



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

Board Meeting Minutes for June 4, 2026
First Floor Conference Room 1-A
Davy Crockett Tower

Tennessee Board of Architectural and Engineering Examiners met on June 4, 2026, and the following business was transacted:

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Eddie Jett

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Glenn Kopchak, Laura Martin, Ariel Carter, Joseph Kennedy, Melanie Holcomb, Alexandria Griffey, Tammy Roehrich, Ashley Byrd, Megan Maleski

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.

APPLICATION REVIEW

Application #1:

Alton Hethcoat made a motion to deny Mr. Crook's request to proceed with the application based on the untruthful response about license revocations or suspensions in other states. This was seconded by Jason Carder. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Application #2:

Staff were directed to contact Mr. Ramirez and request supporting evidence showing whether, during the time described as technician experience, the applicant worked with registered engineers or otherwise gained qualifying progressive engineering experience.

NEW BUSINESS

Philip Lim raised a process issue involving applicants who were previously denied for insufficient experience and later reapply. He noted that an applicant may mistakenly answer “No” to a question asking whether registration had ever been denied because the applicant may interpret the question as referring only to disciplinary denials.

Staff discussed clarifying future correspondence so applicants understand that all prior denials, including denials for insufficient experience, should be disclosed and explained.

BYLAWS COMMITTEE

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / NOTICE OF MEETING

James Collins called the meeting to order at 9:30 am and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

REVIEW

The Committee reviewed proposed amendments to the Board Bylaws, to include those related to the upcoming consolidation with land surveyors.

James Collins agreed to prepare additional revisions for further review at the August meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business was presented.

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 requested that “NCEES Southern Zone Interim Meeting Update” be added to the agenda.

AGENDA

Jason Carder made a motion to approve the agenda with an amendment to add “NCEES Southern Zone Interim Meeting Update” after the “LS Wall Certificates and Seals” agenda item. This was seconded by Blair Parker. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

APRIL MINUTES

Alton Hethcoat made a motion to adopt the April minutes. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORTS

Kasey Anderson, representing ACEC Tennessee and the Tennessee Society of Professional Engineers, reported that ACEC National had adopted a new strategic plan that includes licensure protection as one of its top priorities. She stated that the effort is focused on defending state-based licensure structures, elevating the value of the engineering profession, and responding to threats to the engineering role in protecting the public.

Suzanne Heron, appearing virtually for ASCE, thanked the Board representatives for speaking at the Tennessee section meeting in February and noted that their discussion had led to productive engagement with Tennessee Tech. Suzanne Herron announced that the next Tennessee section meeting is scheduled for February 11–12, 2027, and expressed her hope to arrange another lunch presentation. She also reported that ASCE will begin the Tennessee infrastructure report card process in the fall, with the grading phase expected to take approximately one year.

Anita Ryan, President of ASID Tennessee and a professional member of IIDA Tennessee, provided a joint report for ASID Tennessee and IIDA Tennessee. She thanked the Board members for their individual support and encouragement during recent legislative activity and reported that the title act and registration remained in place following legislative amendments.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Budget Report

Director Kopchak presented the financial report for March, noting an expense under “Other” was attributable to the remaining grant payment that was delayed due to a vendor maintenance issue that was resolved.

LS Wall Certificates & Seals

Director Glenn Kopchak reported that following the upcoming consolidation, land surveyor wall certificates would follow the Board’s existing certificate format.

Rick Thompson made a motion to approve the proposed Board seal that received majority vote from the members that participated in a prior survey. This was seconded by Melanie Doss. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

NCEES Southern Zone Meeting Update

James Collins provided a summary of the recent NCEES Southern Zone meeting highlighting discussions regarding Upwork and similar platforms. James Collins also reported that many states are operating programs similar to Tennessee’s grants to higher education program, including efforts directed at grade schools, high schools, and colleges to encourage engineering and support licensure exam participation.

Alton Hethcoat stated that Jason Carder and James Collins represented Tennessee well at the meeting and played major roles in presentations.

LEGAL

Legal Report (presented by Laura Martin, Joseph Kennedy, & Aerial Carter)

1. 2025037181 (ADM)

First Licensed: 09/11/2012

Expiration: 09/30/2024

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

This is an administratively opened complaint. During submission of a reapplication, Respondent answered “yes” to the question “Have you practiced your profession in Tennessee by working with the public since your certificate of registration expired? If yes, please provide additional information to the board office.”

Respondent answered the complaint through their attorney (“RA”). In the response, RA states, “[Respondent] admits that he practiced during a time in which his Tennessee P.E. license had, unbeknownst to him, lapsed.” RA provides Respondent first obtained licensure in 2012, has no previous disciplinary complaints, and holds licensure in two (2) additional jurisdictions. RA provides that in September 2024, Respondent went through the process of renewal, submitted payment, but “for an unknown technical reason or complication on his end, his renewal registration was never submitted, and his payment never processed.” RA states Respondent believed his license to be renewed and continued working in Tennessee and the other two (2) additional jurisdictions. Additionally, RA states Respondent provided forensic reviews and reports on fifty-three (53) matters, but this did not include structural drawing, designs, or plans—only forensic investigations containing Respondent’s stamp and signature. Each investigation was reviewed and approved by a supervising professional engineer. Upon discovery of Respondent’s lapsed license, RA states Respondent immediately ceased work and called the Board.

