

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting
Held in Las Vegas, Nevada, Thursday, September 13, 2018

Vice Chairman Karen Purcell, PE, declaring a quorum present, called the meeting to order at 9:40 am, in the Las Vegas board office at 241 W. Charleston, Suite 130, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102. Board members present were Kent Anderson, PE; Michael G Kidd, PLS; Brent Wright, PE/SE; Angelo Spata, PE; Tracy D Larkin-Thomason, PE; Thomas Matter, public member; and Gregory P DeSart, PE. Also present were Patty Mamola, PE, Executive Director; Murray Blaney, Compliance Officer; Chris MacKenzie, Board Legal Counsel; and Louisa Kern, Administrative Assistant. Board guests were Peter Perazzo, PLS, and Nickolas Smith, PLS.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call of Board Members

All board members are present with the exception of Chairman Robert LaRiviere who was excused.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Comment Period

Neal Jones, PE, read a prepared statement, it is attached to these minutes.

4. Introductions and Guest Orientation

Vice Chair Purcell welcomed the board guests and asked that they introduce themselves.

5. Discussion and possible action on Approval of July 12, 2018 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

The board considered the minutes and no comments were given.

18-61 Motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Ms Larkin-Thomason to approve the minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion and possible action on Approval of August 6, 2018 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Mr MacKenzie highlighted a correction (wrong word typed) that needed to be made.

18-62 Motion was made by Mr DeSart, seconded by Mr Matter to approve the minutes with the noted correction. The motion passed. Mr Spata and Mr Wright abstained as they were not present at the meeting.

7. Committee assignments for one year terms commencing on July 1, 2018

a. June 2018 Financial Statements

b. July 2018 Financial Statements

Mr DeSart noted that numbers in the July budget statement did not appear to be correct. Ms Mamola said it looked like the incorrect dollar amounts had been entered into the July 2018 table column, saying the

information was manually entered rather than it being a spreadsheet downloaded from the QuickBooks software. Ms Mamola stated that a correction would be made and that the July 2018 Financial Statements would be re-presented for approval at the November board meeting.

18-63 A motion was made by Mr Matter, seconded by Mr Anderson to approve the June 2018 financials. The motion passed unanimously.

18-64 A motion was made by Mr DeSart, seconded by Ms Larkin-Thomason to revisit the July financials after corrections have been made. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion and possible action on compliance reports by Compliance Officer

a. Compliance officer report on complaints being investigated

Mr Blaney said the first complaint listed in the report has been withdrawn, and in reviewing what was involved in it we did not find enough substantial evidence for the board to move forward with the complaint.

Mr Blaney said the next complaint concerned a degree of competency in producing a forensic report. He continued to say that case was ready for board liaison review and would be sent out next week.

Mr Blaney stated that this case was related to an engineer acting as a faithful agent in fulfilling the client's best interests. The case is complete and we are considering having the AG's office review the findings before it goes to a board liaison, as Mr MacKenzie is conflicted on this complaint.

Mr Blaney continued to say that the fourth complaint in the report was an allegation of forgery in a document presented to two planning authorities. It is alleged that the signatures of two senior building officials were forged on the coversheet of a submission. Mr Blaney stated that a stipulated agreement has been prepared and sent to the respondent by board counsel. Mr MacKenzie added that they have until September 30th to accept the agreement.

Mr Blaney said the next case – related to code of conduct, not acting as a faithful agent – came back from the board liaison with a recommendation to dismiss the case. He said the complaint involved a misaligned boundary fence and the options provided to remedy the situation.

Mr Blaney continued to say that the sixth case was an allegation of plagiarism of another engineers work product. He said that the complaint review has moved into the technical phase where we have sought outside expert help. Mr Blaney added that the complaint was also morphing towards the possibility of unlicensed practice and lack of responsible in charge. He said that the case will be sent out for board liaison review following the technical expert's report.

Mr Blaney said that the next item listed was a self-reported discipline by another state (Texas in this case) and stipulated agreement has been sent to the respondent by Mr MacKenzie. Ms Larkin-Thomason asked for clarification on the process regarding self-reported discipline. Mr Blaney said that each case is reviewed for severity of the infraction and how best to protect the public in Nevada if any reciprocal disciplinary action is imposed. He continued to say that in general, for cases that cross a tolerance line that the probationary action taken by the original state will be mirrored in Nevada, but punitive action (or piling on of fines) is not taken. He said that we will monitor projects being performed in Nevada to ensure compliance and public protection.

