare, etc. One of the projects that the Respondent worked on was on the company website labeled "design build." The company is listed as the architect on the project and the link directs users to a page entitled "meet the team." The team contains various employees with different titles, such as Director of Architecture & Design, Architect, Architectural Designer, Architectural Design Tech, Interior Design, Marketing & Design Assistant

This project was also mentioned in an article and referenced by the Complainant. The project was for a television station and was constructed in Virginia. The article emphasized the Respondent's input related to design, and that the work was completed by local professionals. The article mentioned the school from which the Respondent graduated. Counsel reviewed the school website. It's an international school that offers the following academic programs: Architecture, Interior Design, Product Design, Master's in Advanced Architectural Design, and Master's in Urban Planning. The Architectural Design program doesn't advertise a career as a licensed Architect.

The information was also reviewed by a board member, who agreed that the contractor made a clear distinction between a registered architect and the Respondent.

Based on all the information, it is believed that the Respondent meets the exemption under Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-102 and doesn't require registration because the Respondent's title doesn't give the impression that they are engaged in architectural services. Therefore, Counsel recommends that this matter be closed.

**Reviewed by Board member: Brian Tibbs**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Close.**

**Board Decision:** Concur.

**2. 2025010301 (AC)**

**First Licensed: 06/14/2019**

**Expiration: 06/30/2023**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

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

The complaint was administratively opened against the Respondent after they submitted a reapplication and were asked if they worked in the State of Tennessee while their license was expired, and answered "yes." The Respondent's license expired on July 1, 2023, and was reinstated on May 20, 2025.

The Respondent stated that they unintentionally let their license expire in 2023. The lapse happened after the Respondent changed jobs but failed to update their email address with the Tennessee Board of Architects and Engineers, so they didn't receive their renewal notice. The initial response didn't include the projects they worked on, so additional information was requested. The Respondent was asked to provide a detailed list of the projects they worked on (i.e., number of projects, types of projects, and their role in each one) and any supporting documentation they had.

The Respondent submitted an Excel sheet which showed that they worked on thirty-five (35) projects while unlicensed in Tennessee from 2023 to 2025. They stated that their role in all of the projects was as a design engineer for either steel-to-steel connections or steel stairs and rails.

This matter was reviewed by a board member, and it was noted that although there were quite a few jobs listed, the role appeared to be a delegated engineer and not an Engineer of Record for the various projects. It was also mentioned that a good portion of the project listing deals with life safety, which is paramount to the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Based on the information provided, Counsel recommends that the Respondent be assessed a civil penalty of One Hundred and Fifty Dollars per project they worked on (Total Civil Penalty \$5,250.00); Take and Pass the Laws and Rules Exam

**Reviewed by Board member:** Ed Jett

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors: Projects involved public health and safety

**Recommendation:** Assess a Civil Penalty of One Hundred and Fifty Dollars per project that the Respondent worked on while unlicensed, in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-105(b)(1), for a total Civil Penalty \$5,250.00, and require the Respondent to take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.

**Board Decision:** Concur.

**3. 2025010451 (AC)**

**First Licensed: 01/13/2003**

**Expiration: 01/31/2023**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

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

The complaint was administratively opened against the Respondent after they submitted a reapplication and were asked if they worked in the State of Tennessee while their license was expired, and answered "yes." The Respondent's license expired from August 1, 2023, to April 22, 2025.

The Respondent stated that during the timeframe that their license was expired, their duties were administrative in nature. They worked as the vice president in the Engineering department for their local airport authority. They stated that their responsibilities included overseeing the solicitation, contracting, and completion of various construction projects. Their job was to manage internal staff and manage the contracts to ensure that the projects are delivered within the airport's scope, schedule, and budget. The Respondent stated that at no point did they conduct any engineering calculations or stamp any drawings.

The initial response didn't include the projects they worked on, so additional information was requested. The Respondent was asked to provide a detailed list of the projects they worked on (i.e., number of projects, types of projects, and their role in each one) and any supporting documentation they had. The Respondent provided a list of eight (8) projects, where they provided administrative oversight for the contract and project management.

