NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting
Held in Elko, Nevada, Thursday, September 12, 2019

Chairwoman Karen Purcell, PE, declaring a quorum present, called the meeting to order at 8:30am, in the Humboldt Room at the Red Lion, 2065 Idaho Street, Elko, Nevada. Board members present were Vice Chairman Michael Kidd, PLS; Kent Anderson, PE; Brent Wright, PE/SE; Thomas Matter, Public Member; Gregory DeSart, PE; and Angelo Spata, PE. Also present were Patty Mamola, Executive Director; Chris MacKenzie, Board Legal Counsel; Louisa Kern, Administrative Assistant; Murray Blaney, Operations/Compliance. The following people attended as guests of the board:

Boyd Ratliff, CE, #18908, Nevada Department of Transportation
Bob Thibault, CE/PLS, #20723, City of Elko
Joel Donalson, CE, #24270, Newmont Mining

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call of Board Members**

Board members Robert LaRiviere, PLS and Tracy Larkin-Thomason, PE were excused.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

3. **Public Comment Period**

Chairwoman Purcell said that before moving to public comment, she would like read the mission statement of the board as a reminder of the board’s purpose.

*The purpose of the board as stated in Nevada Revised Statute 625.005 is to safeguard life, health and property and to promote the public welfare by providing for the licensure of qualified and competent professional engineers and professional land surveyors and our mission is founded on the board’s purpose, the board’s mission is to uphold the value of professional engineering and land surveying licensure by assessing minimum competency for initial entry into the profession and to insure on going standard of professionalism by facilitating compliance with laws regulations and code of practice and to provide understanding and progression in licensure by openly engaging with all stake holders.*

There was no public comment.

4. **Introductions and Guest Orientation**

Board members made introductions. Ms Purcell welcomed the board guests and asked that they introduce themselves.

5. **Approval of Regular Board Meeting Minutes July 11, 2019**

19-43 A motion was made by Mr Spata, seconded by Mr Anderson to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously. Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.
6. **Financial Statements**

   a. **June 2019 Financial Statements**

Ms Mamola reviewed the June 2019 financial statements. She said that final journal entry adjustments would need to be made based on the results of the audit, and that the statements would be re-presented at the next board meeting.

Mr Spata recommended that the approval of the June 2019 financial statements be tabled until the November board meeting.

7. **Compliance Reports**

   a. **Compliance officer report on complaints being investigated**

1. 20180019 – Incompetency and misconduct in producing a design report
Mr Blaney said that the complaint file has come back from the board liaison with a recommendation to dismiss. He said the complainant and respondent had been notified.

2. 20180020 – Structural design: Incompetency and failure to act in the client’s best interests
Mr Blaney said that a proposed stipulated agreement regarding this complaint would be considered by the board today.

3. 20180021 – Incompetence in producing an elevation certification
Mr Blaney said that stipulated agreements relating to items 2 and 3 would be considered by the board today.

4. 20180025 – Incompetency in producing a radius map survey
Mr Blaney reported that this complaint is currently with board counsel.

5. 20190001 – Practicing with an expired license
Mr Blaney said the stipulated agreement that came to the board at the July board meeting had recommendations made to revise the terms of the agreement. He said adjustments had been made and the revised agreement is to be presented to the board for consideration today.

6. Incompetency and faithful agent: Delivery of services
Mr Blaney said that this case had come back from the board liaison with an initial recommendation. Staff will connect with board counsel about the best course of action moving forward with the complaint.

7. 20190004 – Failure to act in a professional manner
Mr Blaney said the investigation is near completion and that the case file should be out for board liaison review shortly.

8. 20190006 – Faithful agent: Delivering services in a timely manner
Mr Blaney reported that this item is still in the investigative stage and there appears to be a breakdown between the relationship of the engineer and client. He said staff is working through the details of the issue and are working with both parties to see if they can come to a resolution.

9. 20190007 – Incompetency and faithful agent: Delivery of services
Mr Blaney said that this item is a self-report of disciplinary action from California. The California board determined competency issues with the engineering performed and found unlicensed practice of surveying. He said the complaint is about to go out for board liaison review.

