

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting
Held at 241 W Charleston Blvd Suite 130, Las Vegas, NV 89102
on Thursday, January 16, 2025, at 8:30am

Board members participating were Vice Chair Brent Wright, PE/SE; Thomas Matter, public member; Karen Purcell, PE; Michael Kidd, PLS; Matthew Gingerich, PLS; and Greg DeSart, PE. Chairman Angelo Spata, PE, and Robert Fyda, PE, were excused. Also joining were Mark Fakler, Executive Director; Chris MacKenzie, Board Legal Counsel; Murray Blaney, Operations/Compliance; Jasmine Bailey, Licensing Specialist; Ed McGuire, Professional Standards; Derek Vogel, Communications; Cassidy Wilson, Government Affairs Liaison; and Fatima Bouzidi, PE, as a board guest.

1. Meeting conducted by Vice Chair Brent Wright, call to order and roll call of board members to determine presence of quorum—board members Michael Kidd, Karen Purcell, Thomas Matter, Matt Gingerich, Robert Fyda, Brent Wright, Greg DeSart, and Jay Dixon.

Mr Wright called the meeting to order, and a quorum was determined.

2. Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Public comment.

There was no public comment in-person, virtually, or via email.

4. Introductions.

Board members, staff, and the board guest introduced themselves.

Mr Wright read the board's purpose and mission.

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.

5. Consideration of initial licensure applicant requests to waive certain requirements of Nevada

Revised Statutes and Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 625.

Mr DeSart recommended approval of the request to waive NRS 625.193 (1)(a) made by Chinecherem Igboke applying for civil engineering licensure.

- 25-01 A motion was made by Mr DeSart, seconded by Ms Purcell to approve the waiver request. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

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

The Board reviewed eleven applications in the board packet for initial licensure and recommendations were made.

- 25-02 A motion was made by Ms Purcell, seconded by Mr Gingerich to approve the applications for initial licensure contained in the board packet with recommendations noted. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

The Board reviewed six additional applications in the supplement to the board packet for initial licensure and recommendations were made.

- 25-03 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Mr Dixon to approve the applications for initial licensure contained in the board packet with recommendations noted. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

7. Discussion and possible action on approval of November 7, 2024, board meeting minutes.

- 25-04 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Ms Purcell to approve the November 7, 2024, board meeting minutes. The motion passed. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

8. Discussion and possible action on approval of December 12, 2024, interim board meeting minutes.

- 25-05 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Mr Gingerich to approve the December 12, 2024, interim board meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

9. Discussion and possible action on financial statements.

a. October 2024.

b. November 2024.

Mr Fakler reviewed the October 2024 and November 2024 financial statements as presented in the board packet and provided clarifications for the board.

25-06 A motion was made by Mr Kidd, seconded by Ms Purcell to approve the October 2024 and November 2024 financial statements. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

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

a. Compliance officer report on complaints being investigated.

Mr Blaney reported on the status of the five (5) open compliance case files. There were no questions from the board.

b. Consideration of probation reports:

Dooley Riva, PE #18231	Buckley Blew, PLS #24520
Jason Caster, PLS #19338	Armando Monarrez, PE #19652
Mark Johnson, PE #19830	Robert Mercado, PLS #10352
Lyle Scott Mackay, PE #15131	Andrew Hammond, PE/PLS #21191

Mr Blaney reported on the status of licensees currently on probation. He said Mr Hammond has “pending” status on his probation as concerns have arisen from the independent competency report relating to his professional land surveying work product. He added a board liaison has reviewed the report and made a recommendation and it has been moved to board counsel for drafting.

11. Discussion on Board Counsel Report.

Mr MacKenzie gave an overview of the four current pending disciplinary matters with anticipated timelines for each. There were no questions from the board.

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

a. Approved licensees report.

Mr Fakler reviewed the approved licensee report as presented in the board packet and answered questions from board members.

b. Action items related to 2021-2025 Strategic Plan.

Mr Fakler said a strategic planning update session has been scheduled for March 12, 2025, in Reno.

Mr DeSart suggested with the degree of uncertainty surrounding SB78 that the board consider postponing the planning session until the legislative session has concluded.