This matter was reviewed by a board member. It was noted that the Respondent represented themselves as a professional engineer to the airport board in a presentation, in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-101. Under Tenn. Comp. Rules and Reg. 0120-01-.10(2)(b), the management of projects and engineering activities is considered an essential skill showing progressive experience in becoming an Engineer. It is believed that the Respondent's assertion that they acted in a managerial position doesn't release them from the requirement to be properly registered. Furthermore, the projects had a direct impact on the general public and should be considered public works, so the "industrial exemption" does not apply.

Based on the information provided, Counsel recommends that the Respondent be assessed a civil penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) per year that the Respondent represented themselves as an Engineer to the airport board without valid registration (a total of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00)), in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-102(a); Assess a civil penalty of Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) per project they worked on, in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. 62-2-105(b) and Tenn. Comp. Rules and Reg. 0120-01-.25(6)(c); Require the Respondent to Take and Pass the Laws and Rules Exam.

**Reviewed by Board member: James Collins**

Mitigating Factors: Self-report

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Assess a Total Civil Penalty of Three Thousand Dollars (\$3,000.00) with the following breakdown:**

**One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) (or Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) per year that the Respondent was unlicensed) against the Respondent for representing themselves as an Engineer to the airport board without valid registration from 2023 to 2025, in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-102(a);**

**Assess a Civil Penalty of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000.00) (or Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) per project they worked on) in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. 62-2-105(b) and Tenn. Comp. Rules and Reg. 0120-01-.25(6)(c); and**

**Require the Respondent to take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.**

**Board Decision: Assess a Total Civil Penalty of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000.00) with the following breakdown:**

**One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) (or Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) per year that the Respondent was unlicensed) against the Respondent for representing themselves as an Engineer to the airport board without valid registration from 2023 to 2025, in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-102(a);**

**Assess a Civil Penalty of Four Thousand Dollars (\$4,000.00) (or Five Hundred Dollars (500.00) per project they worked on) in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. 62-2-105(b) and Tenn. Comp. Rules and Reg. 0120-01-.25(6)(c); and**

**Require the Respondent to take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.**

**4. 2024068391 (AC)**

**First Licensed: 03/24/2016**

**Expiration: 12/31/2026**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

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

The complaint was administratively opened against the Respondent after they submitted a reapplication and were asked if they worked in the State of Tennessee while their license was expired, and answered "yes." The Respondent's license was expired from April 1, 2024, to December 30, 2024.

The Respondent stated that they unknowingly engaged in unlicensed activity by practicing engineering while their license was expired. They believed that their license expired on December 31, 2024. They stated that they are licensed in six (6) states and had the wrong renewal date for Tennessee.

The initial response didn't include the projects they worked on, so additional information was requested. The Respondent was asked to provide a detailed list of the projects they worked on (i.e., number of projects, types of projects, and their role in each one) and any supporting documentation they had. The Respondent provided designs, plans, and revisions for two (2) projects. The first project involved converting a natural grass football field and a natural grass practice soccer field to artificial turf. The second project, was a larger redevelopment of an existing park complex of baseball and softball fields.

This matter was reviewed by a board member, and it was determined that some of the plans submitted by the Respondent are expected components of any design, and revisions should not be considered a "new" design.

Based on the information provided, Counsel recommends that the Respondent be assessed a civil penalty of a total of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) (or Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.000 per project) and require the Respondent to take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.

**Reviewed by Board member: Alton Hethcoat**

Mitigating Factors: Self-report

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Assess a civil penalty of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) (or Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.000 per project) and require the Respondent to take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.**

**Board Decision: Concur.**

**5. 2025000691 (AC)  
First Licensed: 02/03/2020  
Expiration: 02/29/2024  
Type of License: Professional Engineer  
History (5 yrs.): None.**

The complaint was administratively opened against the Respondent after they submitted a reapplication and were asked if they worked in the State of Tennessee while their license was expired, and answered "yes." The Respondent's license expired from August 29, 2024, to June 30, 2025.

