

Below is a draft of the minutes from the board meeting, with the official copy subject to board



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

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

Tennessee Board of Architectural and Engineering Examiners met on October 1, 2026, and the following business was transacted:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Ashraf Elsayed, Jason Carder, Rick Thompson, Frank Wagster, Brian Tibbs, Gary Clark, Justin Rains, Tommy Young, Blair Parker, Melanie Doss, Jeff Nalley, Alton Hethcoat, James Collins, and Eddie Jett

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: James Collins, Philip Lim

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Glenn Kopchak, Joseph Kennedy, Erica Cable, Melanie Holcomb, Alexandria Griffey, Tammy Roehrich, Philip Allocco, Ashley Byrd

BOARD MEETING

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / NOTICE OF MEETING

Frank Wagster called the meeting to order at 9:00 am and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Director Glenn Kopchak recognized Blair Parker and Melanie Doss for their national leadership roles and highlighted Tennessee's strong volunteer participation in national organizations.

Attorney Joseph Kennedy instructed members to introduce themselves before speaking or to raise their hands to be recognized by the chair to ensure accessible transcripts and ADA-compliant records.

AGENDA

Alton Hethcoat made a motion to approve the agenda. This was seconded by Jason Carder. The

motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

AUGUST MINUTES

Jason Carder made a motion to adopt the August minutes. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORTS

Kasey Anderson, Tennessee Society of Professional Engineers/American Council of Engineering Companies of Tennessee (TSPE/ACEC-TN), provided updates that the “Vertical Forum” and “Engineering Excellence Awards” will be conducted on December 10, 2026.

Ashley Cates, Executive Vice President of AIA-TN, provided updates on the recent conference held in Chattanooga. She also announced an upcoming webinar, “License to Build,” scheduled for November 5, 2026; a meeting with NCARB next week to review upcoming changes; and a leadership retreat for new AIA board members on November 12–13.

Director Glenn Kopchak read the Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors (TAPS) report which provided updates from their Board of Directors meeting held on September 26, 2026. The report further announced upcoming events, including future BOD meeting dates and the Spring Conference scheduled for March 4–6, 2027, in Murfreesboro at the Embassy Suites.

Hannah Finch, President of American Society of Interior Designers (ASID) and Allie Bierman, International Interior Design Association (IIDA-TN), reported updates for their organizations to include a summary of the upcoming “Better Together” annual advocacy networking event on November 5, 2026, at “Walk Your Plans Nashville”.

LAND SURVEYOR EDUCATION REPORT

TAPS	1413	TAPS - BOD – General Membership Meeting	3	Approved
TAPS	1414	TBOE – Rules Updated and Q &A	2	Approved
TAPS	1415	TDOT - Contracts	1	Approved
TAPS	1416	Introduction to the CFS Program	1	Approved
TAPS	1417	TDOT – Highway Drone Mapping	2	Approved
TAPS	1418	Ethics	1	Approved
TAPS	1419	Tennessee Standards of Practice	1	Approved
TAPS	1420	ALTA Survey Updates	3	Approved
TAPS	1421	Drone Mapping Workshop	10	Approved
TAPS	1422	Four Corners	3	Approved

TAPS	1423	Surveyors in the Line of Fire	3	Approved
TAPS	1424	TN/MS Line Land Dispute	2	Approved
TAPS	1425	Rights of Ways & Easements – Finding, Locating, and Describing	4	Approved
TAPS	1426	Business Economics for LS	4	Approved
TAPS	1427	Tennessee Case Study- Presumption, Assumption, and Gumption: The Art of Retracement	2	Approved
ASPS	1429	Twenty-Seven Miles of Evidence: The Rapides– Grant Parish Boundary Dispute, Part 1	3.5	Approved
ASPS	1430	Plat of Survey - Surveyor Ethics Workshop	3.5	Approved
ASPS	1431	Best Practices in Drone Surveying - 2026	3.5	Approved
ASPS	1432	Twenty-Seven Miles of Evidence: The Rapides– Grant Parish Boundary Dispute, Part 2	3.5	Approved
ASPS	1433	Catahoula Lake: When Surveying Evidence and the Law Collide	3.5	Approved
ASPS	1434	The Sepulga River Investigation: What a River Was Like in 1819	4	Approved
ASPS	1435	Developing Surfaces: Purposes, Types and Selections	3.5	Approved
Halfmoon	1436	Boundaries and Easements	6	Approved
ASPS	1437	Four Corners	3.5	Approved
Halfmoon	1438	From 1620 to 2027: Metes and Bounds Land Description Workshop	6	Approved
Halfmoon	1439	Property Rights in Practice: Navigating Easements, Takings and Eminent Domain	7	Approved
Halfmoon	1440	How to Build a Drone Program for Your Firm	2	Approved
McKissock	1441	Building Information Modeling (BIM) for Engineers & Land Surveyors	3	Approved
McKissock	1442	Online Correspondence: Building Information Modeling (BIM) for Engineers & Land Surveyors	3	Approved

Justin Rains made a motion to approve the education report. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote with Gary Clark recusing himself.