A brief discussion ensued and it was decided to cancel the March 12, 2025, and reschedule after the legislative session at a date to be determined. Staff were directed to contact the planning session facilitator and determine their future availability. (ACTION Item)

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

Mr Fakler reported on the member board administrator (MBA) meeting he attended on January 14, 2025. He said the main item for discussion was the release of the PS exam and the PLSS module, which is scheduled to be in place by August 2027. Mr Fakler added that the NCEES Western Zone meeting will be held in Albuquerque, NM May 15-17, 2025, and that funded delegates have been selected, and the NCEES Annual Meeting is August 19-22, 2025, in New Orleans, LA.

Mr Kidd said with the release of the PS exam module, some regulation adjustments would need considered to accommodate any change directed by the board, relating in particular to the format of the current Nevada state special PLS exam.

Mr Gingerich said because the timelines involved in regulation revisions, action items should be identified now and assigned to the appropriate committees of the board. (ACTION Item)

13. Discussion and possible action on board committee reports.

a. Administrative Procedures Oversight Committee, Chair Brent Wright.

Mr Wright said the committee has not met since the last board meeting but will schedule a meeting in early April. (ACTION Item)

b. Legislative Committee, Chair Greg DeSart.

Mr DeSart said he had nothing to report, but the committee is meeting on January 28, 2025.

c. Professional Association Liaison Committee, Chair Michael Kidd.

Mr Kidd said unfortunately yesterday's meeting was cancelled because of a last-minute conflict, but a meeting will be scheduled in the near future.

d. Public Outreach Committee, Chair Jay Dixon.

Mr Dixon said he had nothing to report. The committee has not met since the last board meeting, but a meeting will likely be scheduled sometime in March.

e. PLS Standards of Practice Subcommittee of the Legislative Committee, Chair Matt Gingerich.

Mr Gingerich said the committee will be meeting on January 27, 2025, with the main purpose of addressing the comments received during the PLS regulation adoption hearing in November and proposing text revisions. Mr Gingerich requested that Mr MacKenzie attend the meeting.

Mr Fakler said he would send a calendar invite to Mr MacKenzie. (ACTION Item)

14. Consideration of delegation of appearing on behalf of the Board in front of the Legislature to the Executive Director.

25-07 A motion was made by Ms Purcell, seconded by Mr Kidd to approve the delegation of appearing on behalf of the Board in front of the Legislature to the Executive Director. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Spata and Mr Fyda were excused from the vote.

15. Discuss legislative and regulatory matters with board's government liaison, Cassidy Wilson.

Ms Wilson said the Governor delivered the state of the State speech last night he set his priorities, and he alluded to SB 78. He did not say it by name, but he brought up the boards and commissions, and what was done last session, and what Dr Sanchez will be bringing forward this session. Ms Wilson said relating to the board's BDR, it has been submitted but a BDR number has not yet been assigned. She added that minority leader Greg Hafen is running the bill and we're going to get several co-sponsors. Assemblywoman Marzola, the chair of Commerce and Labor, is reviewing it along with a number of others.

16. Update on status and possible impacts of Senate Bill 78 (SB 78) which revises provisions relating to boards, commissions, councils and similar bodies.

a. Board Chair Update.

b. SB 78 Content.

i. Staff Overview.

ii. SB78 - Pre-filed November 20, 2024.

c. Department of Business and Industry Position Paper.

Mr Fakler reviewed the overview prepared by staff on the possible direct and in-direct impacts of SB 78.

Mr Wright asked board members for any comments.

Mr DeSart

I've already been approached by members of the profession who are concerned about this, asked me. What does the Board think of it? I said. Well, I'm not the board. I said. We are appointed by the governor, and this is the governor's bill, and we're going to answer whatever questions that come up and we're going to support the process. However, we can as you mentioned, I guess. You know there's even talk about some of the professional associations having their lobbyists go take a position potentially opposed to this right, and I guess I'd like to have a little bit of an open discussion about what the Board's official position is about this, or how we're going to go about having an official position. You know you brought up the summary here is really good. I don't know. Put that together, but it's a really good summary and you know it brings up some strategic implications, some key questions. You know things that need to be clarified and from my perspective, you know, this board operates fairly well. We have built a surplus. We are efficient. We have a lot of representation of different perspectives and there, you know, there might be some unintended consequences here, even though the intent is good to streamline. Government have more consistency, more standardization. All of that makes sense. But I guess just wanted to have at least an initial conversation about what the board, how we're going to approach this as a board.