Mr Blaney said the seventh item listed is a dispute between two engineers. We had some follow-up questions for the complainant and we have just received clarification back, so we hope to have the case out for board liaison review in the next few weeks.

Mr Blaney continued to say that item number nine is another self-report of discipline by another state, and that this case originated in Oklahoma. He said the respondent became involved with a notorious engineer by the name of Stephen Maslan, who has been disciplined to the point of license revocation in numerous states. Mr Blaney said the Oklahoma complaint started out as guilt by association, but looking into complaint further they discovered other issues, and their key concern was that the engineer did not understand the true meaning of responsible in charge. This is the reason why we pursue a stipulated agreement and place the respondent on probation so we can be aware of any work he is performing in Nevada.

Mr Blaney said the second to last case involves an employee vs supervisor (who is a professional engineer) at a public entity. It is alleged that the engineer has violated the engineering code of conduct in the performing of their supervisory duties. He continued to say that the case will be out for board liaison review after consultation with Mr MacKenzie.

Mr Blaney continued saying that the last complaint involves a land surveyor that did not meet contractually obligated timelines, and as the timelines got behind, then failed to return calls. He added that it got to the point where the complainant hired an attorney to get a resolution, but there was still no action from the surveyor. Mr Blaney said that the case review is near completion and will be out for board liaison review in the next couple of weeks.

Mr DeSart asked for a clarification regarding the issues surrounding Mr Jones' public comment. He added he was not aware of what the specifics were behind the case Mr Jones was referring to, and questioned if this was something he was supposed to know or information would be forthcoming. Mr MacKenzie responded that the complaint had been vetted through the complaint process and a dismissal was the recommendation. Mr MacKenzie continued and explained the rules of practice (the process) for handling complaints and said that details of a case are only heard before the full board if the recommendation from the board liaison was for a formal hearing, or if a respondent rejected a stipulated settlement. He added that past processes had all complaints reviewed by the full board where all members got to view all information and make decisions, but due process does not allow for that. Mr DeSart asked if that meant that case details were confidential unless they came before the full board. Mr MacKenzie responded that that was correct.

Mr Wright stated that Mr Jones seemed persistent about this issue, and asked if there was a process to appeal a ruling on a complaint. Mr MacKenzie responded that someone can be very frustrated if the board doesn't do what they want. During public comment they have their opportunity to vent that frustration and you have to rely on your staff to carry out the jobs that you give them. He continued saying, the good thing is that there is not only one person reviewing and making a determination on a complaint; you have your compliance officer, your investigator, you have your executive director, often times myself, and a board member who makes the ultimate decision, so it is four or five people that have some input on whether or not it is a legitimate case. Mr MacKenzie said he can bring a civil matter to seek judicial recourse for a public official who is not performing as they are supposed to.

Mr DeSart asked if an agenda item could be added at a future meeting to explain Rules of Practice of complaints so the board could discuss those procedures.

b. Consideration of probation reports:

Michael Keegan, PE #8821

Larry J Sanchez, PE #15752

Mr Blaney asked if the board had any questions related to the enclosed probation report. There were none.

9. Discussion on Board Counsel Report

Mr MacKenzie stated that there had been a lot of follow-up related to the administrative audit by the Governor's Finance Office since the last meeting. It involved research on legislative history and also seeking clarification on board employee status, related to PERS and PEBP, and it was determined that staff are not state employees. He continued to say the regulation amendment process had been time consuming and would be ongoing. Mr MacKenzie said, related to disciplinary actions, three stipulated agreements were out for response, and depending on whether they accept or reject those stipulated agreements, we may have some upcoming formal hearings or as many as three stipulated agreements to be considered at the next meeting. Mr MacKenzie said that he has also been reviewing the Reno office lease, which would be discussed later in the agenda.