10. 20190008 – Allegation of forgery
Mr Blaney said this complaint involves the allegation of forgery where an engineer appears to have taken work performed by a surveyor and forged a signature then submitted it to a public authority. He said a request for a formal response has been sent.

b.  Consideration of probation reports:
   Larry J Sanchez, PE #15752  Roger Blair, PE #24744
   John Mutiso, PE #22799  Mingqiao Zhu, PE #15943
   Lazell Preator, PE #14982

Mr Blaney said that the status of Mr Preator’s probation was currently under review. He said although firm dates for the payment of the administrative fine were not listed in Mr Preator’s stipulated settlement, staff had come to an agreement with Mr Preator as to when the payments would be made. The dates have since come and gone and the balance is still outstanding.

Mr MacKenzie said that if terms of a stipulated agreement were not adhered to, with notice to the licensee, the stay of a license suspension can be removed. And then to remove the stay, it would need to be an agenda item for possible action. The agenda item would be to determine that there has been a violation and then to make a motion to have the stay lifted.
Mr Spata suggested that a letter should be sent to notify the licensee that if he continues not to comply with the stipulated agreement that the stay on his license suspension can be lifted.

8. **Board Counsel Report**

Mr MacKenzie said that he had been asked to look into possible procedures for the board to give collective input before voting at NCEES national meetings. He said there is an exception in open meeting laws where board members attend seminars or conferences, but there is no specific exception for the board possibly deliberating on an issue that is within its jurisdiction.

He said as he understood the process at the national meeting, the board chair is vested with the vote – and there is virtually no or very little opportunity to discuss an issue because of the speed of the procedures. He added that the annual meeting is not open to the public, so any noticing prior to discussing an issue would be a moot point. Mr MacKenzie reiterated that there is an exception for board members to go to conferences and participate with more than a quorum, but not to participate in processes of deliberating an issue.

9. **Discussion and possible action on stipulated agreement for Richard Warren, PE, license number 017389, complaint number 20180020**

Mr MacKenzie reviewed the stipulated facts and terms of the proposed agreement with Mr Warren, and asked if the board members had any questions or concerns.

Mr Spata asked why due dates for administrative fines and investigative costs were not listed in the stipulated agreement.

Mr Blaney said that currently once the agreement is signed by the licensee, staff negotiates due dates for payment – whether it be lump sum or by payment plan – and turn-in dates for whitepapers or re-education courses.

Mr Wright suggested that it may be worth having the discussion with the licensees on payment dates and other due dates prior to the finalizing of agreements so they can be included as part of the stipulated terms for increased accountability. (**ACTION Item**)

Mr Spata asked discussions be held with Mr Warren and a agreement on a payment schedule be made within the next thirty days. (**ACTION Item**)

19-44 A motion was made by Mr Spata, seconded by Mr Matter to approve the stipulated agreement as written. The motion passed unanimously. Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.

10. **Board Discussion and possible action on stipulated agreement for David Richards, PLS, license number 010026, complaint number 20180021.**

Mr MacKenzie reviewed the stipulated facts and terms of the proposed agreement with Mr Richards and asked if the board members had any questions or concerns.
Mr DeSart questioned if a work order as mentioned by the respondent or a series of email communications satisfied the requirements of NAC 625.545.

Mr MacKenzie said that a series of documents can become a contract, but this did not have the primary terms of forming a contract. A contract does not necessarily need to be a single document, it can be a series of emails where the parties involved voluntarily express saying everyone signed off or agreed to the terms as outlined in the regulation.

Ms Mamola said a detailed work order can constitute a contract but, in this instance, it did not have the components to meet the requirements of the regulation. She said a benefit of the doubt was given regarding the presence of a contract, but no other communications were offered up that could have inferred a contract was provided.

Mr Kidd said in his opinion this violation doesn’t appear to be an isolated mistake by Mr Richards – the concern is that this could be how he does business. He added that his preference would be for Mr Richards to appear before the board with the opportunity for board members to see all the details of the complaint and to question the licensee directly.

Mr DeSart said when someone is intentionally and consistently grossly negligent on a regular basis, as opposed to a one-time mistake, it would be worth the board’s time having the licensee appear.

Mr MacKenzie said to bring Mr Richards before the board on this matter would constitute a formal hearing. To do that board would first need to make a motion to accept or reject the stipulated agreement being considered. If it were rejected the next step would be to go back to staff to determine a timeline for where the most appropriate location is and to connect with AG counsel to prosecute the case. Finding that person now is not the easiest either. It could be bumped out for a number of months just to bring this before you for a formal hearing.