RA provides that, following a review of the Board’s previous decisions, and due to the mitigating circumstances provided in this matter, a significant civil penalty would create a significant financial hardship and outweigh the benefits of ensuring deterrence for what RA classifies as an honest mistake. RA further states that Respondent’s actions were neither reckless nor intentional; upon discovery of the issue, Respondent took immediate action to rectify it; and that Respondent’s work was forensic in nature and not services to the public. Due to these facts and circumstances, RA requests Respondent be assessed a letter of caution and a minimal administrative civil penalty.

Following expert review, which included review of five (5) of Respondent’s completed reports, it appears that Respondent’s reports included assessing structural damage of homes, negating the allegation Respondent only completed forensic reviews. However, due to mitigating circumstances and the Respondent’s proactive self-reporting, Counsel recommends that the Respondent be assessed a Five Thousand Three Hundred Dollar (\$5,300.00) civil penalty for violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-101, but more specifically, Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D), prohibiting use of expired or revoked certificate of registration and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1), practicing or offering to practice engineering in this state. Lastly, Counsel recommends Respondent take and pass the Rules and Law examination within thirty (30) days of receipt of the consent order.

Reviewed by Board member: Dr. Ashraf Elsayed

Mitigating Factors: Respondent answered the complaint, Respondent self-reported the matter to the Board and took steps to rectify, and Respondent has no disciplinary history.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Five Thousand Three Hundred Dollar (\$5,300.00) civil penalty for violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D), and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1). Also, Respondent shall complete and pass the Rules and Laws examination.

Board Decision: Concur.

2. 2025022141 (TH)

First Licensed: 04/10/2003

Expiration: 04/30/2027

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

This is an administratively opened complaint. Respondent is a professional architect. During submission of a reapplication, Respondent answered "yes" to the question "Have you practiced your profession in Tennessee by working with the public since your certificate of registration expired? If yes, please provide additional information to the board office."

Respondent answered the complaint, stating that during the time their license was inactive, they were employed in the capacity of a project manager, but were not the architect listed on any of the projects submitted with Respondent's reinstatement application. Per internal records, Respondent's license expired on April 30, 2019. Respondent did not reinstate their license until April 22, 2025. Therefore, Respondent's license remained expired for six (6) years. Respondent listed nine (9) projects with their reinstatement application from 2019-2024, all occurring during the license lapse. Counsel recommends Respondent be assessed a Nine Thousand Dollar (\$9,000.00) civil penalty for violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-101, but more specifically, Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D), prohibiting use of expired or revoked certificate of registration and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1), practicing or offering to practice architecture in this state. Lastly, Counsel recommends Respondent take and pass the Rules and Law examination within thirty (30) days of receipt of the consent order.

Reviewed by Board member: Rick Thompson

Mitigating Factors: Respondent answered the complaint and self-reported.

Aggravating Factors: Respondent's license lapse was for six (6) years.

Recommendation: Nine Thousand Dollars (\$9,000.00) civil penalty for violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D), and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1). Also, Respondent shall complete

and pass the Rules and Laws examination.

Board Decision: Concur.

3. 2025006031 (TH)

2025037681

First Licensed: 10/23/1990

Expiration: 01/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

2025006031

Complainant is a Tennessee codes department. Respondent is a professional architect. On or about February 3, 2025, Complainant received an application for an eight (8) unit apartment building. Upon review, Complainant determined the plans submitted were incomplete and sent a follow up inquiry via email requesting MP&E's and structural drawings per the requirements for building design outlined in the reference manual. Complainant received a response from Respondent acknowledging understanding of the intent of the application and attached additional sheets and comments.

Respondent answered the complaint stating they did not understand Complainant's contention with the use of the term "apartments" in the title or drawing as this term is not defined in the edition of either the IRC or IBC. Respondent contends Complainant's interpretation of the code is incorrect and does not comport with the intention of the code. Respondent states this is the third time they have designed a version of this project where "apartment" is used and not "duplex" due to the nature of the project. Respondent states all three (3) versions included "schematic" ME&P designs for each unit and were signed and sealed by Respondent as a professional architect. Respondent believes they are competent to design a single-family residential dwelling unit.

Complainant submitted a rebuttal stating Respondent's plans lacked sufficient clarity to indicate the nature and extent of the proposed were referred to as two bedroom apartments by Respondent. Complainant rebuts that Respondent's arguments, specifically that the application submitted for the project indicates the intent was not to originally build duplexes. Complainant further states they are opposed to argumentative nature they encounter with Respondent, and that Respondent has a responsibility to ensure the codes department is provided with adequate information on construction documents and that Respondent and their clients are on the same page. Complainant closes stating they request the Board review the plans for adherence to the rules of professional conduct.