10. Mark Santucci oral interview, consideration of initial licensure as a Land Surveyor (For Possible Action) Portions of this interview may be conducted in closed session pursuant NRS241.030

Mr MacKenzie advised Mr Santucci that there is a statutory provision that allows for an oral interview to be a closed session if he desired. Ms Mamola added that in closed session, the proceedings are recorded but no minutes are taken.

Mr Santucci elected to have the oral interview in closed session.

Mr MacKenzie stated that the closed session is for the interview portion and then we will bring it back to open session where board members will deliberate and make a decision. We are going into closed session now.

(Interview Closed Session)

Ms Purcell reopened the meeting at 11:17am. She continued to say that a closed session interview was conducted with Mr Santucci and before we have further discussion and the board decides to vote on this, it should be known that he was actually applying for comity licensure, and that his application shows initial, but he is now currently licensed in the state of Arizona as a PLS.

Ms Purcell asked if there was any further discussion or deliberation amongst the board. There was none.

18-65 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Mr Spata to approve Mr Santucci for licensure in Nevada. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Discussion and possible action on administrative report by Executive Director.

a. Approved Licensees Report

Ms Mamola reviewed the enclosed report and asked for any questions or comments. There were none.

b. Action items related to 2017-2021 Strategic Plan

Ms Mamola asked if anyone has anything they want to discuss on the strategic plan. Mr DeSart requested that the actions items resulting from the strategic plan be included in future board packets for quick reference. Ms Mamola said she would include the plan's Executive Summary in board packets going forward.

c. Governor's Finance Office Department of Internal Audit second phase of audit process of Nevada's independent regulatory boards

Ms Mamola reviewed the letter received from the Governors Finance Office of Internal Audits after the phase one of their audit that started in October of 2017. Ms Mamola said she would draft a response in consultation with Mr MacKenzie, and then as directed by the board, review and seek input on the reply from the legislative committee before it is finalized.

Ms Mamola said that in addition to the audit response letter, information requested by the GFO – a four page document that asked questions about our organizational structure and our processes – has been completed and returned prior to their August 28, 2018 deadline. She added that the response was detailed and that staff attempted to be as thorough as possible in answering the questions that they asked.

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

i. NCEES annual meeting – items from business agenda, conference reports and action items

Ms Mamola reviewed the contents of the board packet related to the NCEES Annual Meeting that was held August 15 – 18, 2018.

Mr DeSart commented that there were issues that were voted on that he felt that we didn't have full background information on or time to process the material provided, which made coming to decision voting difficult. He continued saying it would be valuable to bring some of the items voted on (NCEES model law and rules) back to the board to have a conversation on to understand the true impacts on licensure and how that relates to Nevada.

Mr Spata added that as a new member he would have liked to discuss some of those points that we were voting on as a group. He continued to say that he felt on the spot listening to some of the open discussions but with only a short amount of time that afternoon to read the material and then vote on it. He said it would have helped him if he had an opportunity to discuss the issues at hand. Ms Larkin-Thomason agreed, and said having an opportunity to briefly review each issue would have been helpful in deciding the yes or no vote.

Mr Spata asked if there was a forum or committee to look at past NCEES model law changes to see if there is anything we want to apply to our laws. Ms Mamola replied that the board has made note of important changes and have reviewed how they may impact or influence - or require a revision - to our NRS and NAC's.

Mr DeSart said that some of the NCEES issues voted on did have information in the board packet ahead of time, but I don't think we had any in-depth discussion at meetings prior to the annual meeting. He added that it may be worth reminding ourselves to spend a few minutes skimming through them picking out the highlights. He said he would have appreciated that in hindsight.

Ms Mamola added that not all of the issues and information is available ahead of time, and if the information arrives outside of a scheduled meeting cycle a special board meeting could be arranged. She said sometimes though, items are added to the voting agenda the day before the vote – where pre-discussion could be problematic. Mr MacKenzie agreed, and that because of a quorum, appropriate noticing etc related to open

meeting law would need to be adhered to. Ms Mamola stated that the NCEES meeting is not open to the public, it is by invitation. Mr MacKenzie said he would review the application of open meeting law relating to the annual meeting. Ms Mamola said she would look into what entities from other states do.