Ms Purcell asked if there is an opinion that this is how the licensee practices, and if the board rejects the agreement for a formal hearing, is Mr Richards able to practice in the meantime?

Mr MacKenzie said yes, Mr Richards would be able to practice until the time of the hearing. He added that if there was concern of potential harm to the health and human safety of the public a special meeting could be held before the next scheduled southern Nevada board meeting or if that concern was imminent a cease and desist could be issued. Mr MacKenzie continued to say taking away someone’s livelihood is going to be subject to a higher level of scrutiny.

Mr Kidd said that he does not have a concern of imminent harm to health and human safety of the public, and a hearing scheduled at the next Las Vegas board meeting would be satisfactory.

19-45 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Mr DeSart to reject the stipulated agreement. The motion passed 4 (Mr Kidd, Mr DeSart, Ms Purcell and Mr Spata) to 3 (Mr Anderson, Mr Wright and Mr Matter). Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.

11. Discussion and possible action on stipulated agreement for Robert “Dooley” Riva, PE, license number 018231, complaint number 20190001.
Mr MacKenzie reviewed the stipulated facts and revised terms of the proposed agreement with Mr Riva and asked if the board members had any questions or concerns.

Mr Anderson asked if Mr Riva’s license had been reinstated. Ms Mamola replied that Mr Riva’s license was not yet reinstated, and that his application for reinstatement was pending the outcome of the complaint.

Mr DeSart said he was concerned that the stay on suspension which essentially allows him to continue to practice. The violation was an intentional disregard to the law to his license. He asked for other board members thoughts on the stay. Mr Matter agreed with Mr DeSart’s comments.

Ms Purcell said she had no issue with the stay, given that he appears to be competent and held a current California license during the time period.

Mr Anderson said that even though his work is competent, he perpetrated fraud for 10 years in stamping these projects, and there could well be cause for civil action or criminal action from fraud. Mr MacKenzie said yes that could potentially happen if some persons came forward and said they were harmed on the civil side. He said he was not so familiar with the potential for action on the criminal side.

19:46 A motion was made by Mr Spata, seconded by Mr Matter to accept the stipulated agreement. The motion passed 6 (Mr Spata, Mr Matter, Ms Purcell, Mr Wright, Mr Anderson, and Mr Kidd) to 1 (Mr DeSart). Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.

12. 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

Ms Mamola gave a summary of actions taken over the last year related to the strategic plan, as related to the stated goals of the plan; outreach, licensure, regulation, and operational excellence. Ms Mamola listed the following:

1. Outreach—Engagement with legislators during 2019 legislative session culminating in successful update of NRS 625. Created collateral piece that was used for legislative meet & greet. RFP developed for communications and outreach, vendor selected, project kicked-off. Provided speakers for various events, UNR, APWA, NCEES (BPA and Annual Meeting), reformatted newsletter and published twice annually as of 2016, updated website.

2. Licensure—implementing a PR (outreach) program to university students, increase kid’s knowledge of engineering/land surveying—Soroptimist at risk school STEM project, sped up process of comity licensure, providing options to meet land surveyor education requirements.

3. Regulation—updated and reflective of current practice in alignment with NV economic strategy—NAC’s successfully updated 1/19 (SE requirements, contract disclosure of professional liability insurance, signing and stamping, and brick/mortar. NRS successfully updated and in effect 7/2019 (removed obsolete

4. **Operational Excellence**—opened LAS office and staffing 1 wk/mo, downsized/updated RNO office, staff cross-training/stabilized, retained social media consultant, completed conversion to e-files/eliminated paper files. Created business plan/budget for new initiatives/board improvements/updates, updating/moving to new licensing platform, starting 2nd phase of website update, continuous review of office procedures and processes for improvements.

Mr Kidd asked if the statutes had been updated on the legislature website. Ms Mamola said that the LCB had not yet updated its website and said she would reach out to the LCB to get the timeline for the website update. She continued to say that staff would work on getting a revised version of the statute and regulation handbook published. **(ACTION)** Ms Mamola added that there is a link on the front page of the board website to the updated NRS and NAC amendments.