Reviewed by Board member: Rick Thompson

Mitigating Factors: None.

Aggravating Factors: Respondent has previous discipline.

Recommendation: Defer. Respondent shall submit all construction drawings for the subject project. Specifically, Respondent shall submit all structural drawings and structural calculations within thirty (30) days, to be reviewed by Mr. Thompson and an engineering board member

specializing in structural engineering. Following review, the expert reviewers shall review the projects for possible violations of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.03 and Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.04.

Board Decision: Concur.

2025037681

Complainant is a county building official. Respondent is a professional architect. Complainant alleges Respondent has submitted and sealed documents Complainant does not believe meet the standard of care and/or competency licensure requirements. Complainant cites the Board has disciplined Respondent several times, including a complaint submitted through Complainant's office that resulted in an August 2015 hearing. Complainant requests the Board review the project drawings and determine whether Respondent meets the statutory standard of care and is competent to work in the architecture field.

Respondent answered the complaint stating the complaint does not include any drawings, nor indicate which project Respondent has failed to meet the statutory standards of care and competency requirements. Further, Respondent states "I feel this is a personal attack on my professional abilities and disagreements with the departments' mis-interpretation of code requirements from the IRC braced wall designs to IECC perimeter slab insulation installation requirements." Complainant submitted a rebuttal stating this project relates to a "12,000 sf S-1 occupancy, post frame, Type VB construction and Bodyshop" and that Complainant is requesting guidance as to whether the drawings and details provided meet the standard card requirements enforced by the Board.

Recommendation: Defer. Respondent shall submit all construction drawings for the subject project. Specifically, Respondent shall submit all structural drawings and structural calculations within thirty (30) days, to be reviewed by Mr. Thompson and an engineering board member specializing in structural engineering. Following review, the expert reviewers shall review the projects for possible violations of Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.03 and Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0120-02-.04.

Board Decision: Concur.

4. 2025039061 (TH)

First Licensed: 03/26/2008

Expiration: 07/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

This is an administratively opened complaint. Respondent is a professional architect. During submission of a reapplication, Respondent answered "yes" to the question "Have you practiced your profession in Tennessee by working with the public since your certificate of registration expired? If yes, please provide additional information to the board office."

Respondent answered the complaint, stating they reinstated their license as of July 1, 2025, after an expiration date in 2023. Respondent states they did not receive the license notification in 2023 after “the state switched to a new system.” In June of 2025, after an inquiry from Respondent’s bookkeeper on their license fee status, Respondent realized their license expired in 2023 and “had to sign up on the state system which had changed in 2023.” During this time, Respondent states they worked on two (2) projects, a two (2) car garage and a master bedroom. Further, Respondent states the county of the projects does not require plans to be signed and sealed; specifically, the city only reviews and requires a sealed survey with the building setbacks and proposed building footprint noted. Respondent further states these two (2) projects were not stamped and were only for design purposes. Respondent argues that since no seal is required, Respondent did not “practice” architecture but merely provided plans and elevations to the homeowner.

Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(c) states, “A person is construed to practice or offer to practice engineering, architecture or landscape architecture who, by verbal claim, sign, advertisement, letterhead, card or in any other way, represents to be an architect, engineer or landscape architect, with or without qualifying adjective or through the use of some other title that implies the person is an architect, engineer or landscape architect.” Therefore, Counsel finds Respondent is in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105, as Respondent represented themselves to be an architect to their neighbor. Subsequently, Counsel recommends Respondent be assessed a Five Hundred Dollar (\$500.00) civil penalty for violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-101, but more specifically, Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D), prohibiting use of expired or revoked certificate of registration and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1), practicing or offering to practice engineering in this state. Lastly, Counsel recommends Respondent take and pass the Rules and Law examination within thirty (30) days of receipt of the consent order.

Reviewed by Board member: Brian Tibbs

Mitigating Factors: Respondent did not sign and seal the plans for the two (2) projects. Respondent answered the complaint and self-reported.

Aggravating Factors: None.

Recommendation: Five Hundred Dollar (\$500.00) civil penalty for violations of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D), and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1). Also, Respondent shall complete and pass the Rules and Laws examination.

Board Decision: Concur.

5. 2025034921 (KS)

First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Architectural Firm

History (5 yrs.): None.

Complainant alleges that the Respondent is preparing unstamped drawings for multi-family duplexes that are over 5,000 square feet without a license. Pictures of the drawings are attached to the

Complaint. The matter was sent out for investigation by the State's investigator. The state's investigator obtained a sworn statement from the Respondent stating that the Respondent did not prepare the drawings, the drawings were prepared by a third-party company. The ED has opened an administrative Complaint against the third-party company.

Reviewed by Board member: James Collins

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Concur.