GRANT PRESENTATIONS

The universities that submitted grant proposals for FY27 presented their proposals and answered questions from the board.

ADA ACCESSIBILITY TRAINING

Legal provided ADA training on use of Robert's Rules, chair-driven recognition, clear motions, recorded roll-call when needed, and document identification, emphasizing compliance by April 2027 with ADA accessible documents, recordings, and transcripts.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Budget Report

Director Kopchak summarized the financial reporting for June and drew attention to line items entitled "Technology". Director Kopchak reported that the uptick in expenses was due to computer and equipment upgrades.

Conference Updates & Travel

Director Glenn Kopchak provided a summary of the recent NCEES Annual Meeting, highlighting an exam administration record of 104,000, NCEES Foundation grants totaling \$660,000 to 18 organizations, and the formation of a task forces to address fraudulent seals and Artificial Intelligence.

Alton Hethcoat made a motion to approve membership travel to all 2027 Spring and Fall annual meetings and associations. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Grants To Higher Education Committee

Jason Carder made a motion to approve and authorize distribution of funds as presented in the committee. This was seconded by Dr. Ashraf Elsayed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote by the full board.

Engineer Committee

The Board approved to let William Blackwell continue in the application process.

Land Surveyor Committee

The Board approved James LaPointe's application for hardships and exemptions.

Jimmy Chao presented NCEES's mission to advance licensure for engineers and surveyors.

LEGAL

Legal Report (presented by Joseph Kennedy, & Erica Cable)

1. 2026032861 (JK)

First Licensed: 04/11/2017

Expiration: 05/31/2028

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 on April 30, 2025, and was renewed on May 15, 2026.

In addition to self-reporting on reapplication, the Respondent provided a written explanation of the failure to renew and an explanation of work during the time that the license was expired. 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 the license had expired, listing three projects.

Reviewed by Board member: James Collins

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported upon reapplication.

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of Three Thousand Dollars (\$3,000), which consists of \$1,000 per project on which the Respondent provided the services of a professional engineer without active licensure, 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.

2. 2026032971 (JK)

First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

An anonymous complaint was received alleging that the Respondent, an unlicensed individual, has been performing unlicensed engineering and construction work. The Complaint included a Facebook post that uses "engineering" in the title of the page.

The Respondent refutes providing unlicensed engineering services and states that they never represented themselves as a licensed professional engineer. The Respondent states that the use of "engineering" was from their educational background and prior employment titles.

Counsel recommends that this Complaint be closed with a letter of warning as the Respondent's use of "engineering" may be in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-102(1), but the Respondent simultaneously lists the services of "pre-holiday fixes and touch-ups" including door handles, light replacement, leaky faucets, shelves/trim/small repairs, and other residential projects, which informs the public that the Respondent is not offering services as a professional engineer.

Reviewed by Board member: Eddie Jett

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Letter of Caution that the Respondent's use of "engineering" may be in violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-2-102(1), and the Respondent should avoid improper use of the appellation.

Board Decision: Concur.

3. 2026037821 (JK)

First Licensed: 07/15/1999

Expiration: 06/30/2028

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. During the relevant time period, the Respondent served in a role as a director of engineering of a city.

The Respondent's licensure expired July 31, 2025, and was renewed on June 2, 2026.

In addition to self-reporting on reapplication, the Respondent provided a written explanation of the failure to renew and an explanation of work during the time that the license was expired. The Respondent took immediate action to renew its licensure upon discovery of the expiration. The Respondent served in the role for approximately ten (10) months without valid licensure.

Reviewed by Board member: Eddie Jett

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported upon reapplication.

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a civil penalty of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) via a consent order, which consists of \$500 per month for the ten (10) months during which the Respondent was in the role without an active license, 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.

4. 2026030711 (JK)

First Licensed: 06/13/2011

Expiration: 05/31/2028

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. During the relevant time period, the Respondent served in a role with a consulting firm as a water resources engineer.

The Respondent's licensure expired June 30, 2025, and was renewed on May 6, 2026.

In addition to self-reporting on reapplication, the Respondent provided a written explanation of the failure to renew, citing possibly missing the renewal reminders. The Respondent took immediate action to renew its licensure upon discovery of the expiration.

