



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

**Meeting Minutes for May 21, 2026
First Floor Conference Room 1B
Davy Crockett Tower**

The Tennessee Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors met on May 21, 2026, and the following business was transacted:

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / NOTICE OF MEETING

Gary Clark called the meeting to order at 9:05 am and Director Glenn Kopchak took roll call.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Director Glenn Kopchak recognized former board member Jay Caughman for his years of service and dedication to the Tennessee Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors. Mr. Caughman was presented with a plaque in appreciation of his leadership and contributions to the profession and the Board.

The board broke for a 5-minute recess.

AGENDA

Tommy Young made a motion to adopt the agenda. This was seconded by Justin Rains. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

MINUTES

Justin Rains made a motion to adopt the February minutes. This was seconded by Kevin Martin. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY REPORT

Jay Caughman, Tennessee Association of Professional Surveyors (TAPS), announced upcoming events to include the June BOD meeting on Saturday, June 13th in Nashville and the Certified Floodplain Surveyor (CFS) course from July 29 – August 1, 2026, in Nashville.

CE EXEMPTION REVIEW

Justin Rains made a motion to formally ratify a prior approval granted for hardship and medical exemption of continuing education requirements for Mr. Bateman pursuant to Rule 0820-05-.09. This was seconded by Kevin Martin. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

EDUCATION REPORT

Course Provider	Course Number	Course Name	Hours	Recommendation
Halfmoon Education	1353	Deep Dive into Drainage Rights	2	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1354	Drone Applications for Utilities	6	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1355	How to Obtain, Interpret, and Change a FEMA Flood Map	3	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1356	Reading, Interpreting and Writing Land Descriptions Workshop	3	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1357	State Plane Coordinate System: Transition to NATRF2022	7.5	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1358	Complying with Survey Standards	2	Approved
ASPLS	1359	Boundary Determinations	3.5	Approved
ASPLS	1360	Contracts with One Hour of Ethics	3.5	Approved
ASPLS	1361	SPCS 2022 Workshop	3.5	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1362	Complying with Land Surveyor Code of Ethics	2	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1363	Land Surveying and Climate Change	2	Approved
Halfmoon Education	1364	Orthometric Heights Using GNSS	3	Approved

Halfmoon Education	1365	The Usefulness of Drones For Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors	2.5	Approved
--------------------	------	---	-----	----------

Justin Rains made a motion to formally ratify the prior approval granted for all the courses listed on the education report. This was seconded by Kevin Martin. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

SAMPLE PLAT AND DESCRIPTIONS

The Board discussed updates and revisions to the sample plat and descriptions and further highlighted the need for an update due to some recent changes in the rules, but also the possible inclusion of a purpose statement to underscore intent with additional disclaimer that the plat is an aid, not necessarily a comprehensive template.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Budget Report

Director Kopchak summarized the revenues and expenses from January through March and drew attention to items listed under "Other" and "Technology". After reviewing the ledger, expenses were determined to be NCEES membership dues and CORE Cloud hosting services/IT work.

LEGAL

Legal Report (Presented by: Erica Cable)

1. 2026001361

Respondent:

License Status: Unlicensed

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant is a licensed land surveyor who filed this complaint against Respondent, an unlicensed individual, alleging they are engaging in unlicensed surveying. Additionally, Complainant requested the Commission issue enforcement action and provide clearer guidance to protect the public.

Complainant was contacted by a licensed civil engineer to provide land surveying services for a proposed project in January of this year. Respondent had already provided a topographic survey and property lines to the engineer for design purposes. Respondent also provided LiDAR data, created contour lines, visited the site with their GPS, located two property corners, plotted the survey calls, and then translated the calls and linework geometry to the two property corner coordinates.

Complainant and Respondent had a non confrontational discussion about whether or not Respondent was providing surveying according to our statute. Respondent was not opposed to Complainant filing this complaint as an inquiry.