Ms Mamola said an item of note about NCEES is that Jerry Carter is retiring as of the end of October then he will continue as a consultant while NCEES transitions with their new CEO. She continued to say that David Cox who is the executive director of the Kentucky Board will be the new CEO of NCEES as of October 1, 2018.

e. Consideration of board authorized digital signatures and input received from Nevada Building Officials

Ms Mamola said she is still working on this item but it has been put on the back burner with the time sensitivity of the audit responses. She continued to say the board has tasked staff with getting information from the building officials within the state of Nevada, and we are working on a survey to send out to them to find out what they know and don't know related to the issue. She added that a webinar may also be scheduled to get their input. Ms Mamola also said that at the PAL meeting yesterday it was discussed having a joint meeting of professional organizations and having a panel on digital signatures to get direct industry and licensee feedback.

Ms Purcell commented that there is an opinion in her company that until the jurisdictions are requesting that third party (identify) verification, self-verifying will be sufficient. She added that there are multiple options for that third party verification and I think that we really need to consider if that is worth our time and effort. Ms Purcell said that she is licensed in Washington and they do require third party verification, and she has used it for submissions there, but otherwise most of the time self-verification can be used.

Mr Anderson said for digital signatures to truly work, the public entities need to be onboard and committed to the process.

12. Discussion and possible action on board committee reports.

a. Administrative Procedures Oversight Committee, Chair Karen Purcell

i. Lease proposal for Reno Office

Ms Purcell said at the last APOC meeting the lease proposal for the new Reno office was reviewed and APOC is recommending that we approve and move forward with that lease.

Ms Mamola reviewed the information presented in the board packet. She added that in the board packet there is a form authorizing and granting the authority for the executive director to sign the lease.

Mr Spata asked for clarification as to why the lease is for 10 years. Ms Mamola said the improvements to the space were quite significant in cost, with the estimate being at \$100,000+ and the landlord wanted a stable tenant before committing to the expense, and they asked for a 10 year lease. Ms Mamola continued saying the price per square foot is reasonable compared to market rates, and the finished office will be close to class A standard, but with rent being in step with class B, which is what the building overall is rated. She added that Mr MacKenzie researched to see if there is a time limit amount of lease we can have and there is not.

Mr MacKenzie said that even with board approval, the lease would still need to go before the State Board of Examiners. They look over every contract and they might say that 10 years is a long lease and we are not

going to approve it. So that is always a risk. He added, but there is nothing in writing that we could find that prohibits how long you can enter into a lease.

18-66 A motion was made by Mr DeSart, seconded by Ms Larkin-Thomason to approve proceeding with Ms Mamola finalizing the lease per the lease proposal letter and to sign. The motion passed unanimously.

b. Legislative Committee, Chair Michael Kidd

Mr Kidd reported that the legislative committee met on July 31st to discuss the changes to NAC and NRS, and asked Ms Mamola to review where we are in the process.

Ms Mamola said that the proposed changes to NRS 625 and NRS 329 now need board approval to be moving forward. She added that a sponsor will be needed for a bill draft request and that will likely have to be done by one of the state legislators. We will be developing a strategy on how best to move forward for the legislative session starting in January 2019.

Ms Mamola stated that a meet and greet has been scheduled with legislators at 8:00am on February 15, 2019 at the state legislature. She continued saying that staff is working on a handout that will outline who we are (the board), what we do, why it is important, what our takeaways are, and what our asks are - which will obviously be the changes to our laws. Ms Mamola said she will review the handout content through the legislative committee and get their blessing on it. Ms Mamola continued to say that any board members that are available that date and would like to attend would be very welcome. She added that it is not just NVBPELS, the Contractor's Board and the Board of Architects are co-hosting the event.

i. Proposed changes to Nevada Revised Statutes 625

Ms Mamola reviewed the proposed changes to NRS 625 and NRS 329, and asked for any questions or clarifications.

Mr Spata said he had a concern related to the proposed amendment to NRS 625.407 relating to the impact the change may have on mentoring of non-licensed engineers. He added that being on-site is a more effective way to mentor.

Mr MacKenzie stated, for clarification on the proposed amendment to NRS 625.425, "privileged" is for the purpose of testimony or testifying in court. Privilege is a different element in protecting something from compelling testimony or subpoena in court. It is an extra level of protection for the investigator.

