NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting
Held in Reno, Nevada, Thursday, March 14, 2019

Chairman Robert LaRiviere, PLS, declaring a quorum present, called the meeting to order at 9:30am, in the Ed and Mary Alice Board Room at 1755 E Plumb Lane, Suite 130, Reno, Nevada. Board members present were Vice Chairman Karen Purcell, PE; Kent Anderson, PE; Michael Kidd, PLS; Brent Wright, PE/SE; Thomas Matter, public member; Gregory DeSart, PE; and Angelo Spata, PE. Also present were Patty Mamola, PE, Executive Director; Chris MacKenzie, Board Legal Counsel; Murray Blaney, Compliance Officer; and Louisa Kern, Administrative Assistant. The following person attended as a guest of the board:

Matt Gingerich, PLS (Land Surveyor) # 014413, Nevada Energy

1. Call to Order and Roll Call of Board Members

Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present and was excused from the meeting.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Comment Period

There was no public comment.

4. Introductions and Guest Orientation

Chairman LaRiviere introduced Mr. Gingerich as the board guest.

5. Approval of Regular Board Meeting Minutes

a. January 17, 2019

19-16 A motion was made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Kidd, to approve the January 17 minutes. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Spata abstained and Ms. Larkin-Thomason was excused.

b. February 14, 2019

19-17 A motion was made by Mr. Kidd, seconded by Mr. DeSart, to approve the February 14 minutes. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Purcell abstained and Ms. Larkin-Thomason was excused.

6. Financial Statements

a. December 2018 Financial Statements

Ms. Mamola reviewed the December 2018 financial statements. There were no questions from the board.

b. January 2019 Financial Statements

Ms. Mamola reviewed the January 2019 financial statements. There were no questions from the board.

19-18 A motion was made by Ms. Purcell, seconded by Mr. Spata, to approve the December 2018 and January
2019 financial statements. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present.

7. Compliance Reports

a. Compliance officer report on complaints being investigated

1. 20180014 – Dispute between two engineers

Mr. Blaney said that the respondent his been granted an extension on his written response to the complaint filing. The response is due by the end of April.

2. 20180019 – Incompetency and misconduct in producing a design report

Mr. Blaney stated that a technical expert had been secured to help with the analysis of the sizeable amount of documentation filed with the complaint.

3. 20180020 – Faithful agent; failure to act in client's best interests

Mr. Blaney said that the case involved a civil engineer doing structural engineering. He added that complaint file has been out to the board liaison and is now with board counsel

4. 20180021 – Incompetence in producing an elevation certification

Mr. Blaney said that this complaint against a surveyor has been held up as we are waiting for some additional information from the respondent. He said once the clarification is received the case will go out for board liaison review.

5. 20180023 – Incompetence in producing a forensic report

Mr. Blaney said that the complaint had been reviewed by a board liaison and the recommendation was to dismiss the case.

6. 20180025 – Incompetency and Faithful agent; failure to act in client's best interests

Mr. Blaney said the complaint involves a surveyor allegedly misidentifying a community facility as part of a radius map. He said that information has been received from the reviewing agency which provided some good clarification, and that the case summary will be out for board liaison review in the near future.

7. 20180026 – Practicing with an expired license

Mr. Blaney said the case is in regards to an engineer who continued to practice professional engineering after his license had expired. He added that the license had been expired for 9 years. Mr. Blaney said the case is currently out for board liaison review.

b. Consideration of probation reports:

Larry J Sanchez, PE #15752
Mohan B Upasani, PE #11760
Michael Regan, PE #11081
John Mutiso, PE #22799
Lazell Preator, PE #14982
Roger Blair, PE #24744
Mingqiao Zhu, PE #15943

Mr. Blaney said at the time the report was issued for the board pack all probationers were in good standing.

Mr. Spata asked if Mr. Preator had paid his administrative fine by the March 4 due date. Mr. Blaney said he had not. He added that he has a meeting scheduled with Mr. Preator to review the terms of his probation and the past due balance.

Mr. LaRiviere asked that Mr. Blaney review and caution Mr. Sanchez relating to the statements of topographic and boundary surveying in his probation report. He added that he would like more detail in Mr. Preator's description section.