Mr DeSart asked that the dates that the Las Vegas office is staffed be posted on the board website for the benefit of southern Nevada licensees who may want to discuss items in-person. **(ACTION)**

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

i. Annual meeting agenda, conference reports, motions, and action taken by the council

Ms Mamola said that the board packet included NCEES actions items from the annual meeting, along with national committee reports and motions.

ii. Consider Resolution of Cooperation to Facilitate Interstate Licensure. US professional engineering and land surveying licensing boards are being asked to sign the resolution in advance of the NCEES 200-year anniversary to reconfirm commitment to founding principles of NCEES

Ms Mamola said the NCEES MBA committee is asking all boards to consider the Resolution of Cooperation. It reaffirms the states commitment to work to improve mobility and license portability, which was the reason NCEES was created. In short, it is a commitment to review our laws and regulations to see how we can improve the portability and mobility of licensure. Ms Mamola said it would require a motion by the board to enable the board chair to sign the resolution.

Mr DeSart said he has a concern that it could potentially be construed as compelling us to adopt NCEES policies when we don’t necessarily agree with them. Ms Mamola replied that the resolution does not force or require that the board adopt NCEES model laws and model rules, it asks boards to consider ease of movement between states when rule making.

Mr Anderson said he liked the resolution, and the commitment by a number of states toward mobility would encourage those that are not as progressive when it comes to comity licensure to review their position and enact some change.

19-47 A motion was made by Mr Anderson, seconded by Mr Matter that the board sign the resolution.
The motion passes unanimously. Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.

d. Consideration of board authorized digital signatures, input received from southern and northern Nevada building departments and licensees

Ms Mamola said that the board will participate in a workshop on digital signatures being hosted by ASCE and APWA, September 19. She said this follows similar events in southern Nevada hosted by NSPE. Ms Mamola said the discussion will be about what agencies should be doing and what licensees should be doing to comply with the law, and the difference between electronic signatures and digital signatures. There is misconception that an image of your signature on a document complies with the law – it doesn’t. It must be a digital signature which has meta data embedded in it. We also want to highlight there is a manner in which a digital signature can secure a document where an entity can still mark up and comment. Ms Mamola said we are also finding new questions in the overall process that we need to consider. She continued to say that a number of entity representatives will be in attendance. The electronic submittal process is far from uniform and having the public sector participate is a start in trying to create a process that follows the law. Ms Mamola added that an introductory whitepaper would be prepared following the workshop to help reduce confusion about digital signatures.

Mr Kidd asked if there had been any outreach to the Architect Board, in that their process may well be in conflict with engineering and land surveying law.

Ms Mamola said she is planning to connect with the Architect’s Board executive director. Their law allows for just the image of a signature, and anecdotally I have heard that architects as prime professionals have requested engineers to provide unlocked documents which are just images of their signatures, stamp, and seal which violates our law. Ms Mamola added that she, Mr MacKenzie and Ms Purcell are going to meet with the Secretary of State’s office to get clarification of legally binding signatures on electronic documents – and hopefully use that as prompt to get the architects board to address their rules and regulations.

Mr DeSart said at the workshop we could point out the difference between engineering/land surveying and architects’ regulations, just highlighting that part of the confusion and they allow things that our regulation does not allow.

Ms Mamola said the goal would be to clear up confusion for both licensees and entities on what the law really says to avoid having enforce compliance issues.

Mr DeSart said he hopes it doesn’t come to a point of enforcement. We have to set a framework to educate and then continue to educate, and work to persuade the reluctant to come into compliance.

13. Discussion and possible action on board committee reports

a. Administrative Procedures Oversight Committee, Chair Michael Kidd

Mr Kidd reported that there had not been an APOC committee meeting since the last board meeting. He added that a meeting would be scheduled before the November board meeting.

b. Legislative Committee, Chair Angelo Spata
Mr Spata said he wanted to reaffirm who has been assigned to that committee, as well as the goals, and his thoughts moving forward. He listed the committee members as Mr Kidd, Mr Wright, Ms Purcell, Mr MacKenzie, and Ms Mamola, and extended an open invitation to other board members to attend. Mr Spata stated that there were two primary functions of the committee – the first is related to bi-annual matters and the committee assists staff with monitoring legislative activities during Nevada’s legislative session. It also advises the board on legislative matters that are in that legislative session. The secondary function is to periodically review and suggest changes to the Nevada Revised Statutes 625 and Nevada Administrative Code 625. By law the board is to review its regulations every 10 years and file its reviews and findings with the Legislative Counsel Bureau. The board also has an obligation to update their laws and regulations to reflect current and professional practices. These can occur more frequently than the mandated 10 years. The committee recommends law and regulation changes to the board and assist staff in making those administrative changes.