Mr Spata asked for clarification of firm (or entity) as it relates to NRS 625.460, as opposed to accused person. Mr MacKenzie stated that we have had a scenario in the past where an out of state firm submitted some work, and they didn't have any licensees, and so we couldn't do anything because they didn't have a licensee. He continued saying that this wouldn't be calling for discipline, it would be a cease and desist to the firm and you don't initially have to identify the individual. He added that this expands the jurisdiction beyond licensees, interns and applicants - individuals or accused persons - and that other boards do have this and NVBPELS does not.

ii. Proposed changes to Nevada Revised Statutes 329

Ms Mamola reviewed the proposed amendments to NRS 329.

Mr Perzazzo commented that in the surveying community there is always the argument between what represents a corner and what represents a monument on a corner and this seems to be a land resident corner. In our discipline the corner and the monument may not be the same in specifying the type of corner, and asked if it was a representation by association. Mr Kidd responded saying it is not the corner that is tangible, the corner is a thing you can't touch. He added it is a location and the monument is the physical thing, and the change proposed is purely definitive.

18-67 A motion was made by Mr DeSart, seconded by Ms Larkin-Thomason to approve the proposed changes to Nevada Revised Statutes 625 and Nevada Revised Statutes 329 as written. The motion passed unanimously.

iii. Licensure for military members and their spouses to be linked to federal funding

Ms Mamola reviewed the information enclosed in the board packet. She said that the Secretary of the Air Force, Heather Wilson, spoke at an event in Utah at the National Governors' Conference and said that the military is looking at sending their money on expanding bases in states who expedite the licensure for military or military spouse. Ms Mamola continued to say that they are, in part, linking federal funding for military bases to licensure. Ms Mamola added that we do a great job for endorsement or comity licensure, but initial takes quite a bit longer. She continued saying that in the board packet you see that California expedites or does something different for the military and military spouses – in terms of expediting the license approval process. Ms Mamola said that the board has heard at the joint board regulatory training, that the presenter said if you can expedite for people in the military, then why can't licensure be expedited for everybody - especially when there have been challenges to licensure.

Mr Spata asked if there was a specific time frame we should be targeting regarding licensure, and has there been a standard set by other states. Ms Mamola replied she believed the board was doing a great job on comity and I don't see that we need to make any changes there, though there may be opportunity with something for our initial applicants, including those in the military and their spouses, and whether the board should consider using the same process that we use for comity. Ms Mamola added that this may need to be an agenda item at a future meeting.

Mr Kidd said that he would like to put forward that the board offer a reduced fee or a waived fee for initial active military members or their spouse. Ms Mamola said she would add that as a future agenda item.

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

Mr DeSart gave an overview of the PAL Council meeting held the previous afternoon. He said a common theme was that a number of organizations were having difficulties with membership participation. He added NSPE specifically cannot get a chapter active in Northern Nevada. Mr DeSart continued to say that the group talked about combining forces to improve the caliber of speaker(s) at joint luncheons to add value to membership and achieve better attendance. He added that is what led to the conversation about possibly having a panel discussion at a lunch or dinner about the new proposed stamping/digital signature regulations, and that he got the impression that NSPE would take the lead on getting some forward movement.

d. Public Outreach Committee, Chair Greg DeSart

Mr DeSart said the committee was looking to schedule a time to meet to review outreach opportunities – with particular attention to universities. Ms Mamola said she would send an e-mail to the committee member to arrange a meeting date.

13. Discussion and possible action on Corporate Name Requests

There were none to be considered

14. Consideration of applicant requests to waive certain requirements of NRS/NAC for license.

Waiver of Two Years Supervision Under a PE – NRS 625.183.4 (b)

Mr Anderson recommended the granting of the waiver request by Daniel Burns, applying for licensure as an environmental engineer.

Mr Anderson recommended the granting of the waiver request by Lior Singer, applying for licensure as a civil engineer.

Ms Purcell recommended the granting of the waiver request by Nathan Ribordy, applying for licensure as a mechanical engineer.

18-68 A motion was made by Ms Larkin-Thomason, seconded by Mr Spata to grant the waiver requests. The motion passed unanimously.

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

The board considered 38 non-appearance applications for initial licensure and recommendations were made.