8. Board Counsel Report

Mr. MacKenzie said that he has one stipulated agreement in draft and we will be getting it to staff to review. He added that he is covering the legislative session and expected that 600-700 bills in total will be received by the deadline. Mr. MacKenzie said there may be a couple of bills of concern for the board and that he will be in communication with Ms. Mamola and Ms. Fischer if any issues arise.

9. Discussion and possible action on administrative report by executive director

a. Approved Licensees Report

Ms. Mamola reviewed the approved licensees report. There were no questions from the board.

b. Action Items Related to 2017-2021 Strategic Plan

Mr. DeSart said in relation to the strategic plan goal of operational excellence, he wanted to Ms.ke the board award that Ms. Mamola (on behalf of the board) was a finalist in the good government award category of state organizations. He added that the recognition was a great step in the direction of achieving operational excellence.

c. Items Related to National Council of Examiners for Engineering & Surveying (NCEES)

i. Funded vs non-funded delegates to NCEES meetings

Ms. Mamola said this agenda item was to clarify for newer board members the difference between a funded vs non funded delegate to NCEES meetings.

Ms. Mamola said that for western zone meetings (meetings held in the western states) and for zone meetings, we are entitled to three funded delegates; what that means is NCEES funds (the cost of registration, travel and accommodation) those three delegates designated by the executive director. A funded delegate must attend the Thursday and Friday business sessions. When designated as a funded delegate, travel arrangements have to be made through the NCEES travel agency which is through Travel Inc. for air travel. She said in addition, for the NCEES annual meeting, NCEES will fund any new board members.

Ms. Mamola said that non-funded delegates are still paid for, the difference is that the costs are covered by the board and that board staff will assist with registration and travel arrangements.

ii. **Board President's Assembly**

Ms. Mamola said that this meeting series is held annually in February and involves board executive directors, chairs and vice-chairs. The executive directors come in the day before and they have a meeting to talk about issues that are important to executive directors and board operations. Then the following day meetings are held with all of the board chairs, vice chairs, and executive directors to go over relevant topics of interest.

Ms. Mamola said a highlight was from the MBA committee that is working on a resolution/memo of understanding regarding the acceptance of model law engineers for comity licensure. Where licensure would be expedited for someone who is an MLE or whatever that looks like to that state. The committee is looking to encourage states to work to change their processes and simplify things to speed up the process for comity licensure. Ms. Mamola said there will be a presentation at the MBA zone meeting report and it will be a voting item at the annual meeting. She said the new NCEES CEO David Cox made a presentation on ongoing threats to licensure that was very interesting and informative, and that they continually monitor to identify any new potential issues. Ms. Mamola also said that she was a presenter at the assembly on the topic of international mobility initiatives and agreements.

d. **Consideration of comity application anomalies and review Nevada Revised Statute 625.382 and Nevada Revised Statute 622.530**

Ms. Mamola said she was tasked by the board at our last meeting to create a written list, which is being worked on (ACTION Item), but can report that an anomaly is really anything that currently doesn't fit what is in our licensure law or instances where an applicant doesn't appear to have listed experience that is directly relevant to the discipline applied for. These types of applications would be sent to a board member for consideration.

e. **Clark County bill draft request 54-487, Assembly Bill 2**

Ms. Mamola reported that she did not have an update. She said a follow-up conversation with Clark County representatives had not yet taken place. Mr. DeSart asked for a clarification on the board's position. Ms. Mamola said that the board had voted not to support AB2 as it is currently written, and has put forward an amendment with the proposed language provided by board counsel. She added that Mr. MacKenzie was going to connect with the county lobbyist to get a clarification on their position.

Mr. MacKenzie said he has been in contact with Mr. Rowe, but he (Mr. Rowe) was still working on identifying and connecting with the relevant people in Clark County. Mr. MacKenzie added that the biggest issue is that Clark County may have different people with a different perception of what this bill was meant for.

Ms. Mamola said that Ms. Fischer is aware of the board's position and is monitoring any movement at the legislature.

f. **Consideration of board authorization digital signatures and input received from Nevada Building Officials**

Ms. Mamola said that NSPE has coordinated a workshop on March 27,2019 at the Springs Preserve from 9am-1pm that date. She said the board will be represented by herself and Ms. Purcell, and that a number of officials from public agencies in Southern Nevada will be attending. Ms. Mamola added that she would like to get a similar event scheduled in the next 60 days in Northern Nevada for the public agencies and licensees here.

