



**BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR LAND SURVEYORS
500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243
615-741-2241**

**Meeting Minutes for February 19, 2026
First Floor Conference Room 1B
Davy Crockett Tower**

The Tennessee Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors met on February 19, 2026, and the following business was transacted:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Gary Clark, Tommy Young, Justin Rains, Kevin Martin (Virtual)

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Glenn Kopchak, Melanie Holcomb, Philip Allocco, Alexandria Griffey, Kyle Johnson, Erica Cable

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / NOTICE OF MEETING

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

AGENDA

Tommy Young made an amendment to present the legal report immediately after the professional society report. This was seconded by Justin Rains. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

MINUTES

Justin Rains made a motion to adopt the November minutes. This was seconded by Tommy Young. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORT

Jay Caughman, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors (TAPS), announced upcoming events to include the TAPS Annual Spring Conference that will take place March 5 - 7, 2026, at the Embassy Suites in Murfreesboro, TN. Mr. Caughman also provided a brief introduction and summary of the following bills being considered during this legislative session: SB1814 and SB2224.

LEGAL

Legal Report (Presented by: Erica Cable)

1. 2025056551

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 10/28/1988

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant filed this complaint against Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, regarding a survey Respondent completed for Complainant's neighbors. Complainant alleges that Respondent's survey plat, recorded July 31, 2025, for Complainant's adjoining neighbor, improperly shifted the neighbors' northwest corner from an established monument at the westerly terminus of a public road to an "existing concrete marker" at the easterly terminus. This change appears to be in conflict with prior deeds and surveys, converts a prior encroachment into the neighbors' platted boundary, eliminates the Complainant's shared-drive access, omits a documented 30-foot easement crossing the new tract, and contains record-citation errors.

Respondent states they were hired to survey a new 15-acre tract for their clients' daughter and created a 25-foot ingress/egress easement through a parent tract to an existing gravel driveway that meets a public right-of-way. Respondent explains this was done as a result of a one-access policy. Respondent states the easement exposed a boundary conflict with the Complainant and their neighbors. Specifically, Respondent cites long-term possession (driveway & fence) and a buried, non-standard concrete marker approximately (~)18.5 feet from a monument as justification for the northerly line. Respondent included the driveway area "by strength of possession," acknowledging it could encroach on Complainant's deed. Respondent admits to not verifying the Complainant's frontage and believes that the driveway was not the primary access to the Complainant's property. Respondent's survey created the 25-foot access easement but omitted an existing (and separate) 30-foot easement at their client's request, believing it unused. Respondent admits a deed book typo and missing plat citation (referring to another surveyor's survey) and says they should have labeled the Complainant's line as "possession only/in conflict." Respondent further admits that a revised plat may be needed. Respondent's opinion is that litigation may be required to settle the matter between landowners and their survey has made the issues evident and available to Complainant and the public.

An expert review was conducted. The expert first notes that the root cause of the complaint is a boundary dispute. The Complainant believes they are being

encroached upon by their southerly adjoiner but does not have their own survey and has not brought any action against the adjoiner. While the expert believes this is a civil matter, there are several concerning items worth noting about the Respondent's work and actions summarized as follows:

1. A vicinity map and/or a descriptive location of the property appear to be missing from both the drawing supplied by the Respondent and the recorded document supplied by the Complainant in violation of Standards of Practice 0820-03-.07(1)(b)(1).
2. The drawing provided by Respondent in response to this complaint does not seem to bear their seal and does not appear to be marked PRELIMINARY in violation of Standards of Practice 0820-04-.08(2). The Complainant did provide the recorded copy which is sealed.
3. Respondent failed to show an easement that is apparent and obvious in the record, purportedly at the request of the client. The easement appears on previous work of the Respondent. This error is in violation of Standards of Practice 0820-03-.06(8) and 0820-03-.07(1)(f).
4. Respondent notes that North and East boundaries are subject to verification by current field survey and have been taken from an unadjusted 2008 survey by another licensed surveyor. The North and East lines generally seem to align with the other survey, except the final calls at the driveway/access point where the boundary issue seems to be. If Respondent is using the other licensed surveyor's survey for the North and East lines, then the line should hold a specified/numbered concrete monument (141). Instead, they deviate, removing access from the Complainant. This is in violation of Standards of Practice 0820-03-.06(4).
5. Respondent admits to not verifying the Complainant's frontage while adjusting the other survey's line to honor a different monument. The citation for Complainant's deed is also incorrect on Respondent's recorded plat. This may violate Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-18-127 regarding a land surveyor's duty to research common boundaries.
6. Respondent failed to notify Complainant of the discrepancy in the area of the driveway. This is a violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-18-124(d) which requires a land surveyor to notify affected adjoiners of any major apparent discrepancy as defined by the Board between the deed description of adjoiners, evidence of use or possession not consistent with deed descriptions or otherwise has notice that there is an adverse

claim across a boundary, if that discrepancy was discovered or should have reasonably been discovered.