Mr MacKenzie said he would look into when the last “10 year review” statement was filed. **(ACTION)**

Mr Spata said in addition to the primary functions the following list may be possible agenda items and goals of the committee: review the statutes and update as appropriate; review items against the NCEES model law; review NCEES Resolution of Cooperation against our rules and regulations; review professional development hours – the quantity required and content; and be the initial venue for the PE state discussion. He added that this was an initial list and will be expanded as issues are identified.

Ms Mamola said she would work with Mr Spata and the committee members to schedule the legislative committee meeting. **(ACTION)** She added based on workload it may not happen before the next board meeting.

i. Proposed changes to NRS/NAC 625

c. Professional Association Liaison Committee, Chair Greg DeSart

Mr DeSart reported that the meeting was held last Friday via video conference and representatives of APWA, NSPE and UNLV participated. The main agenda items talked about was how to partner with the professional associations to implement our public relations. We have good support from the PAL group and we have a lot of interest to tag team on the social media component of the public outreach campaign.

d. Public Outreach Committee, Chair Greg DeSart

Mr DeSart said the committee had a kick-off meeting with Vogel Designs who were chosen after an open process on a qualification-based selection. We talked about our objectives, logistics of the board, and participation needs. They will be making a full presentation to the entire board describing and laying out the entire campaign. It will essentially be a combination of social media which will be Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter. It will include creating a speakers bureau that will be comprised of mostly board members. Depending on resources we could possibly go to schools, agencies, APWA conferences, and that sort of thing if they want to know what the board is up to. We are having discussions on including some advertising but that is still an unresolved issue. Mr DeSartsaid it is an involved process and we are making good progress. He said
the push and share factor of the social media component will give us a way to more effectively connect to licensees, legislators, and the general public.

Mr Matter said the speakers bureau would help fill a need for schools looking to connect with someone knowledgeable when they work on STEM projects. He said from his experience the schools have struggled to connect with the people and it may be worthwhile letting the district know that the speakers bureau exists when it is in place. (ACTION Item)

ii. Continuing Education Event October 10, 2019

iii. Discussion and possible action on communications/public outreach/social media professional services for 2019-2020 fiscal year

14. **Discussion and possible action on Nevada specific Professional Land Surveyor exam, Nevada Revised Statutes 625.280 and Nevada Administrative Code 625.310**

Mr Kidd reported that we are looking to get some formatting help to bring all the reference materials, study guide and practice exam together and host it on the board’s website. Having a central platform that then links out to relevant areas we think is the most effective way to present the information

15. **Discussion and possible action on assignment of professional development hours for certain activities, such as mentoring activities, committee activities, and authoring/publishing papers, Nevada Administrative Code 625.470**

Ms Mamola said this item is on the agenda for discussion and possible action. It came up at the PAL committee meeting, where one of the attendees said they were at an Idaho board meeting and that the Idaho board was considering allowing mentoring of elementary, middle school, and high school kids on what engineers do, as PDH hours. Ms Mamola said that Idaho was agreeable to forward a draft of their rule changes which is included in the board packet, along with a copy of what Nevada law says. Also included for reference is the NCEES model law and rules as it relates to PDH’s.

Ms Mamola added that a licensee submitted a letter requesting the board to consider PDH hours or adding PDH hours for prepping committees/committee work or publishing papers. The letter is included in board materials to be considered in the discussion.

Mr Wright said he questioned the need for requiring continuing education. He said it is hard to see how the requirement has any real positive impact in the quality that the engineer’s practice or that it really improves the safety of the public, and that he had talked to many practicing engineers that share that view. He questioned if there is any study or data that shows by requiring PDH’s that it actually increases or improves the health and safety of the public or improves the practice of professionals.