6. 2024066591 (TB)

First Licensed: 08/30/2010

Expiration: 09/30/2026

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

Complainant, an attorney from Houston, Texas, alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent by way of a 58-page Fire Risk Assessment document signed by Respondent which Complainant alleges violates the Society of Fire Protection Engineers and National Society of Professional Engineers code of ethics. Complainant alleges that Respondent had made misrepresentations in the industry "regarding the viability and cost of Ignitable Liquid Drainage Floor Assemblies in an apparent effort to dissuade potential consumers from considering [the same] as an alternative to foam suppression systems." Complainant alleged that many of the representations are "factually inaccurate" but also made such representations to benefit Respondent's self interest to secure a contract. Complainant stated that the risk assessment information provided is "replete with examples of [Respondent] misguiding [the company] about the. . . intended prescriptive nature of fire suppression systems for group 1 hangers." Respondent continues to outline such descriptors that, in their view, fall below the nationally set professional standards and ends with a list all 52 jurisdictions (including D.C. and Guam) that this complaint package was sent. As justification for filing the complaint Complainant speculates, "As referenced herein, it is likely that similar representations have been made by [Respondent] to other stakeholders in the industry." Respondent does not provide any additional information regarding these "likely" "similar representations."

Respondent "vehemently denied" the allegations contained in the complaint and explained that Complainant had filed a lawsuit against Respondent on October 30, 2024. Respondent stated this matter has since been removed to Federal Court and that they will continue to defend Respondent in this matter. Additionally, Respondent stated they have advised their client to refrain from providing documentation at this time as such information would become discoverable in the federal suit and would become admissible at trial which would place Respondent at a disadvantage.

Respondent acknowledged their responsibility to the industry and responsibility in responding to this complaint and stated they would respond to the fullest extent possible regarding the complaint without putting their client at such a disadvantage.

Summary: In short, Complainant fails to specifically mention by name any alleged violation of applicable Tennessee statute or rule. In fact, Complainant only identifies action conducted in the state of New York and does not even name specific state violations but points to national standards. It appears Complainant's goal is to not only occupy significant time and resources for Respondent to reply to each complaint filed in all 52 jurisdictions, but to hope that some or all respective Boards will request further documentation and information from Respondent so as to either face disciplinary action from those jurisdictions or provide documentation that then becomes admissible at trial.

Stated succinctly, this is not the purpose of this Board and it is unclear where or how Tennessee's involvement is relevant to these proceedings other than the alleged violation of national ethical standards and a vague assumption that Respondent has made "similar representations" to "other stakeholders" again, failing to identify any specific representation made in Tennessee to any stakeholder made in Tennessee. In which case, it would still not be within this Board's jurisdiction to determine whether national ethical standards had been violated. Such authority would come from a federal court, which this matter has already been removed to as the litigation continues. Complainant's complaint is not narrowly tailored so as to describe what violations, if any, implicate Tennessee statute or rules. This is further evidenced by the fact that an identical complaint was sent to all 50 states, D.C., and Guam. This case is at best; a decision better left for a federal court's jurisdiction and at worst an attempt to utilize this Board to gain an advantage in pending litigation.

Reviewed by Board member: Alton Hethcoat

Mitigating Factors: No specific violations of Tennessee laws or rules are cited or referenced; does not provide specific information regarding any action alleged to have occurred in Tennessee.

Aggravating Factors: N/A

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Concur.

7. 2025053311 (JW)

First Licensed: 02/04/2021

Expiration: 09/30/2027

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

This complaint was administratively opened by the Board on September 11, 2025. The complaint was filed against the Respondent after they submitted a reapplication for an architect license. As part of the reapplication, the Respondent was asked if they worked in the State of Tennessee while their

license was expired and answered "yes." The Respondent's license expired from February 28, 2023, to September 10, 2025. The Respondent attached a list of 10 projects that they worked on after their license expired to the reapplication.

The Respondent filed a response to the complaint on September 25, 2025. The Respondent stated that during the timeframe that their license was expired, they worked for an architectural firm; however, they always worked under and were supervised by a licensed architect as either a production staff member or as a project manager. The list of projects submitted by the Respondent aligns with their response as their role for all 10 projects is listed as either "Project Manager" or "Production Staff Member (drafting)." The Respondent provided the identities of the 5 registered architects that supervised their work on the 10 projects. The Respondent also provided the architectural plans for 6 of the 10 projects, which contain the stamps of the supervising registered architects that employed the Respondent. The Respondent provided descriptions of the remaining 4 projects because they did not possess the corresponding architectural plans. Additionally, the Respondent provided a sworn and notarized declaration that states that they did not serve as the "responsible charge of supervision" for any of the 10 projects that they worked on without a valid license, and they did not present themselves to clients as a licensed architect while their license was expired (February 28, 2023 - September 10, 2025). The Respondent did not interface with clients during the projects that they served as a drafting/production staff member. On the projects that the Respondent worked as a project manager, the Respondent was introduced to clients as a project manager working underneath the architect of record.