7. In summary, the expert reviewer believes that the information provided by the Complainant and the Respondent depicts a scenario where the Respondent is operating below the normal standard of care that land surveyors are held to.

Counsel recommends discussing these technical violations and issuing a Letter of Warning, and/or requiring the Respondent to take continuing education above and beyond that which is already required, and/or a civil penalty based on the Board's opinion of the seriousness of these violations. The Board can issue a civil penalty between \$50 and \$1,000 for each violation according to Rule 0820-01-.06(1). As a reminder, the Board should consider whether a civil penalty will be a substantial economic deterrent, the circumstances leading to the violations, the severity of the violation and risk of harm to the public, the economic benefits gained as a result of non-compliance, and the interest of the public. The Board can also consider the fact that Respondent has not been disciplined since obtaining their license in 1988, as well as the high cost of the expert review of this complaint.

RECOMMENDATION: Discuss

BOARD DECISION: Authorize a \$3,000 civil penalty against Respondent for violations of Standards of Practice 0820-03-.07(1)(b)(1) and Standard of Practice 0820-04-.08(2) and Standard of Practice 0820-03-.06(8) and 0820-03-.07(1)(f) and Standards of Practice 0820-03-.06(4) and Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-18-127 and § 62-18-124(d).

2. 2025066651

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 10/19/2018

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant's complaint is very short, stating "we've hired so many surveyors from 2020-2025 to resolve property line dispute. We even used our title insurance, but they denied helping us due to the neighbor suing us. We need help!" Respondent is a licensed land surveyor in Tennessee but lives and operates out of Mississippi, where they are also licensed. Based on some attachments provided with the short complaint, it appears

Complainant has a boundary dispute with neighbors or believes their boundary lines have been improperly surveyed.

Respondent explains they were hired to verify a previous survey on the subject property, and they were aware of the ongoing lawsuit at the heart of this complaint. Respondent states there have been at least 8 prior surveys of the same property, and they realized they may have gotten themselves involved in a “mess.” Respondent spent a lot of their own money to perform the survey, and they have not been paid, nor have they submitted an invoice for services rendered. Respondent has prepared a report of their findings and submitted it to the attorney for the defendant in the ongoing litigation.

Complainant filed a rebuttal and confirmed Respondent had not submitted a survey at the time they filed the complaint. The Complainant recently followed up again claiming they may have “jumped the gun” and asked that we remove Respondent from this complaint. Due to the lack of clear allegations against Respondent and lack of evidence of any issues or violations to review, Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

3. 2025065661

License Status: Unlicensed

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant alleges Respondent has “grossly misused the professional title of land surveyor.” Respondent is an unlicensed individual. Complainant takes issue with the fact that Respondent filed a complaint with the Tennessee State Fire Marshal’s Office and identified themselves as a land surveyor in that complaint. Complainant obtained a copy of that complaint through a public records request which states that Respondent was trying to contact someone about people living in an Amish shed and another family living in a fifth-wheel trailer. The complaint alleges the owner of the property passed away over four years ago, implying the people are living on the property unlawfully. Complainant argues that they have full permission to live on the property. Complainant notes Respondent works for a licensed architect/engineering firm and may perform survey-related tasks under the supervision of the licensed company, but argues Respondent is not authorized to identify themselves as a land surveyor. Complainant further argues that Respondent created the misleading impression that they are acting as a neutral, professional authority, which could exert influence over state and local officials. Complainant goes on to explain that Respondent is involved in a custody matter and alleges they are attempting to use official channels to influence or interfere with an

existing custody arrangement. Complainant alleges Respondent has violated Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-18-102 and § 62-18-120. The complaint filed with the Fire Marshal's Office was provided with this complaint and Respondent does state "I'm a land surveyor...".