Reviewed by Board member: James Collins

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported upon reapplication.

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Assess a Civil Penalty of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000), which consists of \$500 per month for ten (10) months during which the Respondent was in the role without an active license, 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.

5. 2026038971 (JK)

First Licensed: 06/14/2002

Expiration: 06/30/2026

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): None.

This complaint was opened administratively in error.

Reviewed by Board member:

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close without action.

Board Decision: Concur.

6. 2026030431 (JK)

First Licensed: N/A (Unlicensed)

Expiration: N/A

Type of License: Engineering Firm

History (5 yrs.): None.

The Complainant, a licensed engineering firm, filed this complaint against the Respondent, an unlicensed firm, alleging that the Respondent requested review of plans for a project in California,

which Complainant alleges are stolen/modified plans of the Complainant.

The Complainant also alleges that the Respondent's website states that the Respondent provides engineering in multiple disciplines as well as architecture without licensure by the Board.

The Board lacks jurisdiction regarding the requested review of plans and allegations that the plans were stolen/modified by the Respondent as the project is not located in Tennessee, there is no allegation that the conduct occurred in Tennessee, nor is the Respondent licensed in Tennessee.

Regarding the Complainant's allegations regarding the Respondent's website, the Board does have jurisdiction to ensure that services are advertised to consumers in Tennessee in accordance with the rules and laws of the Board.

The Respondent states that it does not offer or provide professional engineering or architectural services under its own authority; the Respondent produces design documentation and coordinates the delivery of a project, while every professional service within a project is performed, sealed, and under the responsible charge of an independently licensed professional as necessary. However, the Respondent concedes that its website language "did not draw a clear enough line between our design production role and the professional services carried out by the licensed professionals we engage." The Respondent has since revised its website to indicate "Profession engineering and architectural services, including all review, sealing and stamping, are performed by independently licensed professionals engaged for each project and licensed in that project's jurisdiction."

Reviewed by Board member: Eddie Jett

Mitigating Factors:

Aggravating Factors:

Recommendation: Close without action.

Board Decision: Concur.

7. 2026051441 (EC)

First Licensed: 10/30/2018

Expiration: 12/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Land Surveyor

History (5 yrs.): None.

Complainant claims that their neighbor placed posts on their boundary line without their permission after a land surveyor was hired in 2011 to locate pins according to Complainant's existing plot. Complainant further alleges that the assessor told them that the posts representing their boundary line are incorrect. Complainant hired Respondent to complete a new boundary survey and alleges they purposefully and willfully followed the wrong longitude by copying the incorrect survey from 2011.

Respondent confirms that they were hired by Complainant because they believed their neighbor was encroaching on their property. Complainant was present on the property when Respondent completed the field survey and told Respondent that they believed some of the posts may have been placed incorrectly. Respondent found all six monuments of the tract of land that Complainant owns per the recorded plat. The 3-acre tract was originally included with their neighbor's property but was cut out in 1991. A couple of monuments were slightly different in length from the recorded plat, but the

Respondent notes that it is not uncommon to find. Respondent believes that the two monuments found along the road right-of-way were original monuments based on their size, and the stamped caps on the other monuments were placed by the surveyors in 2011. The southeast corner was not capped, and it matched the recorded plat distance within 1". The monuments match the dimensions referenced in the recorded plat within acceptable tolerances based on the age of the original survey. Complainant saw the monuments Respondent found and flagged, and notes that they did not appear to be upset about anything at the time. Complainant paid \$1,200 for the work, and Respondent provided a stamped copy of the final survey plat. Respondent denies purposefully and willfully following the 2011 survey and notes that they have never been provided with a copy of that survey plat. It appears that the surveyor only set survey stakes and did not provide a plat. Respondent reviewed the assessor's map measurements, and they do not match the recorded plat. Based on measurements on the GIS mapping software, the east line measures 412' compared to the 394.80' recorded, and it measures 247' compared to the 218.66' recorded. Complainant appears to have relied on the assessor's alleged statements rather than the recorded plat and field evidence. Respondent understands that Complainant wants the assessor to be correct, but the fact remains that the recorded plat and the monument that represents it hold.

Reviewed by Board member: N/A

Mitigating Factors: N/A

Aggravating Factors: N/A

Recommendation: Dismiss

Board Decision: Concur.

8. 2026045061 (EC)

First Licensed: 07/10/1997

Expiration: 12/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Land Surveyor

History (5 yrs.): None.