Mr. LaRiviere asked what the next step would be after gathering information at the workshops. Ms. Mamola replied that she would need to report back to the board with what we are hearing as to the preferences and what the disadvantages are, and the board would then discuss and weigh in as to a direction to move forward.

Mr. Anderson said a difficultly in implementing an overall plan would be getting all the agencies to get on board too. He said they all seem to have different methods of electronic submittal acceptance and would likely be unwilling to change. Mr. Anderson added that the board would need to have a commitment from the agencies to go along with any proposed change. He said getting buy-in from rural counties could be difficult as paper and wet sealing is the only way they know.

Ms. Mamola said that was a very valid point. A lot of the need for change is being driven by the large agencies in the south who are trying to get more efficient in their operational processes, and they want to do so in way that is compliant with the law and workable for licensees. The variance among agencies in how they accept electronic submissions and the signing of those submissions, digital or otherwise, are all across the board - and that is the problem.

Mr. Matter said the board championing electronic submissions and digital signatures in the more rural counties would be a service to licensees as a difficult part of working rurally is getting plans out and getting back and forth for revisions. Ms. Mamola said it would be incumbent upon us to have a dialog with them and to engage them in the discussions. Part of their issue though, as much as professionals want to utilize electronic submittals, those outlying agencies may not have hardware, software, or bandwidth/internet service to be able to do it. Mr. Kidd added that rural agencies, Lincoln or Esmeralda counties for example, have restrictive budgets to where any change may not be possible. For those areas paper and manual stamping will have to remain an option.

Mr. Kidd: I think outreach to the county's is going to be huge because someone mentioned Elko and when you get into the rural's of Nevada, Elko looks like a big city compared to Lincoln or Esmerelda and their first question is going to be how are we paying for this. They are going to say how are you changing my stuff and where is this money coming from. The rural's have a really tight budget. So I think that outreach and input is huge but so long as the manual stamp stays an option; which it absolutely should. I do not know how that is never not an option. But maybe that is what satisfies the rural.

Mr. LaRiviere: It is not only the rural, for example, I recorded a map in Carson City last week and I am used to Washoe County and we get back a scan that day on our recorded map. I found out in Carson City that they cannot make a 24x36 copy. I was just talking with Greg this morning with NALS and you have to bring two prints. They want a print and then they will write the reporting information, I have to then wait for it to go over to engineering and this is in Carson City. They do not have a scanner. So it is not just the rural. It is something that we all assume everyone has all these capabilities and it is just not the case.

10. Board Committee Reports

a. Administrative Procedures Oversight Committee, Chair Karen Purcell

Ms. Purcell said that APOC has not met since the last board meeting, and did not have anything new to report.

b. Legislative Committee, Chair Michael Kidd

Mr. Kidd said that an item of note is that our bill tracking through has recently moved from one person carrying it for us to another. Mr. MacKenzie said the new sponsor of the bill is Senator Chris Brooks.

Mr. Kidd added the board meet & greet at the Nevada legislature was held on Friday February 15. He asked for feedback from those who attended. Mr. LaRiviere said he was disappointed and thought the attendance by legislators was very light, adding that the weather and it being the day before a long weekend could well have been factors. Mr. MacKenzie said often events such as these are more likely to be attended by staff rather than the legislators.

Mr. DeSart suggested that a different approach may be effective in the future where we would arrange appointments with key leaders in the legislature, caucus leaders and those in the leadership group, and have a delegation from the board to take to the meetings. Mr. MacKenzie said Ms. Fischer is diligent in identifying who the key people are, those that have an interest in areas relevant to the board, but the hard part is actually getting an appointment and then having the legislator present at the meeting.

Mr. Kidd asked if there was value in trying to meet with legislators out of session. Mr. MacKenzie the issue of reelection can be factor, but typically they do have more time. Ms. Mamola added that we talked about having those meetings before the session, but in this go-around there was going to be such turnover, and not knowing who was going to have what positions and be on what committees, it wasn't really possible for us to meet with anyone before the legislative session.

c. Professional Association Liaison (PAL) Council, Chair Greg DeSart

Mr. DeSart reported that a meeting had been held at 8:00am this morning and that a good discussion was had on digital signatures and that ASCE volunteered to help organize the Northern Nevada discussion.

d. Public Outreach Committee, Chair Greg DeSart

Mr. DeSart said the committee hasn't met recently, but at the next meeting he would like to revisit what the goals of the committee are and to make sure they are in alignment with what is in the board's strategic plan. (ACTION Item)

Mr. Anderson asked if the use of social media could achieve a greater outreach or public engagement. He added that the architect's board has a facebook page that lists items of interest and that the Wyoming board uses social media messaging.