Mr Dixon

So I agree with everything, Greg said. I think it's too early for us to take a position, because there are some questions that we can't answer yet, and one of my biggest question is, you heard the financials? We

have a healthy surplus. These other boards that were being commingled with at least proposed how does their financials compare? Are we going to just? Are we going to redistribute those funds that this, that right off the bat doesn't seem fair to me.

Mr Fakler

Those are all good questions. We had on the agenda the position paper that we hope to have as part of this board packet. We have been told that we will receive that position paper on the 21st. So hopefully that because we have a lot of you know, Angelo and I have been at a meeting a week and a half ago with Nikki Haag and he and I also will be sitting down with Nikki. It'd be a virtual meeting tomorrow at 1 30 with Nikki and Kris to go to walk through more of our position, ask more questions, but we really need to see the position paper. And because we have everything you've asked. We've asked.

Mr DeSart

Where is the position paper coming from?

Mr Fakler

That's coming from state, and that's coming from business and industry.

Ms Wilson

Yeah, it's from B&I. It's a whole policy paper. It was supposed to come out last October and they have continued to change it because they are meeting with all the boards and commissions. I do want to mention that Mark has done an amazing job, and he's been very proactive on this, and we have had several meetings with Dr Sanchez on this, and Dr Sanchez has acknowledged that this board operates very efficiently, and it is an outlier compared to many of the other boards, the 315, and they're still counting. I do also want to highlight that the Governor last night mentioned that this bill is going to be massive, and that when it gets put on the desk at in committee that not be shocked and scared of how large it is we've heard it's going to be probably 4,000 pages. There will be changes the way it comes out. It will not be the same. There will be amendments. And so that's why B&I is meeting with Mark tomorrow to discuss amendments, and then I have a meeting with Amanda and B&I next week she reached out to me to discuss their other legislative priorities. I have a feeling that majority of theirs around this, so majority of our conversation will be focused on SB 78. Yes?

Mr DeSart

Is it possible, or remotely likely, that this board could get carved out of it?

Ms Wilson

I cannot confirm that. But we have been having those discussions. And we have been asking.

Mr Fakler

That's a question we've we have asked if we've been referred to as a model board by some of these very same people and you know we kind of in one of our 1st meetings with Kris, I walked him through our licensing process. You know, we went through our comity licensure, and how we act, how rapidly we get to licensure, and how we do our business, conduct our business, and he's like his comment to me was, if every board operated like NVBPELS operates, we wouldn't be doing this. So, having said that they recognize the work that this board has done in the past and continues to do. And so and when I say, we're going to we're going to work with them. If we think something needs to be fixed, or we see a better way. We're going to bring it up to them. So working with them means just that it's going to be work.

Mr Kidd

Just Cassidy's opinion on if it's worth. Greg mentioned some of the professional societies, maybe trying to make a move to do some lobbying. Is it worth asking them to assist with trying to get a carve out, or we don't know enough yet to even anticipate or talk intelligently about a carve out.

Ms Wilson

Yeah. So we've been meeting with this State Association, and I work with lobbyists. So it's great right now, we're kind of in that awkward waiting period until session does start. And we receive this policy paper, and we have more of an understanding right now it's the skeleton form of the bill on Nellis, so you can read it 82, or 92 pages, and so you can look at it there. But that's not the full bill. So once this is scheduled for hearing, and we have done a lot of background work and working with the State Association on this, then we can get additional info and have input from them. But this still has to be set for hearing and introduced, and all those different things.

Mr Matter

Well, I guess you know, and I understand we're, you know, kind of you know, at the behest of what the governor wants. But I mean, does anyone really think that pulling this board into with the other boards are associated with that? It's going to make it a better or more effective and more efficient board. I mean, when I look at you know, what's the mission of this board, you look at 3 boards that really have a profound impact on the State safety, the Medical board, the Contractors board, and the engineering board. And when you minimize that down to your approvals, you're going to have designers determining who's a competent engineer and not a competent engineer. It just seems like a bad idea to me. I know we can't really do anything about it, but it just seems like a bad idea.