Respondent state that they have never represented themselves as a licensed land surveyor. Respondent identifies as a grading and site development contractor and in this instance, they provided preliminary project feasibility and constructability advice. The CAD file was intended for early conceptual evaluation to aid client decision-making, not for final design or construction. The surface data in the file was derived from publicly available Tennessee LiDAR data. Property boundary lines in the CAD file were digitized from an existing licensed survey provided by the property owner and shared with the engineer. GPS equipment was used to locate two property corners and was for general "situational awareness" only.

An expert review was conducted considering the recent frequency of this issue coming before the Board. The expert notes that Respondent has a high degree of technical acumen and appears to use the same tools that surveyors and engineers use. The expert believes Respondent's machines are likely guided by GPS and they probably use CAD to extract designed positions which they lay out, or stake to, on the job site to construct. Respondent assembled a CAD file with elevation data and boundary shape spatially positioned and provided it to the engineer. These actions are typical in the due diligence phase of a project to consider feasibilities. The expert opines that what Respondent provided to the engineer was not a topographic survey and was not intended to be one. It is common practice for grading contractors to be provided with a survey that sets the limits for their project. Often, the property corners themselves serve as "project control" and the contractor must fit themselves into the site by observing these corners with GPS. This action is a typical duty of a land surveyor, but Respondent is not purporting to be a land surveyor, is not offering up opinions about corners or boundary lines and is not annotating them with bearings and distances or creating a formal document. The expert does not believe Respondent is engaging in unlicensed activity. Based on the expert's review and opinion, Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Discuss

BOARD DECISION: Letter of Instruction.

2. 2026010271

Respondent: License Status: Unlicensed Disciplinary History: None.

License Status: Unlicensed

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant is a licensed land surveyor in Tennessee and Respondent is an unlicensed individual. Complainant alleges Respondent is running a land surveying business out of their residence. Respondent's LLC used "Surveying" in the name of the business and has advertised on various Facebook groups by posting a picture of Respondent's business card. The posts from 2025 offered "land surveying and layout," boundary surveys, house layouts, or "other survey needs." Respondent's LLC was only active for a month before it was dissolved. Respondent changed the name of the business in May of 2025 from using "surveying" to "land services." Respondent provided their new business card and their county business tax license, which shows their new business name and the license was issued on 2/24/26.

Complainant alleges Respondent came to them 3 years ago and wanted to work for them as a sub-contractor. Respondent explained to Complainant that they would have to be employed by a licensed surveyor and work towards getting a license. Complainant opines that Respondent refuses to work under a licensed surveyor because they can make more money by posing as a land surveyor while undercutting the local licensees. Complainant provided a copy of a plat allegedly completed by Respondent but stamped by a licensed surveyor on 1/21/26. A consultant for the Division of Groundwater Protection in the County listed in the plat brought this issue to Complainant's attention. Counsel reached out to the consultant who allegedly brought the plat to the attention of Complainant. Counsel had not heard back from them at the time this legal report was completed.

Respondent works for the licensed surveyor who signed the plat at issue. Respondent offers "land surveying assistance, property mapping, property staking, and commercial and residential layout." Respondent admits to meeting with Complainant and the other surveyor to offer their services in "layout and staking." Respondent denies ever claiming to be a licensed land surveyor but understands how their business name could be confusing. Respondent claims the consultant does not have a problem with the plat at issue. Respondent came from a very large contracting company as a field engineer doing building layouts and understood they did not need a surveying license to do property staking or layout. Respondent's goal is to obtain their surveying license.

Counsel reached out to the surveyor who signed the plat. The surveyor confirmed Respondent has worked as a field party chief on projects beginning in Spring 2024, Respondent's initials are on the plat at issue because part of the requirements for licensure in Tennessee is to submit two plats, the surveyor proofread and stamped the survey after reviewing all field work and making judgments on measurements set, and they do not have any knowledge of Respondent engaging in unlicensed surveying. The surveyor also confirms Respondent is working hard to obtain their license.

Based on the information provided, the support from the surveyor who signed the plat and the lack of response from the consultant who allegedly brought this "issue" to Complainant's attention, Counsel recommends issuing a Letter of Warning for advertising land surveying services prior to changing their business name.