Complainant is a real estate agent who owns a property that was for sale. The potential buyer of the property hired Respondent to complete a survey of the property. Complainant alleges that the survey's reported encroachment caused the buyer to terminate the purchase contract. Complainant provided a second survey requested by the title company after a claim was filed, and it reached a different conclusion than Respondent's survey.

Respondent notes this is the first complaint they have received in the 29 years since they have been licensed. Respondent was hired to find or replace property corners and mark property lines and claimed that the buyer's main concern was the location of the driveway and the development of the property to the west. Respondent survey personnel performed 8 hours of fieldwork. Respondent monitored the fieldwork and remotely provided calculations as to what to look for regarding the neighboring developing property. There were older wooden stakes marking the west line and an old iron ½" rod located at the southwest corner that was disturbed. After review of the field data, additional

data was collected to find more evidence to the east and along the highway. Most of the evidence found was sporadic and did not give a clear reason to modify the initial opinion, as working from the west. Time was of the essence for the buyer, so Respondent provided the opinion to them verbally, and recommended getting a second opinion because the evidence outside of what Respondent found to the west and their measurements were based on the normal standards of care. Respondent reviewed the survey provided by the title company, which found most of the same evidence except for one key point. The southwest corner of the neighboring property showed a gap between two properties, which led Respondent to agree that the new surveyor's opinion of the retracement survey is better than the one Complainant made. This is why, when publishing their survey, Respondent specifically stated in the notes that they reserved the right to modify their opinion based on any new evidence provided by others. In summary, the new survey provided a professional opinion of a boundary based on current deeds of record that identified a potential issue with improvements as they exist on the property. Complainant assumes that Respondent's client, the buyer, would have continued with the sale if provided with an opinion made by the new surveyor. Respondent disagrees and believes the buyer would not have proceeded with the sale because the driveway was shared.

Counsel does not find any violations based on the information reviewed and recommends dismissal. However, if the Board finds that it would be helpful for a Board member to review this matter to determine whether Respondent violated the standards of care, Counsel recommends deferring this matter to the next Board meeting pending a Board member's review.

Reviewed by Board member: N/A

Mitigating Factors: Complainant is not Respondent's client.

Aggravating Factors: N/A

Recommendation: Dismiss or defer pending Board review

Board Decision: Dismiss.

9. 2026049621 (EC)

First Licensed: 05/27/2011

Expiration: 12/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Land Surveyor

History (5 yrs.): None.

Complainant has concerns regarding Respondent's boundary survey that was prepared for use in pending litigation involving adjoining properties and claims of adverse possession and prescriptive easement. Respondent was retained by the adjoining property owner's attorney to prepare the survey, and Respondent later testified under oath concerning their work during a deposition on June 3, 2026. Complainant wants this Board to determine if Respondent's conduct constituted negligence, gross negligence, incompetence, misconduct, failure to exercise appropriate professional judgment, failure to perform an adequate investigation, or any other violations of the statutes and rules that govern the profession. Complainant alleges Respondent looked at the property once, spoke with their client three times, examined aerial imagery and other documents, concluded that the traveled driveway reflected

the intended access, and treated conflicting monument or mathematical evidence as irrelevant. The complaint included a 7-page forensic review of Respondent's survey with the purpose of supporting this complaint and evaluating whether the survey accurately distinguishes observed physical conditions, recorded property interests, survey measurements, and monument evidence, statements supplied by Respondent's client, historical inferences, and legal conclusions concerning prescriptive easement or adverse possession.

Complainant further alleges Respondent, licensed since 2011, has not completed any required continuing education since 2017 because they could not find it in the public records. Counsel reviewed our internal records and found proof of Respondent's CE from 2020 when they were part of the 2019 audit. Because Respondent has not been part of any audit since, Respondent has not had to submit their more recent CE records. Respondent did attest to completing the CE in their 2021, 2023, and 2025 renewal applications.

Respondent claims that this complaint was filed as retaliation after they were deposed. Nevertheless, Respondent provides a very detailed response to each of the ten allegations made in the forensic review of their survey. Respondent notes that their scope of work was limited to their client's property and access easement, and their opinions are professional and to be judged accordingly as part of the litigation. Respondent argues that the evidence they gathered was sufficient to make and provide a professional opinion, and additional evidence that was presented to them during the deposition only reinforced their initial opinion. Respondent further explains that they flew a UAV mission so that they could limit the amount of time they needed to be onsite at the property, and during the course of the fieldwork that lasted less than a day, they were able to positively identify all of their client's boundary corners and several of the corners monumenting the access easement. Respondent did not need to investigate the survey monuments because the boundaries are not in question. What was in question was how the material monuments do not accurately define the existing driveway that follows the recorded access easement. A driveway existed before the easement was recorded, and Respondent's professional opinion is that the driveway is what the initial grantor intended the easement to be, and the math and geometry of the initial surveyor and the corner pins of the following surveyors do not accurately contain this existing driveway. The fact remains that Complainant does not like this opinion. Respondent believes this complaint is unwarranted, and if it were found to be justified, they are not sure how they would continue to operate as a land surveyor. Respondent's deposition and opinion are to be presented to a judge so they can make a decision regarding adverse possession and a prescriptive easement in a court of law. If Respondent's work is required to be perfect or if their opinions are to be silenced, then they wonder what path is there forward in the profession.