Respondent states they "do survey land as [their] full-time occupation; however, [they] have never claimed to be, nor represented [themselves] as, a licensed land surveyor." Respondent denies ever misrepresenting their qualifications and notes the complaint at issue does not mention any claim of being a "licensed" land surveyor as alleged. Respondent argues this complaint is retaliatory in nature because they notified the Fire Marshal of fire safety concerns related to exposed insulation, leading to their concerns for their daughter and other children living on the property. Respondent also raised concerns about unsafe electric wiring and structural design which could present serious risks to the occupants. Respondent only asked that professionals from the Fire Marshal's Office inspect the property because of these concerns. Respondent's intent was to protect the well-being of the children on the property, not to represent themselves or their professional status. Respondent provided an email from the Fire Marshal's Office confirming Respondent never listed information claiming they were a licensed land surveyor and noting that complaint had nothing to do with land surveying.

Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Instruction cautioning Respondent to be aware that referring to themselves as a "land surveyor" on any document or in any way could still be considered a violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-18-120, which clearly states that qualifying adjectives are not necessary for an individual to infer they are a licensed land surveyor.

RECOMMENDATION: Letter of Instruction

BOARD DECISION: Concur

4. 2025061701

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 10/30/1987

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant hired Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, to survey a lot they just purchased. Respondent was selected through Complainant's realtor. Respondent informed the realtor that the survey was completed on 7/25/25 and sent an invoice for \$1,000 which Complainant paid by check. Complainant alleges that Respondent

has not responded to their requests to obtain the original survey, noting they have never even spoken with Respondent.

Respondent states that in August of 2025, the realtor asked them to survey a parcel of land. Respondent did the work and emailed the drawing and invoice to the realtor. Respondent confirms they received a check for payment from Complainant even though they were not hired by Complainant and also confirmed that they had never even spoken with them. Respondent told the realtor they could pick up the original copies whenever it was convenient. Later, Respondent received a call from the county sheriff stating Complainant was trying to contact them but was having trouble doing so. Respondent told the sheriff that their office hours were in the morning before noon and Complainant could pick up the plats anytime before noon Monday through Friday. Respondent states Complainant sent a lady to their office to pick up the plats and the sheriff's office called back to state Complainant had withdrawn their complaint.

Complainant sent additional correspondence to the Board as well as a rebuttal. Complainant wants Respondent reprimanded for never corresponding with them as a client causing them to have to involve the sheriff. Complainant claims it took six months, which does not match the timeline of all the information provided. Complainant alleges Respondent told them they would only provide an emailed version of the survey, which also seems to be in conflict with the statements that they never spoke with Respondent. Complainant confirms they received the original survey and plat. Complainant alleges Respondent is lying in their response to this complaint; however, it appears Respondent's statements are also confirmed by Complainant.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

5. 2025069361

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 7/12/2013

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant hired Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, to do an easement on their property. Complainant states that the road that was supposed to be surveyed "received some of the pins and stakes but they did not do the easement to show on

both sides of the road in which it was not complete...Complainant had their plats with seal on all of them way before they came back to set their center pin in the road. Complainant's court date was over in October of 2024, and they couldn't take pictures of it for court." The complaint does not make any further allegations or provide any other details.

Respondent confirms that they were hired by Complainant to locate and show the location of an existing gravel road, as it sits today, and the location of an agreed upon ingress/egress easement that was recorded in the Register of Deeds Office. The purpose of the survey was to show Complainant's attorney the location of the existing road location and the center of the recorded easement for a pending court case in which Complainant is the defendant. Respondent had felt bad for Complainant because another surveyor was supposed to complete this work but never showed up, and Complainant was in a bind, so they wanted to help. Respondent completed the survey on 10/30/23 for the court date originally scheduled for 11/1/23, but the court date was moved to 10/23/24. Respondent had explained to Complainant that they wanted to wait until after the judge made their decision and ruling to place the monuments in the center of the road. Respondent testified at the trial and Complainant told Respondent that they were fine with waiting for the judge's ruling. Respondent later set the corners for Complainant's property and clearly flagged them all, noting Complainant was with them and their crew at every corner that was set and flagged. Respondent explained the rebar is the corner of the property and the easement is 12 feet wide on each side of it, and a total of 24 feet wide. They walked the entire exterior of the boundary of the property and Respondent made sure Complainant understood everything. The neighbor even came out and drove down the common boundary line without any objections to what was being done by Respondent and their crew. However, this neighbor later filed a separate complaint with this Board against Respondent which was closed without action when presented to the Board at a previous meeting. Respondent believes they are being dragged back into more boundary disputes between Complainant and the neighbor, noting two separate lawsuits regarding the property that Respondent is aware of.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