Mr. DeSart said social media was one of the things that we discussed in our strategic plan and that adding that to the committee's agenda in our outreach meeting could move things forward. He added that we may be losing the opportunity to engage with younger licensees or those considering getting licensed by not being active in these channels.

11. Architectural Engineering licensure, Nevada Revised Statutes 625.175 and Nevada Administrative Code 625.220.

Ms. Mamola said that this item relates to architectural engineering applicants applying for comity licensure in Nevada. Because we do not license in the discipline of architectural engineering the applicants have to select mechanical, electrical or sometimes civil engineering as their discipline. She said the challenge is being a discipline specific state, which is the minority with there being only 11 states that are discipline specific, and most of the applicants come from PE states where a designated discipline is not required. Ms. Mamola said the issues of having the architectural applicant select ME, EE or CE is that we are asking them to move from a broad area of practice to one with a narrow focus. Ms. Mamola stated that NCEES has been offering the examination in architectural engineering since 2003. She added that 49 boards license architectural engineering, with 44 of those being PE states and 5 that are discipline specific jurisdictions.

Mr. LaRiviere asked how many architectural engineering applicants are we seeing per month. Ms. Mamola replied that the average is 2-3.

Mr. DeSart asked if an architectural applicant could be granted licensure in electrical and mechanical when applying. Ms. Purcell replied that is currently how applicants with relevant experience are processed.

Ms. Mamola said this where there is a concern - architectural is broad and they want to be licensed in architectural, they may not have the competency to do depth. So when you have given them mechanical, electrical, or civil, you are entitling them to do depth within that category. Mr. DeSart said that as professional engineers, they would have to stay within their area of competency. Mr. Wright asked how would a limit be placed on the level of depth they could practice to – something like the limitations placed on a civil license relating to structural engineering. Ms. Mamola there is no limitation with regard to electrical and mechanical engineering. Mr. Wright said if the parameters, and in turn the limitations, of architectural engineering were more clearly defined then he would be more for it as a designation.

Mr. Anderson said his opinion of licensing the architectural engineering has changed following his experience on the EP committee with NCEES and discussions with the chair of the architectural engineering examinations. He said he believed there is a niche for the services an architectural engineer provides, which typically are the smaller, residential, small business building and the like. Mr. Anderson added he felt there is a place for architectural engineering in our state.

Mr. LaRiviere asked if the board made a change to its position would there be a need for a statutory or regulation change. Ms. Mamola replied that a regulatory change would be required to add new discipline of licensure.

A motion was made by Mr. Anderson to add architectural engineering to disciplines in Nevada. Mr. Spata seconded the motion. Mr. LaRiviere asked if there was any continuing discussion related to the motion.

Ms. Purcell said she felt by adding this discipline that the board would be moving away from being a discipline specific state. Mr. Wright said he somewhat agreed. Architectural engineering seemed to be a broad classification as opposed to the other disciplines that have both breadth and depth of engineering knowledge.

Mr. Kidd said the direction in his opinion was a step towards a PE state, which asks the question why are we discipline specific. Mr. DeSart agreed. He said it may be time for the broader discussion.

Ms. Mamola said that the board will also need to consider possible paths to licensure for emerging technologies. She said universities are starting now to customize engineering programs – robotics as an example – where mechanical and electrical engineering are intertwined. Autonomous vehicles are similar requiring knowledge of computer systems, mechanical, and electrical. She continued to say you can only

imagine with all of the new technologies coming out that there is going to be a great deal of overlap and what are we going to do with those in the future with regard to the discipline specific model. Ms. Mamola added that other states have historically dealt with overlapping disciplines by providing exemptions which does seem to be in the best interest of public protection.

Mr. DeSart said he felt the board should take some time and look at the bigger picture. Moving toward a PE state might be a cleaner way to deal with the future integration or overlap of disciplines of engineering, but that is a big step and I also think the building departments would have problems with that. It is a conversation that will require careful consideration. Mr. Wright agreed.