Additionally, legal counsel for the Board contacted the 5 registered architects that the Respondent identified as the responsible charges of supervision for the 10 projects. Legal counsel requested that each registered architect submit a written statement confirming or denying the Respondent's assertions. Each registered architect verified the projects that the Respondent worked on and stated that they served as the responsible charges of supervision for all 10 projects. 4 of the registered architects currently work at the same architectural firm as the Respondent. The Respondent was employed at the firm during the unlicensed period (February 28, 2023 - September 10, 2025). These 4 individuals advised in their written responses that the architecture firm was unaware of the fact that the Respondent's license had expired. They stated that the Respondent was identified by her job title "Project Manager" in all written communications with clients. They were unaware of any written communications that identified the Respondent as a licensed architect. However, the Respondent's registration number remained posted on the website and they could not verify that the Respondent was never referred to as an architect as the firm was unaware of the lapse in licensure. The final registered architect confirmed that the Respondent was not identified as an architect during their project.

Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-101 states, in part, "it is unlawful for any person to practice or offer to practice architecture, engineering or landscape architecture, or use the title 'registered interior designer' unless the person has been duly registered under this chapter, except as otherwise provided." Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-103(1) exempts from this chapter, "any person engaging in architectural, engineering or landscape architectural work as an employee of a registered architect, registered engineer or registered landscape architect, provided, that such work may not include responsible charge of design or supervision." The Respondent's sworn and notarized declaration as well as the written statements from the 5 registered architects establish that the Respondent worked under the supervision of

registered architects and did not serve as the “responsible charge of design or supervision” during the period of unlicensure. The Respondent’s conduct falls underneath the registration exemption of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-103(1) because they worked on the 10 projects as an employee of registered architects.

Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1) states “no person shall practice or offer to practice engineering, architecture or landscape architecture, or use the title ‘registered interior designer’ in this state in violation of this chapter.” Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(c) states “A person is construed to practice or offer to practice engineering, architecture or landscape architecture who, by verbal claim, sign, advertisement, letterhead, card or in any other way, represents that person to be an architect, engineer or landscape architect, with or without qualifying adjective, or through the use of some other title implies that the person is an architect, engineer or landscape architect.” The Respondent did not personally represent themselves to customers as an architect during the period of unlicensure. However, the architecture firm that employed the Respondent left the Respondent’s expired registration number on their website. Based on the facts that the Respondent worked on all projects under the supervision of registered architects and the Respondent did not personally promote or advertise themselves as an architect, a letter of warning regarding Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 62-2-105(b)(1) appears to be an appropriate resolution to this complaint.

Reviewed by Board member: Rick Thompson

Mitigating Factors: Respondent answered the complaint and self-reported.

Aggravating Factors: None

Recommendation: Letter of Warning regarding Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1) (Crimes and Offenses; duty to report), and Respondent shall take and pass the Laws and Rules Exam.

Board Decision: Concur.

8. 2026001051 (JK)

First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

This Complaint is related to Complaint Nos. 2026020941 & 2026020951.

Complainant, a licensed PE, engaged the services of the out-of-state employer of Respondent to perform evaluation of a precast roof. A dispute arose between the parties regarding the scope of work to be performed by Respondent’s employer and whether the Respondent’s scope of work included engineering services. Complainant stated that the scope of work did include such engineering services, that Respondent lacked licensure, and failed to stamp the plans as required by the scope of work.

Respondent, through counsel, disputes that the scope of work required engineering services, and

states that the objection to the lack of licensure and stamp were only raised once Respondent's employer requested payment of fees after the report was provided to Complainant. Respondent stated that there was a dispute regarding the fees to be paid by Complainant, and in ultimate settlement of the dispute, Respondent's employer agreed to provide a discount and provide a version of the report that was sealed by a Tennessee-licensed professional engineer.

Complainant has since notified the Board that it has been provided a signed and sealed report and "considers this matter resolved."

The Respondent, an unlicensed individual, used the designations "PE" and "Senior Project Engineer" on the reports provided to the Complainant.

Reviewed by Board member: James Collins

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of \$1,000 for the Respondent's use of "PE" and "Senior Project Engineer" on the Report without proper licensure in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1).

Board Decision: Concur.

9. 2026020951 (JK)

First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Engineering Firm

History (5 yrs.): None.

This Complaint is related to Complaint Nos. 2026001051 & 2026020941.

This Complaint was opened administratively following the Board's review of Complaint No. 2026001051. The Respondent is a corporation which is not licensed as an engineering firm in Tennessee, and the underlying project was located in Newbern, TN for Respondent's customer (the "Customer").

Upon review of Complaint No. 2026001051, it was discovered that the Respondent provided a report dated August 19, 2025, including the results of a limited nondestructive evaluation at a commercial facility in Newbern, TN and consisting of 23 pages (the "Initial Report"). The Initial Report stated it was prepared by an individual who identified himself as "Project Engineer" and "EIT" (the "Preparer") and reviewed by an individual who identified himself as "Senior Project Engineer" and "PE" (the "Initial Reviewer"). Neither the Preparer nor the Initial Reviewer are licensed with the Board.

A dispute arose following the Initial Report, and the Respondent provided an updated report dated

January 26, 2026 (the "Second Report"), to the Customer which then listed a second reviewer who is a licensed professional engineer with the Board with the licensee's stamp and signature (the "Licensee") along with the Preparer and Initial Reviewer listed above. The Second Report consisted of 23 pages, the same as the Initial Report.