RECOMMENDATION: Letter of Warning

BOARD DECISION: Concur

3. 2025065661 2026024361

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 12/1/2014 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant's husband filed a complaint against Respondent earlier this year and that complaint was presented at the February Board meeting. The complaint was dismissed by the Board. In that complaint, Respondent was accused of not returning calls and texts to Complainant's husband after completing 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. This new complaint alleges that Respondent exhibited "unprofessional conduct" because they allegedly would not further assist Complainant because a complaint had been filed. Complainant claims this is retaliatory and argues that further clarification by Respondent is a necessity because the adjoining neighbor's land surveyor's survey is in conflict with Respondent's survey. Complainant wanted Respondent to clarify their findings, methodology, and provide supporting documentation for the survey at issue. Complainant makes it clear that they are not asking the Board to resolve the boundary dispute itself, but to evaluate whether Respondent's conduct is unethical and unprofessional.

When the last complaint was filed, Respondent noted that Complainant is arguing with their neighbor over a fence that ties into their own fence. Respondent had made it clear that they did not want anything more to do with Complainant because they believe they are trying to cause problems with their neighbor. Respondent does not feel obligated to do any more work for Complainant after fulfilling what they believe to be their full contractual obligations. The encroachment at issue 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. Respondent also admits they told

Complainant they were no longer interested in working with them because they reported Respondent to this Board for “not returning a phone call.” Respondent is considering having an attorney send Complainant a cease-and-desist letter and asks the Board for direction. Counsel does not find that Respondent has acted unethically for refusing to continue to work with a Complainant who has reported them to the Board when there has been no evidence of any violations. Considering Respondent’s concern and Complainant’s serious allegations, Counsel asks the Board to make any comments they feel necessary to address this situation. Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

4. 2026013571

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 4/23/2018 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant hired Respondent to complete a survey of their property which was done on 10/15/25. Complainant claims that Respondent was supposed to locate corners and plant wood stakes along the boundary line, replace missing monuments and present the drawing of the survey. Complainant alleges Respondent broke a monument pin with their shovel, left the top half of the monument pin laying an inch under the dirt and didn’t replace it.

Complainant claims Respondent also failed to install a new monument on the front left corner and didn’t stake the whole property. Respondent allegedly only staked from one monument pin to another on the right side of their driveway and never came back. Complainant called Respondent’s office about this and then sent a certified letter on 11/10/25 but they have not heard anything back from Respondent about these issues.

Respondent believes this complaint arose from misunderstandings concerning standard surveying practices, the scope of work performed, and the condition of the existing boundary monuments. Respondent denies engaging in any unprofessional conduct or violating any statutes or rules governing the practice. During the survey, an existing iron pipe was uncovered for verification purposes, and it was old, deteriorated and structurally compromised prior to excavation. The exposed portion separated due to corrosion and age. The remaining portion was still in place and its position observed and verified, but it was not replaced. Respondent’s scope

of work did not require monumentation of every corner unless explicitly agreed upon. Stakes were placed along the surveyed boundary lines consistent with industry practice and site conditions. Respondent acknowledges Complainant attempted follow-up communication and there was never an intent to ignore it. Any delay was administrative in nature due to their office's very high volume of correspondence. Respondent further argues the frequency and length of phone calls from Complainant were bordering on harassment.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

5. 2026010741

Respondent:

License Status: Retired

First Licensed: 10/31/1980 Expires: 12/31/2025

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant filed six complaints against six different surveyors. Complainant filed this complaint against Respondent regarding a boundary survey from April of 2024. Complainant is engaged in a boundary dispute with their neighbor and has hired multiple land surveyors because of this dispute. Complainant alleges that all the surveyors hired have been unable to correct the issue at the core of the boundary dispute. Complainant's neighbor has filed a lawsuit against them regarding the boundary dispute which is currently in litigation. Complainant alleges Respondent refuses to use deeds and landmarks to complete an accurate survey. Complainant also claims Respondent removed a landmark on one side of their property and told them not to worry about it because they gave Complainant more property on another side of it. Complainant provided a Warranty Deed from 1972 and a title transfer with property description from 1971, as well as a Deed of Trust from 1976.