Ms Bouzidi

Can I add just something? Just a comment, I think, what's missing from that summary? And it's a great summary, by the way, is what's the impact on the licensees, either present or future? I know that there is an outreach to the new engineers to gain that licensure. Are they going to be willing to do that with a

board member that has 2, maybe 2 representatives that are going to be maybe of the same discipline or 2 disciplines that are not representative of all the engineers. On top of that I mean one of the main things that the Board upholds is the safety of the public, how those disciplines are going to work. We know that, for example, I was already in previous meeting notes or reports, and it takes a long time already with this Board to have a discipline investigation to discipline introduced, approved, and all of that, and with a board that represents everybody, this 2 members, how that safety of the public is going to be upheld.

Mr MacKenzie

One thing that will change under the way I read it is. It's no longer to be the board hearing disciplinary matters. It's going to be a hearing officer which is like the contractors board, and things like that, maybe as an appellate level after a hearing it would go to the board. But all that disciplinary stuff will be taken off the boards plate. In front of a hearing officer, and that's not uncommon with some other boards. They do it that way, and there is some efficiencies that go with that. But you don't have the broad. I mean, this is like a jury, if you will, and for every matter. So I think it has its benefits. But that will change.

Ms Bouzidi

Which brings some compassion, breadth of knowledge and understanding from different disciplines.

Mr Wright

What will we know after we get the position paper that we don't already. I mean, we've given. We basically understand what they said. They're going to do right. What are we going to know after we get the position paper that we don't already know.

Ms Wilson

I think this just has additional details and more question answers that people have asked throughout this process with Dr Sanchez meeting with everyone.

Mr MacKenzie

If I can follow up on Mr Dixon's question regarding, or Mr Dixon's question regarding the the budgeting process and the accounts, I mean, you will become part of good old fashioned Nevada administrative bureaucratic budgeting process, and you will submit a budget. You will get allocations under that. You won't have your own bank account. It will all be swept under part of the department of Business and industry, and you will submit a sub budget department business industry will submit that budget for you to the legislature to get approved. And that's my understanding. And so it will be a very. You won't get autonomous anymore, you finances, getting approval, you know. I mean, it's going to be a huge change, and you won't be you. It'll be a super board that only has 2 of each of our professions.

Mr Gingerich

So the position paper is being developed by the committee that's preparing this. I think Greg was asking about our position. So is it something after we get that we develop our own? Or is it? Is that.

Mr Wright

Or is it too late.

Mr DeSart

Well, I don't. I mean I don't. It's definitely not too late, in my opinion. But I guess my fundamental question is, I'm not. I don't play. I don't dabble in politics. I'm not a politician in fact, it probably would be a really bad one, because that would be way too direct, but all of us are appointed by the governor. This is being sponsored by the governor, and proposed by the Governor. If and if we believe that this is not in the best interest of the licensees and the public which we've read. The purpose of this Board is to protect the public. Are we willing? And I'm not saying we have to answer this today. But are we willing to oppose this bill, you know, which is kind of equivalent to maybe biting the hand that feeds you, so to speak.

Mr Wright

Seem like we have a duty to.

Mr Gingerich

I think we do. I think that's there's an obligation part of our duty to put.

Ms Bouzidi

I think it's a duty. Yeah, it's a duty. It's not biting the hand that feeds you.

Mr DeSart

And that's why I'm bringing it up because we've had some. This is only our second, maybe 3rd conversation about it. We get a little bit deeper every time, and initially, we were, very you know, un-committal right? We're we don't know really what this means. We don't know what our position is going to be, but as it becomes more real. And as we get into the legislature, if we did want to take a position, and I do believe we have to get more information before we could take a position. But if we did want to take a position that to oppose this, as it's currently presented because we have concerns about how this might not protect the public. Then I then I are we willing to do that?

Mr Kidd

I agree with what Greg is saying, the avenue, or the path that we would take to oppose it. I would think there'd be some strategy and wisdom to try to push strategically as we could for a carve out you know, as opposed to just an opposition. And I don't know. Cassidy, if you have any temperature or what how that would work or?