Counsel does not find any violations based on the information reviewed and recommends dismissal. However, if the Board finds that it would be helpful for a Board member to review this matter to determine whether Respondent violated the standards of care, Counsel recommends deferring this matter to the next Board meeting pending a Board member's review.

Reviewed by Board member: N/A

Mitigating Factors: Complainant is not Respondent's client. Complainant filed this complaint regarding a survey that serves as an expert opinion regarding the subject matter of a lawsuit in a civil court, and the survey is at odds with Complainant's side of the lawsuit.

Aggravating Factors: N/A

Recommendation: Dismiss or defer pending Board review

Board Decision: Dismiss.

10. 2026055061 (EC)

First Licensed: 04/28/1983

Expiration: 12/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Land Surveyor

History (5 yrs.): None.

Complainant is a licensed contractor and alleges Respondent, a licensed surveyor, omitted information that should have been included in their survey. Respondent was hired in January of 2025 to complete a survey for a commercial parcel to establish a food truck park, and they provided a stamped survey on April 23, 2025. Complainant alleges the Codes Department made comments about the survey that still need to be addressed by Respondent.

Respondent confirms they completed an as-built drawing for Complainant and payment was made for the services, but Complainant has since requested a revision to the site plan to add two additional food trucks. Respondent completed the revision and requested payment of \$100 before sending the drawing. Because payment was not received, Respondent marked the file as having an outstanding balance. The client did not respond for more than one year, and after Complainant resumed work on the project and contacted the Codes Department over a year and a half later, Codes advised Complainant that information was missing from the site plan. When Complainant contacted them, Respondent said they would be glad to assist once payment was made on the outstanding balance owed from 2025. Complainant has continuously promised to make payment, but it has yet to be received.

Reviewed by Board member: N/A

Mitigating Factors: The issue is related to an outstanding balance owed, and Complainant has not paid it.

Aggravating Factors: N/A

Recommendation: Dismiss

Board Decision: Concur.

11. 2026051121 (EC)

First Licensed: 12/08/2021

Expiration: 12/31/2027

Type of License: Professional Engineer

History (5 yrs.): 2022 – One complaint closed with a letter of warning for discipline by another state's licensing board.

An administrative complaint was opened internally based on Respondent's recent self-reporting of discipline in Colorado and New Mexico. On December 12, 2022, this Board opened an administrative complaint based on discipline assessed by the Oklahoma Engineering Board on December 2, 2022. It appears that Respondent had not notified the Engineering Boards in Colorado and New Mexico of the Oklahoma discipline at the same time they notified this Board. Therefore, Respondent was issued similar reciprocal discipline by the Colorado Engineering Board on January 31, 2025, and the New Mexico Engineering Board on June 25, 2026. This Board already sent a Letter of Caution to Respondent based on the Oklahoma discipline on December 12, 2022; therefore, Counsel recommends dismissing this complaint.

Reviewed by Board member: N/A

Mitigating Factors: Self-reported, and this Board already issued a Letter of Caution to Respondent for the same initial discipline assessed by Oklahoma

Aggravating Factors: N/A

Recommendation: Dismiss

Board Decision: Concur.

NEW BUSINESS

Jason Carder made a motion to allow the board's land surveyor members to serve as expert reviewers on surveyor complaints. This was seconded by Blair Parker. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote by the full board.

The board reaffirmed that Tennessee licensure is legally tied to protecting "health, safety, and welfare," not "well-being," and members should use the statutory term.

The board debated the value and logistics of grant presentations, with members voicing support for moving them to the Grants Committee meeting while limiting presentation to no more than 3-5 minutes and further reiterated that participation is optional.

Frank Wagster announced the establishment of a Laws and Rules Exam Committee, and appointed James Collins as Chair and Rick Thompson, Blair Parker, Melanie Doss, and Philip Lim as members.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD RELATED TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

ADJOURNMENT

Frank Wagster adjourned the meeting at 12:25 p.m.