6. 2025073241
License Status: Active
First Licensed: 2/14/1996

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant hired Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, to survey their property because they were concerned their neighbor may be encroaching onto their property as they were building a new home next door. Complainant alleges Respondent did not offer or provide a contract. Complainant alleges Respondent sent two unlicensed workers out to their property and after they were done, Complainant expressed concerns about their work and the fact that above-ground utility boxes located on both properties were not shown on the survey provided by Respondent. Complainant alleges the crew only used a small shovel, a metal detector, and a large measuring tape wheel. Complainant bases this allegation on what they saw on their home surveillance cameras. Complainant alleges that because Respondent never came to their property to investigate their concerns about the property line at the utility boxes and allegedly failed to research them in advance of the survey strongly suggests that Respondent had no direct involvement or supervisory role in the surveying of the property. Complainant alleges Respondent should not have sealed and certified the survey as being true and accurate.

Respondent confirms they were hired to do a land survey for Complainant and alleges Complainant is upset the survey did not produce the results they were looking for. Respondent did not provide a contract because they had discussed at length what services would be provided, including an email in which Respondent responded to six detailed questions from Complainant about the job and what to expect. Respondent doesn't typically use contracts unless they are involved in a major project. Respondent claims

Complainant is being untruthful about the equipment used at the site. Counsel asked Respondent what equipment was used in the field and they provided the following list:

1. Field Controller/Data Collector: Spectra Precision Ranger 3 CE OS 5.2.29336
2. Total Station: Topcon GM-55 bluetooth connection to data collector
3. Sokkia Prizm and pole (for electronic measurements)
4. Keson 200ft double nylon coated measuring tape NR10200H (for hand measurements)
5. Schonstedt Magnetic Locator GA-52cx

Respondent did not show the transformer box on this survey because the box is located within the public utility easement, and Complainant never mentioned the transformer box until they had possession of the survey. Respondent denies

Complainant's claim that utility boxes have any bearing to property lines. Respondent did include the public easement on the survey, and their standard operating procedure is that when there is an easement of record, they do not locate/show any infrastructure within that easement. Respondent argues that the transformer does not affect the property at issue and has no bearing on where the property line is. Had the transformer been located outside of the easement, they would have shown it, because it would have an effect on the property. Respondent states that their crew was at the property on a Friday afternoon, and Complainant called Monday morning after they viewed their security footage and listened to secretly recorded audio conversations between the crew members, and before they ever had a chance to look at the field work. Once Respondent downloaded the points and did the line work, it was obvious that the crew had done the calculations correctly and there was no need to revisit the site. Respondent did not visit the property, stating it is standard practice in Tennessee and noting their field crew has about 80 years of combined experience at their company. In response to Complainant's allegations that Respondent failed to have a supervisory role or direct involvement in the surveying of the property and failed to conduct research, Respondent explains that they researched documents with the Registrar's Office to find the recorded warranty deed which is indicated on the survey and on which the survey is based. Respondent also researched various foundational tools housed at the Registrar's Office including relevant pages of the Plat Book and Instrument Numbers. Respondent inspected the field notes and the electronically collected data and made the coordinate geometry calculations to come up with the final survey. Respondent states the survey is correct the best of their knowledge and belief, confirming they did everything Complainant asked for.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Letter of instruction.

7. 2025076731

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 6/28/2010

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant states they have had multiple surveys done by different land surveyors. Complainant alleges the surveyors continue to say their boundary lines are wrong between Complainant and their neighbor. Complainant claims their map and parcel say one thing, but the surveyors state they are wrong. Complainant has

lived at their residence for 25 years and nothing has been mentioned about the boundary until a new neighbor moved in. Complaints have had three title searches on their property. Complainant just wants someone to look at the information they have. Complainant does not make any allegations against Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, or provide any further detail in this complaint.