Mr Spata said he hadn’t come to conclusion whether he agreed or disagreed with Mr Wright, but thought making these changes for mentorship and prepping for committee meetings would lessen the value of the continuing education requirement and add support to Mr Wright’s view.
Mr DeSart said the value of various avenues to acquire PDHs can be debated, but regarding content, from three years on the board and seeing the disciplinary actions the come before us, I believe ethics is by far the area we need to have more education. Also being aware of current laws and the changes to our current laws, making professionals aware of those things. He said those are valuable and I think could be mandatory. Mr DeSart added he would support reducing the amount of PDH’s if the content was focused on ethics and being aware of existing laws. He continued to say if we were to require all engineers and land surveyors to pass a test every renewal cycle, I think would go a lot farther towards improving the health and safety of the public.

Mr Thibault said the continuing education requirement was something he had always accepted and seems standard in a number of professions. He added that with the decline in the number of professional land surveyors mentoring may be appropriate to encourage students to enter the profession to serve the public need in the future.

Mr Boyd said he was not sure of where he stood on the issue but said that some courses and seminars that he had taken as part of continuing education over his career had added to his skill set as a professional.

Mr Donalson said focusing on ethics and the changes on regulations would be valuable, and that he would be in favor of reducing the overall number required.

Mr Anderson said engineers should be self-motivated gaining technical knowledge that will help them in their daily practice – if not they would become obsolete and out of the profession very quickly. He added that in his opinion 90% of professional engineers think PDH’s in the current form are a waste of time.

Mr Wright said regarding mentoring, it helps the person being mentored and not necessarily the mentor. If the goal is to increase your skill and knowledge you are not doing that by mentoring and providing knowledge to someone else. He said he didn’t disagree that some courses were valuable, but shared the view of Mr Anderson, that engineers stay on their own accord to be relevant in the profession. Mr Wright continued to say that he would support something that has a requirement for ethics and staying current with statutes and the administrative code.

Mr Kidd said he agreed with a reduction in the number of PDHs and a better targeted focus on what is required.

Ms Purcell asked what the history was behind the 30-hour requirement. Ms Mamola said the law went into effect in 1997 and was likely based on something from NCEES. She asked that Mr MacKenzie try to pull up some of the history behind the enactment of the statute and regulations. Ms Mamola suggested that the issue be referred to the legislative committee for further review.

Mr MacKenzie said a question he would have is if licensee business owners are asked about professional development hours/continuing education as a condition on their liability insurance applications, and that may be issue to research. Ms Purcell she said would review a policy and work to get an answer. (ACTION)

Mr Wright asked if the legislative committee would be reconsidering the current statutory requirement regarding professional development hours. Mr DeSart replied that it need only be a regulatory change.

19-48 A motion was made by Mr Wright, seconded by Mr Spata that the legislative committee review the continuing education regulations to consider possibly reducing the number required and changing the focus. The motion passed unanimously. Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.
16. **Discussion and possible action on corporate name requests**

There were no corporate name requests to be considered.

17. **Consideration of applicant requests to waive certain requirements of NRS/NAC Chapter 625 for initial licensure**

There were no waiver requests to be considered.

18. **Board approval of non-appearance applications for initial licensure. Refer to Addendum A for list of applicants.**

Mr Spata asked for some clarity on the motion process on this item. He asked if a board member raised a concern about the content of a specific application, and others didn’t, should that application be held out for a separate vote.

Mr MacKenzie said that it would not require a separate vote. Any exceptions put forward by board members would be noted, along with directions to staff as to the required action, and the motion would then encompass all the noted exceptions and directives.

The board reviewed 43 nonappearance applications for initial licensure and recommendations were made.

19-49 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Mr Anderson to approve the initial licensure applications as noted. The motion passed unanimously. Mr LaRiviere and Ms Larkin-Thomason were not present for the vote.

19. **Discussion and possible action on status of Board and staff assignments**

Ms Mamola reviewed those items completed and those still pending. There were no questions from the board.

20. **Discussion and possible action on meeting dates.**

Ms Mamola reviewed the future meeting dates and asked that board members contact her if they had any conflicts. She added that the board would continue to hold meetings in the rural areas of the state every other year.

21. **Discussion and identification of topics for future meetings including possible proposed amendments to the Nevada Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Law, Nevada Revised Statutes and Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 625.**

No future meeting topics were put forward.
22. **Signing certificates of licensure**

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

23. **Public comment**

There was no public comment.

**Adjournment**

Chairwoman Purcell thanked the board guests for attending and their participation in open discussions. The meeting was adjourned at 11:35am, on Thursday, September 12, 2019.

Respectfully,

Patty Mamola, PE
Executive Director