Mr. LaRiviere asked for board to consider the original motion and to vote for a determination.

19-19 A motion was made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Spata, to add architectural engineering to disciplines of licensure in Nevada. There were 2 ayes and 6 nays. The motion failed. Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present.

Mr. Spata said the issue of being a discipline specific versus a PE state should be an agenda topic for a future meeting. (ACTION Item)

Ms. Mamola said she would encourage board members to attend the workshop at the annual meeting on the future of engineering licensure and emerging technologies. The premise of the topic is to get the state boards thinking about what they are going to do about it. And it is also a great opportunity to talk to other discipline specific states on how they handle comity licensure from PE states.

Ms. Mamola said she would have to do some research to collect that data to accurately determine which PE states have a secondary designation with licensure to indicate a licensee's area of expertise. (ACTION Item)

12. Nevada specific Professional Land Surveyor exam, Nevada Revised Statutes 625.280 and Nevada Administrative Code 625.310 (4).

Mr. Kidd said the updated PLS state specific exam will now be an open book exam. He said a Nevada specific study guide is being created in both PDF and printed format along with the BLM 2009 manual. The materials will be supplied to candidates in electronic format to review prior to the exam and available for reference during the 2 hour exam in hard copy. Mr. Kidd said he hopes to have the study guide available at the May meeting for board approval. (ACTION Item)

13. Agency standard drawings as it relates to engineer in responsible charge.

Ms. Mamola stated she was asked by Mr. Kidd to include this item on the agenda.

Mr. Kidd said he thought it would be a good idea for Ms. Mamola to draft a brief article for the next newsletter addressing the issue of an engineer's responsibility and obligations when using standard drawings. When using a standard drawing an engineer needs to use the standard drawing in a manner that the standard was intended to be applied. The engineer is taking responsibility for that standard drawing performing as intended for the specific project design. An example was given about a traffic signal pole standard drawing. The standard drawing might be appropriate for a particular project, until the engineer specifies additional signs be added to the mast arm which changes the loading on the pole requiring the selection of a different type traffic signal pole.

General discussion ensued about engineer in responsible charge for standard drawings and engineer in responsible charge for designs that use standard drawings. The board concluded that an engineer has a responsibility to ensure that standard drawings included in their designs are correctly selected/included to meet the unique requirements of a specific project. Mr. LaRiviere asked what action if any the board should take on this item.

19-20 A motion was made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Wright, to take no action at this time. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present.

14. <u>Determination of guiding principles related to appropriate engineering experience needed to qualify for licensure, Nevada Revised Statutes 625.183)</u>

Ms. Mamola said at the last board meeting it was asked that this item be put on the agenda. NCEES follows the model law and model rules which have been included in the board packet for all of you to take a look at. She added since it is an agenda item we can discuss it and decide what else we need to do at this point.

Mr. DeSart said he and Mr. Wright had a discussion at the last board meeting and we were talking about what to do with the applicants who have primary experience as plans checkers. He said the documentation provides some guidance, but there is still a gray area with plan reviewers as progression is a noted item and I can't think they are really getting progressively more experience as it seems like they would be doing the same thing over and over again in checking for code compliance. Mr. Wright said based on the description of what qualifies based on plans checking, he felt they would be using and understanding engineering in judgment to make a determination if plans submitted were complying with the code. He said related to progression, he could see where a reviewer would progress from making judgement on relatively simple projects and move on to projects involving more complicated elements. Mr. Wright said that he does see issue with the general level of experience a plan checker would have.

Mr. Anderson said his concern with plan reviewing as experience is that he doesn't see it as meeting a standard of being progressive on engineering projects and demonstrate increasing quality of responsibility. He added that there is a question as to the content or quality of experience, he agrees with the board process that allows for the applicant to appear for an oral interview to give them the opportunity to state their case for licensure.

Ms. Mamola said included in the documentation was reference to the law, NRS 625.183, where it is quite general and allows for the discretion of the board in the determination of experience. Mr. DeSart agreed that the law allows for interpretation and we should expect to have differences of opinions and views with a different prospective. He added that he believes for initial licensure it validates why applications should come to the board as opposed to having staff make the determination.

15. <u>Board support of Nevada STEM competitions eg Future Cities, and Robotics Teams.</u>

Mr. Kidd said this agenda item is to see if there is any ability for the board to support any STEM related team from Nevada that is going on to national competition. He asked if it were possible that when renewing a license a professional would have the option by checking an indicator box donate money to support a Nevada STEM fund travel from Nevada to national competitions.