Respondent states Complainant has been looking for a land surveyor to survey their property for a while. Respondent has met with Complainant several times to go over their deed and has done their best to explain to Complainant respectfully that Respondent surveyed the adjoining property to Complainant's west and that Complainant needed to hire another surveyor to survey their property in order to obtain another surveyor's opinion. Respondent also told Complainant during one of the meetings that if Complainant and the adjoining neighbor could meet and discuss the shared boundary, then a boundary line agreement could be formed to eliminate any boundary issue, if both parties agreed to do so. Respondent feels they have conducted themselves professionally and ethically to give Complainant the correct guidance to obtain another survey from a different land surveyor so they could receive a fair and professional opinion regarding the shared boundary at issue. Respondent had surveyed the adjoining property in December of 2012, over 13 years ago, and Respondent has never performed any services for Complainant.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

8. 2025071891

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 1/11/2019

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Respondent is a licensed land surveyor in Tennessee and has been licensed here since January 11, 2019. Respondent resides in Alabama and is also licensed there as a land surveyor. This complaint was opened as a result of Respondent self-reporting discipline out of Alabama when they submitted their most recent license renewal application. Respondent provided a copy of a Consent Order related to two complaints filed against his land surveying license in Alabama which outlines the facts that led to a \$1,500 fine and the requirement that Respondent submit a quarterly list of all land surveying projects they perform beginning on 7/15/25 through 4/15/26. In the Consent Order, Respondent stipulated that they accepted

payments for surveying services they failed to complete for two separate projects in Alabama. Specifically, regarding the first complaint, Respondent stipulated that they received \$1,750 to complete a survey which they failed to complete in a timely manner. Respondent initially communicated with their client regarding the delay but failed to respond to repeated communication attempts by their client until a complaint was filed in December of 2024. Regarding the second complaint, Respondent stipulated that they received an initial payment of \$1,000 to begin surveying work for a project in Alabama and later requested the final payment of \$1,000 for the services but failed to complete the survey. Again, Respondent initially communicated with their client regarding the delay but failed to respond to repeated communication attempts by their client until a complaint was filed in December of 2024. The Consent Order was signed by Respondent on 4/18/25.

Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-18-116(a)(1) authorizes the Board to take disciplinary action against a land surveyor licensed in Tennessee due to disciplinary action taken in another jurisdiction. Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Warning to Respondent based on their violations committed in Alabama.

RECOMMENDATION: Letter of Warning

BOARD DECISION: Letter of Caution

9. 2026002981

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 1/26/2009

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant alleges Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, came out to their property on 12/10/25 and moved a property pin 100 feet from its original location and claimed there was an offset. Complainant told Respondent they didn't have an offset and brought out their deed to confirm there was no offset. Complainant states they contacted their "town records" about this and were allegedly informed they don't have an offset, and their property is a straight line. Complainant did not hire Respondent but states they originally set the pin 8 years ago.

Respondent states the Complainant's statements in the complaint do not accurately represent their conduct or facts of the survey. Respondent originally surveyed and subdivided a 250-acre tract into 35 lots in 2017. Respondent's client recently asked them to remark the unsold lots because many of the original markings were no longer visible. During this work, Respondent's crew encountered Complainant who identified themselves as the owner of a lot and accompanied the crew while they

marked the adjoining lots. Along Complainant's east boundary, there are four iron pins marking the back corners of three other lots. All four original pins were located with Respondent's caps intact, but one pin was found approximately 60 feet from the corner location as shown on the recorded plat.

After the crew reported their findings, Respondent received the information and directed the crew to set a pin at the correct corner as shown on the plat of record. Complainant expressed dissatisfaction to the crew and later emailed Respondent's client about their concerns. Respondent's client forwarded the email to them and Respondent responded to Complainant the same day to explain the findings and the reason for setting a new pin. Respondent provided copies of this correspondence, the recorded plat and a clipping highlighting the pin in question. Complainant asserts that their boundary line should be straight, that Respondent moved their corner due to an offset, that this was done without Complainant's knowledge, and that Complainant contacted Respondent without receiving a response. Regarding the offset, it appears Complainant misunderstood the crew's explanation. The crew informed Complainant that the pin, as found, created an offset in what should be a straight line. This discussion occurred while they were marking the corner in Complainant's presence, which contradicts the claim that the work was performed without their knowledge. The correspondence provided contradicts the allegation Respondent ignored Complainant. Respondent cannot determine what occurred between the original survey and the present, but the evidence suggests the pin was moved. The corner pin was reset in accordance with the recorded plat and in full compliance with current Tennessee minimum standards of practice.

Complainant filed a rebuttal and denied walking around with Respondent's crew and states they told them not to trespass and leave the pins where they were. Complainant claims the crew told them the pins would not be touched and then later moved the pin. Complainant claims the crew ripped their trespassing signs down and cut their electrical fence.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

10. 2026003271

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 12/1/2014

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant alleges they have attempted to call and text Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, and have not received a response. Respondent completed surveys on two of Complainant's properties. Complainant wants Respondent to provide them with a letter verifying that existing fences on both properties are located within Complainant's property boundaries, and the neighboring fences are encroaching onto Complainant's lots.