18-69 A motion was made by Mr Spata, seconded by Ms Larkin-Thomason to approve the recommendations as noted in Appendix A. The motion passed unanimously.

16. Discussion and possible action on status of Board and staff assignments

Ms Mamola reviewed those items completed and those still pending.

17. Discussion and possible action on meeting dates

Ms Mamola reviewed the future NCEES zone and annual meeting dates. Mr MacKenzie said that he has a conflict with the January 17, 2019 board meeting – in the earlier part of the morning. Ms Mamola said she would explore options and notify board members of any proposed date or time changes.

18. Discussion and identification of topics for future meetings including, possible proposed amendments to the Nevada Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Law, NRS/NAC Chapter 625

Mr Kidd asked that iPads be provided for board guests to follow along with the board book. Ms Mamola said she would look into it. Mr Spata added that it would be helpful for the agenda, if not board packet, to be

displayed on a screen during the meeting. Ms Mamola responded that is part of the plan in the AV upgrade to both Las Vegas and Reno board rooms.

19. Signing Certificates of Licensure

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

20. Public Comment

No public comment

Adjournment

Vice Chairman Purcell adjourned the meeting at 12:52 pm, on Thursday, September 13, 2018.

Respectfully,

Patty Mamola, PE
Executive Director

Statement for the September 13, 2018 meeting of the Nevada State Board of Engineers and Land Surveyors. Public comment section # 1.

My name is Neal Jones.

My license number is 14791.

I ask that my written prepared statement be included in the minutes of this meeting.

At the July 12, 2018 meeting of the Board of Engineers and Land Surveyors I asked the Board and the Board Chairman to place an item on the agenda for this meeting for an open, honest and transparent discussion. Obviously, this was not done.

My request to the Board was in regards to complaints that I have filed with the Board against a person licensed as an Engineer in the State of Nevada.

- This Engineer is employed by the State of Nevada as a Staff Engineer III.
- This Engineer works under the direct authority of the State Engineer.
- This Engineer is listed as a Professional Engineer on the flowchart for his Division.
- This Engineer signs his work as a Professional Engineer.
- This Engineer claims that his work was reviewed by (3) other Professional Engineers, therefore it cannot possibly be wrong.

I have provided the Board with clear documentation that this person has falsified information, put this false information into a public document, refused to correct this false information and has lied to not only to me, but to the Board in his response to my initial complaint.

The actions of this Engineer have allowed, in the words of the State Engineer, the “illegal use of water” to continue at a business.

The actions of this Engineer and his falsification of information may lead to detrimental effects on the health, safety and water quality for an entire community.

The Board and the Compliance Officer have decided that they do not have authority over this particular licensed Engineer. This is in spite of the fact that Nevada Law (NRS 625.140) states that our Code of Conduct is applicable to all persons licensed under the provisions of NRS 625.

The Compliance Officer has refused to provide me with the response, or any information, that was supplied to the Board regarding my follow-up complaint against this Engineer. What documentation and information was provided by this Engineer to the Board to convince the Board that they do not have authority over this licensed Engineer? Since the Compliance Officer and the Board refuse to provide justification and clarity for this decision, it must be something that the Board does not wish to be made public. Why?

For transparency and the benefit of the general public, the Board should publish this reason that they believe that some Engineers are not required to uphold the basic integrity, dignity and honesty that people expect when dealing with an Engineer.

The general public can then be informed that when they are dealing with these persons in these particular positions (or these particular Engineers) that they will have no recourse if this Engineer decides to blatantly violate our Code of Conduct by falsifying information, placing this false information into a public document, lying about what they have done, possibly putting the health, safety and welfare of an entire community at risk.

In this situation, in my opinion, the Boards moral compass has gone askew for their placidly condoning of the illegal, immoral and unethical behavior of a licensed Engineer. This position will only serve to embolden that Engineer and other Engineers, in similar positions, to continue, and possibly increase the level of their unethical behavior. That is the message that the Board has sent.

I still intend to uphold my beliefs and my position that I should maintain the honesty, integrity and exemplary moral behavior that is expected of Engineers, regardless of the actions, or inactions, of this Board.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this meeting.

Neal Jones, P.E.
njones14791@gmail.com