The Respondent stated that its employee, the Licensee, obtained licensure as a Tennessee Professional Engineer specifically for this project and that the Licensee is the supervisor of the Initial Reviewer. The Respondent stated that the Customer instructed the Respondent that no PE was needed or wanted for the project because the Customer only wanted test results, not engineering opinions or judgment and that the Customer did not want the facility owner charged for professional engineering services. The Respondent stated that the Licensee obtained the Tennessee PE license regardless and, as the technical leader for the group, remained connected with the Initial Reviewer's work on the project. The Respondent stated that the Licensee did not bill the Customer for the work or oversight as was agreed between the Respondent and the Customer.

Reviewed by Board member: James Collins

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of \$2,000 for the Respondent's employee's use of "Project Engineer" and "EIT" on the Report and in email communications without proper licensure in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1).

Board Decision: Concur.

10. 2026020941 (JK)

First Licensed: 06/05/2025

Expiration: 06/30/2027

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

This Complaint is related to Complaint Nos. 2026001051 & 2026020951.

This Complaint was opened administratively following the Board's review of Complaint No. 2026001051. The Respondent is a licensed professional engineer with the Board.

The Respondent stamped an updated report after it was initially prepared and reviewed by unlicensed individuals.

The Respondent stated that although the report was originally prepared by two unlicensed individuals, the Respondent serves as the technical structural lead and remained in contact with the individual who ultimately signed the first report as a reviewer in addition to its preparer.

Although the Respondent did not sign or stamp the initial report, it appears that the Respondent did supervise the persons preparing the report. Therefore, when the Respondent stamped and signed the supplemental report, the initial and supplemental report were prepared under the Respondent's responsible charge.

The Respondent stamped and signed the final report below the signature of two unlicensed individuals who were identified as "Project Engineer" and "EIT" and "Senior Project Engineer" and "PE."

Reviewed by Board member: James Collins

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of \$1,000 for the Respondent's allowance of the use of "Project Engineer" and "EIT" and "Senior Project Engineer" and "PE" by individuals without proper licensure on a report stamped by the Respondent in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. §62-2-105(b)(1) and Rule 0120-02-.02(1) and (3).

Board Decision: Concur.

11. 2026011101 (JK)

First Licensed: 01/01/1993

Expiration: 02/29/2028

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

This complaint was opened administratively following Respondent's reapplication for a PA license where Respondent indicated that they had practiced the profession in Tennessee since their registration expiration.

The Respondent's licensure expired January 31, 2024, and was renewed on February 12, 2026.

In addition to self-reporting on reapplication, the Respondent provided a written explanation of the failure to renew citing a changed mailing address. The Respondent took immediate action to renew its licensure upon discovery of the expiration. The Respondent provided a list of projects during the time that its license was expired, listing thirteen projects.

Reviewed by Board member: Rick Thompson

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported upon reapplication.

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of Thirteen Thousand Dollars (\$13,000), which consists of \$1,000 per project, pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(b)(1), and the Respondent shall be required to take and pass the Law and Rules Examination.

Board Decision: Concur.

12. 2026011111 (JK)

First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

The Complainant is a professional architect who submitted this complaint to the Board upon becoming aware that his name and license number were being used without his knowledge or consent. The Complainant was contacted by a prospect searching for an architect to design a home in the Chattanooga area, and the prospect stated that the Respondent had provided quotations and a contract with the Complainant's name and license number. The prospect stated that upon seeing the name and license number on the contract presented by the Respondent, the prospect contacted the Complainant regarding the use of their name and license number.

The Complainant provided a copy of an "Architecture Services Agreement" with the Complainant listed as "Consultant: [Complainant], Architect, TN License No. #####" with the deliverables of (i) CAD Drawings (Architectural & Structural) and (ii) permit-ready PDF drawings for a total contract price of \$2,700. The contract was electronically signed "Complainant" below the designation "Architect" and the TN License number.

The Respondent corresponded regarding the construction of a residential structure with the communications signed with the designation "Licensed Architect" and appears to have provided plans for new construction in Winchester, CA as a sample of prior work.

The Respondent in this case has not been identified.

Reviewed by Board member:

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close. Due to the fact that the Board was unable to determine the identity of the Respondent, the Board recommends closure of this complaint. The Board will refer this matter to the Tennessee Attorney General to determine whether this Respondent may be identified and prosecuted.

Board Decision: Concur.

13. 2026005481 (JK)

First Licensed: 05/19/2021

Expiration: 05/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

Respondent is a professional engineer. This is an administratively opened complaint. Respondent failed to complete the continuous education requirement during the audit period of September 31, 2023 – September 31, 2025.

Upon review of this complaint, the Respondent made efforts to ensure that all records were provided to the Board for consideration. It appears that an error occurred which prevented the Respondent from uploading the continuous education certificates. The Respondent has provided evidence of the completion of thirty (30) hours of continuing education during the audit period with at least twenty-eight (28) hours of Health, Safety, and Welfare subjects.