Respondent retired their license on 12/31/25 at the age of 70 and sold their business. Throughout Respondent's engagement with Complainant, they repeatedly asked Respondent to revise the survey to support their specific claims regarding their neighbor's property. Respondent declined these requests because they did not align with the evidence identified during the survey. Respondent used all available deeds relevant to the property. In instances where they found landmarks conflicted, Respondent exercised their professional judgment to determine which monuments most accurately reflected the original intent of the prior deeds. Complainant alleged the next surveyor they hired found a marker 13' away from where Respondent said

the property ended. Respondent confirms they have no knowledge of this marker. Respondent has never removed a found monument in their 50-year career. Respondent has occasionally adjusted monuments that they personally set pending further information but states they did not do so for this project.

Complainant filed a rebuttal which made arguments related to Respondent's assessment of the original deed vs. current deeds, Brown's hierarchy of evidence, senior rights, measurements, and also notes that Respondent did not personally remove the monument but alleges it could have been Respondent's technicians. The rebuttal was provided to Respondent. Respondent provides a very long and detailed response to the rebuttal. Respondent understands that Complainant is very frustrated about the boundary dispute with their neighbor and the resulting gap identified in Respondent's survey, but it has led Complainant to make material misstatements of fact, unfounded accusations, and Complainant appears to have misunderstandings of standard surveying principles. Respondent addresses each of Complainant's arguments with precision and their survey represents a sound, objective professional opinion based on standard surveying methodologies, thorough deed research, and the physical evidence recovered on site.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

6. 2026010821

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 8/26/2007 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

This is the second complaint filed by Complainant. Respondent was hired by Complainant's title insurance company, and they completed a survey on 11/29/23. Complainant provided their title history, as they did for all the surveyors they have hired and who are listed in this report. Complainant alleges Respondent refused to use the title history, did not use known landmarks on site, had measurements that don't match their deed or the neighbor's deed, and produced a survey that is different from the other surveys.

Respondent explains that they would not have accepted this job because Complainant has hired multiple surveyors and has not been satisfied with the results, which presents a "red flag" regarding landowner expectations. The title

insurance company was a long-term client, so Respondent agreed to do the work. Respondent denies Complainant's allegations and did use the history of the land provided, but Complainant does not understand that surveyors are required to give more weight to recorded deeds and evidence found in the field. Respondent provided documents they took into consideration, including the 1975 property plat, the Property Assessor's Tax Map, the controlling deed for the property, and the controlling deeds for adjacent and neighboring properties. Respondent followed the laws of this state and the rules of their profession in conducting the survey which produces results that are sometimes in conflict with landowner expectations, and unfortunately, in this case, Complainant disagrees with the results.

Complainant filed a rebuttal that included their writings on Respondent's survey showing the differences between the deed and the survey. Respondent argues there is no new or useful information to address and is considering the Complainant's statements for a potential civil suit for libel and slander.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

7. 2026010811

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 7/12/2000 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

This is the third complaint filed by Complainant against a surveyor they hired to survey their property due to a boundary dispute. Respondent completed the survey and produced the plat on 3/23/22. Complainant alleges Respondent used a pin in the road which was placed by another surveyor for the land across the street. Complainant alleges Respondent refused to use the title history they provided, did not use known landmarks on site, had measurements that don't match their deed or the neighbor's deed, and produced a survey that is different from the other surveys.

Respondent states Complainant did not originally disclose that the property had been previously surveyed or that they were having a boundary dispute with their neighbor. Respondent detailed some of the field work and what they found, and when they marked the boundary line, Complainant was unhappy. Complainant had built a pond, and, in the process, the toe of the levee falls over the surveyed line.

Respondent went back out to the property, free of charge, to see if they could find any more monumentation that could have been missed. Respondent did not find any evidence to further alteration of the line.

Complainant called Respondent multiple times and eventually told them they had prior surveys, so Respondent made efforts to try to check any prior surveys once they had knowledge of them. Complainant also told Respondent about new items they found in the road that might represent the corner. At that point, Respondent suspected Complainant added these things after the survey had been completed.