Ms. Mamola said for clarification, what Mr. Kidd is suggesting is not the use of board funds but rather giving licensees the opportunity to make a donation to fund that would be directed to support STEM activities.

Mr. DeSart said that he believed the board has an outreach program or we have talked about having an outreach program and a part of that is getting the word out. That might include advertising in small sponsorships. He said he wouldn't be opposed to spending our outreach funds because this could be considered outreach. Ms. Purcell agreed.

Ms. Mamola cautioned that as quasi-state agency the board has to be careful giving funds generated from licensees to be used for other organizations and it is probably more appropriate for the professional societies to do directly. She said a donation conduit at the time of renewal may be a possibility.

Mr. Kidd said an example of giving a donation at the time of licensing or renewing a license is the process used for state hunting licenses where an amount can be donated to state wildlife conservation.

Mr. MacKenzie stated concerns about the process of giving public monies to an outside entity. He said with the hunting license example, the conservation aspect is administered within the same agency, so the monies are not going outside. He added that it is a good concept, but it may need some research to make sure it is compliant with state standards.

Ms. Mamola said it should be explored through the PAL committee with our professional associations to see if they can help facilitate, and also exploring options for licensees to donate. (ACTION item)

Mr. DeSart said it could be an item at an outreach committee meeting and along with revisiting our strategic objective for that committee. (ACTION Item)

16. Corporate name request

There were no corporate name requests that required the consideration of the board.

17. Consideration of Applicant Requests to Waive Certain Requirements of NRS/NAC 625 for Examination or License

19-21 A motion was made by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. DeSart, recommending the denial of the waiver request by Mr. Affleck until he has the appropriate experience under the supervision of a licensed structural engineer. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present.

19-22 A motion was made by Mr. DeSart, seconded by Mr. Anderson, granting of the waiver request by Ms. Crossman. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present.

19-23 A motion was made by Mr. DeSart, seconded by Ms. Purcell, granting of the waiver request by Ms. Niu. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Larkin-Thomason was not present.

Mr. Wright asked what the historical reasoning is behind the requirement that PE references cannot all be from the same company if they are reputable licensed engineers. Ms. Mamola said she did not know the history of the law, but would assume it was to eliminate a company's bias. Mr. MacKenzie said it could possibly be to stop collusion by a company to get an individual licensed.

Mr. Wright said the requirement could make it difficult for young engineers that have worked for a single company, by requiring them to reach out to a PE for a reference that won't know their work as well as those they work with on a daily basis. Mr. Wright added that perhaps regulation could be reviewed if we don't have

a good historical reason why it is in place. Mr. LaRiviere agreed.

Ms. Mamola said she would make a note for the legislative committee to review the good character and references section of the regulations. (ACTION Item)

Mr. Blaney said the website section explaining the application for licensure process and what it entails could be improved to explain options to applicants such as the ability to seek a waiver, with possible examples, if they don't meet the letter of law requirements with regard to references and direct PE supervision. (ACTION Item)

Ms. Mamola said she would like to review the waiver application fee structure with APOC. (ACTION Item)

18. Administrative processes for licensing applicants for initial licensure

The board reviewed 44 non-appearance applications for initial licensure and recommendations were made.

19-24 A motion was made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Kidd, to approve the recommendations made as noted in Appendix A. The motion passed unanimously.

19. Status of Board and Staff Assignments

Ms. Mamola reviewed those items completed and those still pending.

Mr. Spata asked if the information on the materials used at the legislative meet & greet could be incorporated into a newsletter or the website.

Ms. Mamola said she would look into how to incorporate that information on the web and future e-newsletters. (ACTION Item)

20. Meeting Dates

Ms. Mamola reviewed the future board and NCEES meeting dates.

21. Topics for Future Meetings Including Possible Proposed Amendments to the Nevada Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Law, NRS/NAC Chapter 625

No topics were put forward at this time.

22. Signing Certificates of Licensure

The board signed wall certificates for those persons who were licensed by comity and initial licensure

23. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

Chairman LaRiviere adjourned the meeting at 2:56pm, on Thursday, March 14, 2019.

Respectfully,

Patty Mamola, PE
Executive Director