Reviewed by Board member:

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Concur.

14. 2026011531 (JK)

First Licensed: 07/27/2018

Expiration: 07/31/2024 (Invalid, Active)

Type of License: Professional Landscape Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

This complaint was opened administratively following Respondent's reapplication for a PLA license, where Respondent indicated that they had practiced the profession in Tennessee since their registration expiration.

The Respondent's licensure expired July 31, 2024, and was renewed on March 13, 2026. The Respondent did not stamp or seal any plans during the time that the Respondent's license was expired. The Respondent stated that his work for a local home builder as a land development project manager, and any work requiring licensure is provided by "external consultant(s) and is in no way signed off on, certified by, or sealed by myself."

This appears to be a misunderstanding by the Respondent, and the statement that the Respondent had practiced the profession in Tennessee since the expiration was in error.

Reviewed by Board member: Blair Parker

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Close with a letter of caution.

15. 2026012761 (JK)

First Licensed: 02/15/2006

Expiration: 02/29/2028

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

This complaint was opened administratively following Respondent's reapplication for a PE license where Respondent indicated that they had practiced the profession in Tennessee since their registration expiration.

The Respondent's licensure expired July 31, 2025, and was renewed on February 25, 2026.

Upon further review, the Respondent was mistaken regarding the question on the application, and the Respondent states that no services as a professional engineer were provided to the public during the time that Respondent's licensure was expired.

Reviewed by Board member:

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close.

Board Decision: Defer to the August Board meeting.

16. 2026007941 (JK)

First Licensed: 01/19/2021

Expiration: 01/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): 2024 – One complaint closed with a letter of caution for self-reported discipline by another state's licensing board. 2025 – One complaint closed with a \$3,000 civil penalty for self-reported discipline by another state's licensing board.

This Respondent also has Complaint No. 2026011481 open which is also on this Legal Report.

Respondent is a licensed PE who is self-reporting out of state disciplinary action. The Respondent was disciplined by the Ohio Board of Engineers and Surveyors for providing "false and/or misleading information to the Board" on certificate of authorization applications submitted to the Ohio Board on August 21, 2021, and May 8, 2022. The Respondent entered a Settlement Agreement with the Ohio Board which imposed a two-year suspension of Respondent's professional engineer's registration, and the two-year suspension was stayed pending payment of a fine in the amount of \$2,000.00 by Respondent.

Reviewed by Board member: Jason Carder

Mitigating Factors: The Respondent timely reported out-of-state discipline.

Aggravating Factors: This is Respondent's third instance of out-of-state discipline within the last five years.

Recommendation: Letter of Warning related to this Complaint, 2026007941, as well as the Respondent's other open Complaint, 2026011481, related to informing the Board of out-of-state disciplinary action related to Respondent's PE licensure.

Board Decision: Concur.

17. 2026011481 (JK)

First Licensed: 01/19/2021

Expiration: 01/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): 2024 – One complaint closed with a letter of caution for self-reported discipline by another state's licensing board. 2025 – One complaint closed with a \$3,000 civil penalty for self-reported discipline by another state's licensing board.

This Respondent also has Complaint No. 2026007941 open which is also on this Legal Report.

Respondent is a licensed PE who is self-reporting out of state disciplinary action. The Maine Board of Licensure for Professional Engineers disciplined the Respondent for failure to timely report out-of-state discipline to the Maine Board in the form of a warning. The out-of-state discipline was in the form of a Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Ordered entered January 11, 2024, against the Respondent by the California Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists.

Reviewed by Board member: Jason Carder

Mitigating Factors: The Respondent timely reported out-of-state discipline.

Aggravating Factors: This is Respondent's fourth instance of out-of-state discipline within the last five years.

Recommendation: Letter of Warning related to this Complaint, as well as the Respondent's other open Complaint related to informing the Board of out-of-state disciplinary action related to Respondent's PE licensure.

Board Decision: Concur.

RE-PRESENTATIONS

18. 2025050621 (TB)

First Licensed: 03/29/2017

Expiration: 03/31/2024

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

Reviewed by Board member: Rick Thompson

Respondent, a licensed professional architect, had sealed plumbing and mechanical design drawings as part of a "Building HVAC Updates" project. Complainant included these drawings as an attachment to their complaint.

Respondent replied through legal counsel indicating that all design work related to the project was performed by properly licensed professionals. Respondent stated with regard to the mechanical and plumbing design scope, all such design was originally performed by a properly licensed mechanical engineer employed at an engineering firm. However, the employee overseeing these plans left employment at the firm and thus an outside mechanical/plumbing consulting engineer was hired to complete the necessary design work, inclusive of reviewing, altering, and approving the final MEP design for the project. However, when the project design was issued for bid advertisement, the seal of Respondent was applied to the two MEP drawings identified in the complaint. Respondent clarified that Respondent was the project architect and principal designer supporting the overall design of the project while other licensed professionals from the engineering served as the electrical engineer and project manager and the MEP design was completed by the third party. Respondent stated that ultimately the third party continued to provide design drawings by its mechanical engineer and that all of these design plans were replaced in the full set of project drawings, but the two (2) sheets attached to the complaint were overlooked. However, although Respondent states that they did not perform any design services for MEP scope or otherwise perform design beyond their professional expertise or scope of the professional license, Respondent's counsel does provide, "[Respondent's] stamp was placed on the noted mechanical drawing sheets," and that "although [Respondent's] stamp appears on the two drawings noted, such was a mistake."