Complainant filed a rebuttal alleging Respondent didn't use a metal detector and claimed the neighbor's surveyor found a CPS monument in the road on Complainant's property. Complainant makes more allegations detailing why Respondent was incorrect in their field work and final results. Complainant alleges Respondent had mentioned a "no man's land" but didn't show it in their plat. Counsel provided the rebuttal to Respondent but no response had been received at the time this report was completed.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

8. 2026010781

Respondent:

License Status: Unlicensed

Disciplinary History: None.

This is the fourth complaint filed by Complainant against a land surveyor who they hired to survey their property. Respondent completed their survey on 10/23/24. Complainant alleges Respondent, like the other surveyors, refused to use the history of each parcel, refused to use known landmarks on site, provided a survey that makes no sense according to their deeds, used measurements that don't match the deeds or the neighbor's deed, and pulled from an incorrect starting point from the neighbor's side of the property.

Respondent takes issue with the fact that Complainant had hired at least 4 other surveyors before, and all of the surveys show the same results. Complainant is upset because none of the surveyors have the same opinion as them or give them the results they want. Respondent notes all of the surveyors have agreed with each other quite well from what they can tell. Respondent tried to be cordial with

Complainant, trying to help them understand the deeds and surveying procedures. Respondent ultimately walked away from working with Complainant because they believe Complainant was moving pins and stakes.

Complainant filed a rebuttal which was provided to Respondent. Respondent did not have anything to add other than to reiterate that they had more recently become aware that Complainant hired at least 6 surveyors who all basically agree to the same findings.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

9. 2026010771

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 7/24/2001 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

This is the fifth complaint filed by Complainant against a land surveyor they hired to survey their property. Complainant alleges Respondent spoke to one of the other surveyors in February 2025 about the property. Complainant showed Respondent where other surveyors had placed new markers and claims Respondent used those markers for boundary lines, even though Complainant told them that they were not original.

Respondent was retained on 1/14/25 to locate and mark property corners for Complainant. Prior to their field crew conducting a site visit, Complainant provided them with a survey provided by another surveyor. Complainant filed a complaint against that surveyor, and it is summarized in No. 5 above. Respondent did not communicate with the surveyor regarding their survey, and they were not provided access to or made aware of all prior surveys performed on the property. Respondent conducted their work independently and followed standard professional procedures and due diligence based on the information available to them at the time of service. Complainant did not accept the results of Respondent's survey.

Counsel recommends dismissal

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

10. 2026010831

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 8/23/2017 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

This is the sixth complaint filed by Complainant against a land surveyor they hired to survey their property. Complainant alleges Respondent is making the same mistakes as the other surveyors and is pulling the starting location from the wrong locations, not using landmarks or stating landmarks can't be used, refusing to use information provided by Complainant, and is moving boundary lines. Complainant believes that much of the problem stems from a land surveyor that made mistakes when they surveyed the property incorrectly in 1970. Complainant states they have asked all of the surveyors to correct the boundary line according to what Complainant knows to be right, but none of them will make corrections.

Respondent spoke with Complainant on 6/3/25 about the possibility of surveying their property, and then Complainant came to their office a couple days later to discuss it further. Complainant then emailed Respondent later that day with 14 attachments, including deeds and surveys from other surveyors. Respondent was hired on 6/10/25 and sent their survey crew out on 6/16 and 6/17. Respondent began office work by compiling deeds and reviewing the previous surveys and comparing the field information collected with the deeds and previous surveys. Respondent determined which found monumentation of corners they believed to be the closest to the original location and produced a preliminary survey. Complainant became very argumentative and irate, and claimed that Respondent's survey was incorrect and that all the other surveys had the same result as to the location of the disputed property line. Complainant abruptly stormed out of the office taking the rough draft with them but leaving the invoice for the contracted work behind. Respondent has not been paid as of the time of their response on 2/27/26. Respondent provided over 50 pages of work with their response.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

11. 2026016921

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 7/29/2003 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant filed this complaint and the next complaint summarized under No. 12. Respondent surveyed the property in 2006. Complainant alleges Respondent did not use the existing boundary on the surveyed lines on an adjoining property and moved their property line, resulting in a gap between properties. Respondent is very surprised to hear that there can be a complaint filed 19 years after a survey is done, although they stand by their work and are curious how long they would be expected to keep records of prior work like this.