Respondent states that Complainant is arguing with their neighbor over a fence that ties into their fence. Respondent has surveyed both of Complainant's properties and the fences were not built by the owner of either property. Complainant is complaining that their neighbor's fence crosses their property by one foot and wants the neighbor to remove the fence to leave a gap between the two, leaving a small portion of property that no one will be able to cut or mow. Respondent labeled this on the survey provided to Complainant. Respondent does not want anything more to do with Complainant because they believe they are trying to cause problems and be an "annoying neighbor." Respondent does not feel obligated to do any more work for Complainant because they have fulfilled their contractual obligations. The encroachment is labeled on the survey at 1.11'. Respondent does not want to be further involved in a dispute between neighbors over fences that neither person built but will defend the surveys if they are subpoenaed to court.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

11. 2026006771

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 12/13/2012

Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant alleges they paid Respondent, a licensed land surveyor, \$3,650 to complete a survey which should have taken thirty days to finish. Complainant alleges Respondent has not finished the job and they want a refund or a completed survey. Complainant followed up very soon after this complaint was filed and stated this situation was taken care of, blaming it on poor communication, and explaining Respondent finished the survey. Complainant is very satisfied with the outcome.

There is no evidence of any violations and Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Tommy Young made a motion to nominate Gary Clark for Chairman and Justin Rains as Vice Chairman. This was seconded by Justin Rains. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

EDUCATION REPORT

Course Provider	Course Number	Course Name	Hours	Recommendation
Halfmoon Education Inc.	1334	Tracking the Railroads	4	Approved
Halfmoon Education Inc.	1335	Tennessee Highway and Utility Rights-of-Way	6	Approved
Alabama Society of Professional Surveyors	1336	Railroad Rights-of-Way	7	Approved
Alabama Society of Professional Surveyors	1337	History of Surveying in Alabama with Faircloth Notes	3.5	Approved
Alabama Society of Professional Surveyors	1338	How to Fix a Boundary Line	7.5	Approved
Alabama Society of Professional Surveyors	1339	Ethics for Surveyors	1	Approved
Alabama Society of Professional Surveyors	1340	Mentoring	3.5	Approved
Alabama Society of Professional Surveyors	1341	Federal Issues Facing the Surveying Profession	1.5	Approved
Halfmoon Education Inc.	1342	How to Build a Drone Program for your Firm	2	Approved

Halfmoon Education Inc.	1343	Terrestrial Laser Scanning: From Field to Digital Twin	3	Approved
Halfmoon Education Inc.	1344	Topographical Surveys, Easements and Original vs. Retracement Surveys	6	Approved
Halfmoon Education Inc.	1345	Practical GPS/GNSS Surveying	6	Approved
Halfmoon Education Inc.	1346	Aerial Mapping of Underground Resources and Conditions	6	Approved
Surveyors Education Seminars	1350	Trace Evidence for Surveyors – Office and Field	8	Approved
Surveyors Education Seminars	1351	Red Flag Requests	8	Approved
Gary C Clark	1352	Route Surveying for Gas and Electric Energy Providers	6	Approved

Tommy Young made a motion to approve all courses as listed on the education report, except course #1352. This was seconded by Justin Rains. The motion passed by majority roll call vote with Gary Clark abstaining.

Justin Rains made a motion to approve course #1352 entitled, “Route Surveying for Gas and Electric Energy Providers”. This was seconded by Tommy Young. The motion passed by majority roll call vote with Gary Clark recusing himself.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Budget Report

Director Kopchak summarized the financial reporting for October through December and drew attention to reallocation listed under “Other” and “Technology”. Director Kopchak reported that the reallocation of expenses for these line items was due to a credit adjustment coming from the legal division and an STS credit adjustment coming from the IT division.

LEGAL

Legislative Update

Although previously discussed during the legislative update, program attorney Kyle Johnson provided a summary of SB1814 which allows for moving an official land surveying monument to be punished as a Class A Misdemeanor and SB2224 which will consolidate

both the Board of Architectural and Engineer Examiners and the Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors into one board if passed.

Disciplinary History

Tommy Young made a motion to edit the letter of caution to include all licensees that self-report discipline in another jurisdiction less than revocation, suspension, or voluntary surrender. This was seconded by Justin Rains. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Justin Rains made a motion to approve 2 PDHs. This was seconded by Tommy Young. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.