The initial response didn't include the projects they worked on, so additional information was requested. The Respondent was asked to provide a detailed list of the projects they worked on (i.e., number of projects, types of projects, and their role in each one) and any supporting documentation they had.

The Respondent stated that they worked on two (2) projects from August 29, 2024, to June 30, 2025. They didn't have any documents for the projects they worked on and stated they were only on-site one day for each of the jobs. They said during the first project, they collected energy measurements for one

SPT hammer on a Geotechnical Drill Rig. In the second project, they monitored pressure and displacement measurements for one compression, one tension, and one lateral static load test.

Based on the information provided, Counsel recommends that the Respondent be assessed a total civil penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) (or Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) per violation) and take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.

Civil Penalty of Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) for collecting energy measurements for the SPT hammer on a Geotechnical Drill and providing a written summary of the test results.

Civil Penalty of Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) for collecting energy measurements for monitoring pressure and displacement measurements for one compression, one tension, and one lateral static load test, and providing a written summary of the test results.

**Reviewed by Board member: Ed Jett**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

**Recommendation: Assess a total civil penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) (or Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) for collecting energy measurements for the SPT hammer on a Geotechnical Drill and providing a written summary of the test results; Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250.00) for collecting energy measurements for monitoring pressure and displacement measurements for one compression, one tension, and one lateral static load test and providing a written summary of the test results), and Require the Respondent to take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.**

**Board Decision: Concur.**

## **RE-PRESENTATION**

### **6. 2024067501 (AC)**

**First Licensed: 09/09/2010**

**Expiration: 09/30/2026**

**Type of License: Professional Engineer**

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

This complaint was administratively opened by the Board. The Respondent was selected for a routine audit.

On October 30, 2024, the Respondent was informed that they had thirty (30) days to support the continuing education claimed for their 2022- 2024 renewal period. The Respondent didn't comply with the audit. On January 8, 2025, the complaint was opened, and Respondent was sent an offer to resolve the matter via an agreed citation. The Respondent did not provide a response, and the matter was referred to legal on February 11, 2025. To date, a response has not been received from the Respondent.

Registrants are required to maintain continuing education records for a period of four (4) years and provide the records to the Board for audit verification purposes within thirty (30) days of the Board's request. Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.02(4). Additionally, a registrant may be deemed by the board to be guilty of misconduct if they fail to respond to the Board's requests and investigations within thirty (30) days of the mailing of communications, unless an earlier response is specified. Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.07 (5)(c).

Here, the Respondent didn't provide proof of their continued education for the audit period requested, in violation of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.02(4). The Respondent also failed to provide a response to the complaint, in violation of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.07 (5)(c).

It is recommended that the Respondent be assessed a Civil Penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for failing to comply with the requirements of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.02(4); Assess a Civil Penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for failing to comply with the requirements of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.07 (5)(c); Require the Respondent to submit the record of their education that was requested in the audit within thirty (30) days of receiving the consent order; and Require the Respondent to take and pass the Rules and Laws exam.

**Reviewed by Board member: Ed Jett**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for failing to comply with the requirements of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.02(4); Assess a Civil Penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for failing to comply with the requirements of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.07 (5)(c); Require the Respondent to submit the record of their education that was requested in the audit within thirty (30) days of receiving the consent order; and Require the Respondent to take and pass the Rules and Laws exam.

Board Decision: Concur.

**New Information:** The Respondent contacted previous counsel about the Consent Order. The Respondent stated that they were unable to complete the Rules and Laws exam or complete any continuing education classes because they had no time outside of work hours, due to family health issues.

The Respondent claimed that they never performed work in Tennessee. However, the Respondent stated that they were willing to pay the civil penalty of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) and have their license placed in "inactive" status in lieu of satisfying the other requirements.