Respondent states that the surveyor mentioned in the complaint below surveyed the adjoining property and confirmed the boundary in question using the same monuments in 2022.

Counsel recommends dismissal based on the age of the survey due to the Board's four-year statute of limitations and repose.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

12. 2026017061

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 4/25/1980 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

Complainant's adjoining neighbor hired Respondent to perform a survey which was completed on or around 3/1/22. Complainant alleges Respondent changed angles from 40 to 38 degrees, which resulted in an inaccurate survey. As a result, Complainant alleges their property dimensions were reduced. Complainant also filed the complaint above about the same boundary dispute.

Respondent found pins on the northwest and southwest corner of the property that they surveyed as well as on the southeast corner of Complainant's property. Respondent held the distances on their client's property and Complainant's property. On 3/11/25 and 3/13/25, Complainant came to Respondent office and screamed about the property line and would not let Respondent explain anything

related to the survey at issue. Respondent asked Complainant to leave. Counsel recommends dismissal based on the age of the survey due to the Board's four-year statute of limitations and repose.

Counsel recommends dismissal based on the age of the survey due to the Board's four-year statute of limitations and repose.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

13. 2026012731

Respondent:

License Status: Active

First Licensed: 12/16/2013 Expires: 12/31/2027

Disciplinary History: None.

The City where Complainant lives hired Respondent to put up a fence near their property. Complainant alleges the City does not have an easement through their property and claims Respondent is doing the Town a favor by creating a new pin and taking part of their property. Complainant claims they once hired Respondent as a surveyor but believes they are now involved in a conspiracy with the City. The remaining allegations are very unclear and there is no evidence provided to support the complaint.

Respondent takes issue with the fact that this complaint was not vetted prior to being sent to them. Respondent is unsure how to respond due to the convoluted allegations and unclear wording, but they do their best to provide a detailed response to what they think the complaint is trying to address. Respondent and local surveyors have been dealing with Complainant's live-in boyfriend since 2017. The boyfriend has been complaining about the property's boundary line and has used weapons and intimidation over the years. The most recent event occurred after two City employees were traveling along the dedicated easement which lies on an adjoining property to repair a city lift station. The Mayor called Respondent to come show the City workers where the pins were located along Complainant's north line so that a fence could be erected. Under the protection of police, Respondent went and uncovered the northeast and northwest corners of the property. Respondent provided three plats that show this line. Respondent and other surveyors must remind the boyfriend every 5-6 years that Complainant owns property to the set of pins on the south and not the north set of pins which are the north corners of the City's easement. Since 2017, the surveyors that go out are uncovering existing pins, two of which are still capped from the first boundary

survey in 2004 and have to try to explain this to the boyfriend. Respondent asks that we store this response because it will likely come up again in 5-6 years.

This is a dispute between the City and a local resident and there has been much discourse since as early as 2016 based on documents provided by the Complainant and Respondent. If Complainant wants to pursue this further, they should speak to a private attorney and handle the dispute in civil court.

Counsel recommends dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION: Dismiss

BOARD DECISION: Concur

Attorney Kyle Johnson informed the Board that SB1814 which allows for moving an official land surveying monument to be punished as a Class A Misdemeanor passed and will go into effect on July 1, 2026.

NEW BUSINESS

Tommy Young proposed a rule change that would establish a time limit on reapplications for individuals whose licenses have been expired for an extended period. Under his suggestion, the former licensee would be required to retake the Tennessee Specific (TS) exam before the license could be reinstated to active status. Attorney Kyle Johnson noted that the board's rules allow the applicant either to retake the exam or to submit 30 hours of continuing education and that any deviation would require a change in the rules.

Board members discussed the historical significance of the meeting as the final meeting of the Board as an independent board prior to consolidation.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Eddie Campbell made statements about the TDOT LiDAR program.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.