Complainant submitted a rebuttal stating that their complaint did not involve any amended documents, but focused on documents submitted by Respondent for review and approval. Complainant attached a copy of the drawings as approved which included Respondent's stamp on five (5) plumbing drawings as well as sixteen (16) mechanical drawings. Complainant stated it was irrelevant whether the third party provided subsequent modifications as it would not replace these drawings. Complainant attached additional drawings to the rebuttal.

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: \$15,750.00 civil penalty (represented as a \$750.00 civil penalty for the five (5) plumbing drawings and the sixteen (16) mechanical drawings stamped by Respondent) in violation of

Rule 0120-02-.03(3). Further, Respondent must take and pass the laws and rules exam.

Board Decision: Concur.

New Information: Legal spoke with Respondent's counsel who stated that Respondent had retired from the industry and does not possess the financial means to pay the civil penalty. Respondent's counsel has indicated that Respondent has not used his professional architect license for well over a year. Respondent offered that, in lieu of the assessed civil penalty, the Board accept the surrender of Respondent's Professional Architect license in order to close the complaint.

New Recommendation: **Closure contingent upon Respondent's surrender of their Professional Architect's license.**

New Board Decision: Concur.

19. 2025034021 (JK)

First Licensed: 07/23/2021

Expiration: 06/30/2027

Type of License: Professional Architect

History (5 yrs.): None.

Summary: Respondent acknowledged on their renewal application that they had worked on several projects after allowing their license to expire. Respondent stated that they have worked on seven (7) projects in Tennessee since July 2023, and further states:

- *"One of the seven projects is in a schematic design phase, with exterior design elevations having been signed and sealed, but construction documents have not been solicited. The remaining 6 projects have completed permitting and construction; as an additional level of oversight on these, I have gathered the project documents and engaged a TN-licensed colleague to review the construction documents, to ensure they find these to meet TN's requirements. Upon my colleague's review, these documents appear to comply with TN regulations...."*
- *Upon further review of the project list, I would like to clarify that all six projects I signed and sealed construction documents for during the period when my license was expired were each business locations under 5,000 square feet in total gross area. As such, these projects fall within the exemption to requiring a licensed architect as described in Tenn. Code Ann. Section 62-2-102."*

Reviewed by Board member: **Rick Thompson**

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a civil penalty in the amount of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for each of the seven (7) violations for a total penalty of Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$3,500.00) and require Respondent to take and pass the Rules & Laws exam for using an expired certificate of

registration in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D).

Board Decision: Concur

New Information:

The Respondent, through counsel, has requested that this matter be represented to the Board for consideration of the Respondent's Complaint in light of the discipline imposed in Complaint No. 2024017611.

In summary, Complaint No. 2024017611 arose following an expired licensee's reapplication for licensure with the Board. Specifically, the applicant's license had expired December 2023 and was not reinstated until March 2024. Note – the June 2024 Legal Report erroneously indicated that the license expired in June 2023. The licensee stated that a sick relative was the cause of the expiration. During the time that the license was expired, the applicant stated that two (2) plans for projects which were small residential renovations that were both less than 5,000 square feet. Complaint No. 2024017611 was resolved with (1) a Letter of Caution and (2) requiring the licensee to take and pass the Law and Rules Exam.

In this Complaint, the Respondent's license expired on January 29, 2024, and was not renewed until June 13, 2025, over sixteen months later. The Respondent stated that the seven projects which were stamped did not require licensure. The Respondent stated that they had encountered a password issue and then mistakenly believed that the Respondent's license had been renewed.

The Respondent was unlicensed for a period of sixteen months, while the licensee in the other complaint was unlicensed for less than three months. The Respondent stamped seven projects while the license was expired, while the licensee in the other complaint stamped two projects. Although the projects in both complaints do not require licensure, the use of the stamp on the plans denoting approval by a licensed Tennessee architect is improper.

New Recommendation: It is recommended that the recommendation remain unchanged: Assess a civil penalty in the amount of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for each of the seven (7) violations for a total penalty of Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$3,500.00) and require Respondent to take and pass the Rules & Laws exam for using an expired certificate of registration in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-105(a)(1)(D).

New Board Decision: Concur.

ENGINEER and BYLAWS COMMITTEE REPORT

Please see summaries provided above.

NEW BUSINESS

Legal counsel reported that the long-awaited rules, including definitions and retrospective review items, became effective on June 3, 2026.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD RELATED TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

ADJOURNMENT

Frank Wagster adjourned the meeting at 11:35 a.m.