**New Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for failing to comply with the requirements of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.02(4); Assess a Civil Penalty of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for failing to comply with the requirements of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.07 (5)(c) and Require the Respondent to change their license status from "active"**

to “retired” within ten (10) days of signing the consent order. If the Respondent fails to comply, it is recommended that the previous recommendation be reinstated.

**New Board Decision: Concur.**

**7. 2023025121 (AC)**

**First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)**

**Expiration: N/A**

**Type of License: Engineering Firm**

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

Complainant alleges that Respondent is advertising “in-house engineering” on its website and LinkedIn profile. Respondent is not registered as an engineering firm.

Respondent claims they do not self-perform engineering but instead partner with engineers and firms to perform the services. Respondent claims they do have electrical engineers on their payroll, but do not design or stamp drawings. The website states “[Respondent] partners with elite engineers to provide owners...”

After review of the website, the Services Offered page states as follows: “Each and every electrical installation is fully staffed with [Respondent’s] personnel. We can offer you valuable engineering expertise if necessary, ensuring a cost-effective, common-sense approach.”

Under Experience it states: “[Respondent] has more than 20 years of averaged experience from designing to engineering and complete installation of electrical systems. Our personnel of managers, electricians, electrical engineers, and support are all outstanding in their respective fields.”

Reviewed by Board member: Rob Barrick

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Authorize a civil penalty of \$1,000.00 by Consent Order and formal charges for advertising engineering services without being registered.

Board Decision: Authorize a civil penalty of \$2,000.00 by Consent Order and formal charges for advertising engineering services without being registered, and have Respondent remove all “Engineering” designations from their website.

**New Information:** Counsel spoke with the Respondent’s attorney, who proposed a resolution for this matter. They stated that one of the owners of the firm (Firm 1) is a registered engineer and runs a

different engineering firm (Firm 2). They stated that the firms have the same address. They assert that since the two businesses share a physical location, the violation should be for failing to submit the proper disclosure form and proposed that the firm pay a civil penalty of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00).

Counsel reviewed multiple resources to confirm ownership/ registration and found the following information.

Firm 2's website didn't have the owner officially listed under any of the tabs, only an email address.

The listed owner for Firm 2 is connected to a licensed engineer. Firm 1's website had an owner with the same name.

In CORE, the owner's name is listed with a variation of the licensed engineer. For example, the name John Smith on Firm 1's website versus Johnathan Smith in CORE.

**Counsel also reviewed the Tennessee Secretary of State's website** to confirm ownership of the firms. Firm 1 shows a person with a different first name and middle initial (ex: Joe A. Smith) as the registered agent. Firm 2 has the same names found in CORE.

Under Tenn. Comp R. and Regs 0120-06-.04., an officer or principal may be in responsible charge of more than one firm only if the firms are at the same physical location.

Here, although the websites have the same address listed, there's nothing connecting them on CORE or either website. Therefore, Counsel believes that an appropriate violation would be T. C. A. § 62-2-601(b). It states that "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." (emphasis added).

Based on the information, the two owners may be related and using their names interchangeably. The concern is still that Firm 1 isn't connected to a registered engineer, nor was there any indication that it was in business with Firm 2. This matter was set for a hearing; however, with the proposed resolution from the Respondent's attorney, Counsel recommends this matter be presented to the Board so they can determine how they'd like to proceed.

### **New Recommendation: Discuss**

**New Board Decision: Authorize a civil penalty of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) for failing to submit the proper disclosure form, in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-601(b) and require Respondent to submit the proper firm disclosure form within thirty (30) days of signing the consent order.**

### **Open Meetings and Public Records**

Alton Hethcoat made a motion to defer to the February 2026 meeting. This was seconded by Jason Carder. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### **Engineer Committee**

Please see summary provided above.

#### **Landscape Architect Committee**

Please see summary provided above.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Board members discussed the following: outreach to aid in the prevention of license lapses, potential newsletters for additional communication with registrants, reviewing and potentially repealing the bylaws, and forming a committee to update the Reference Manual.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD RELATED TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were no comments from the public.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Frank Wagster adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.