Ms Wilson

So every time we met with Dr Sanchez. He's told us no one carve out so far, but we will see it's not just business and industry, and the governor that are going to be reviewing this bill. We have a legislature. You have the Assembly and the Senate and so, if they deem it fit that you guys are getting carved out, and that could be an amendment or vice versa. So I think it's a long process. What happens in 120 days, and this is going to be a large bill. It could or could not get a hearing at the end of the day as well.

Mr Kidd

There, most likely will be some carve outs. I can't imagine the medical board getting swept with whatever.

Mr DeSart

One thought that I have had kind of alluded to it earlier, but I don't know some in Southern Nevada. Several years ago we had. There was an initiative to fuel revenue indexing which was essentially to create a fuel tax that was going to be indexed to inflation, to create funding for transportation projects in Southern Nevada. Sure, you're familiar with right, and I recall, that the director of the RTC. In Southern Nevada would go Una Rocho not a road show and she went to all the different associations, and she was very careful to say she could not advocate, but she could educate, and she would educate people as to what would happen if we get this and what would happen if we don't get this. And that could be a pathway for this board is we could be through public outreach. If we could be educating, we could go and do a road show to the professional societies. And we take this. You could start this today quite frankly with what we know today with the Nevada bills, you know. SB, 78, overview. And you could talk about. Here's what it says. Here's the unanswered questions. Here's, you know, potential implications without necessarily advocating and to the point about, we have a lot of knowledge about how the Board operates. We have knowledge about how we believe, at least we protect the safety and health of the public. I think that could be a way for us to move forward with this, but it would. We would have to be aligned. That's what we wanted to do.

Mr Matter

Yeah, and I mean I'm in agreement with Greg again. I guess I just don't know if we're better to be the squeaky wheel or, if we're better to hey, just be quiet and proceed with it. And it's, going to you know, ultimately end in a carve out, or however, you want to say, but I just what I look at the end of the day is, I can't see any scenario where combining this board with the boards they're talking about combining it with it is improving the protection for the engineers and the profession, as well as improving the health, safety and well-being of the general public. When you're, you know, for a lot of the boards, it makes sense, it's going to be better off for its members. If they get streamlined and brought in with other people, what have you? It might be more up above the board what have you but for engineering and the engineering profession and the ramifications. I mean to me, it just feels like it's going to ultimately say,

it's going to become a rubber stamp for professional engineers. I mean, it's because you're going to have 2 people that know what they're looking at.

Mr Wright

Or if we were, if our employer asked us to do something that was unwise or would create a safety problem, we would have a duty, and we would write them a letter or send them an email, or whatever we would do, would inform them, because that's what we do. In this case our employer, the governor, is asking us to do something that we think will be unwise and endanger the public. And so, but in order to now inform him and the legislature seems like we need to do the smartest thing, and somebody that's more politically savvy than we are right. If it's educate, then that's I don't know what it is, but I think we probably what we need to do is identify the most effective way to get our message to the Governor that this is unwise and is not going to and possibly could endanger the health and safety of the public.

Ms Purcell

So, I think what we, what we need to do is we need to 1st read that position paper that's going to come from their office. And then perhaps we will add this to our interim board meeting, so that we can have further discussion as far as.

Mr Matter

I think the position paper comes out after our next interim board meeting, doesn't it?

Mr Fakler

It comes out January 21st, so in about 5 days from now.

Ms Purcell

And in addition to that, obviously you and our board chair are having some follow up meetings. So, we'll have even more information. And I'll just want to add that you know our mission, like you said was, is protecting the public. So does the public fully understand the implication

Mr Wright

Well would seem very few boards have as big impact on the life and safety of the public as this Board like we said the Medical Board, maybe the contractors board and our board.

Mr DeSart

Oh, I want to just reiterate. I've already had people approach me concerned about this, that they didn't hear from me. They heard it, however, they heard it so that it's already out there. Anybody who's in a position where they're keeping track of these things, and they run. It runs across their desk and they're like, Oh, my goodness! And then they're reaching out saying. What are you guys going to do about this

and because this is a horrible idea, that's what they're telling me right and so I really didn't have anything to say and like I said, we haven't discussed it, but I do think we should take a position at some point and I think we should probably get out there because and educate, because one of the rules of thumb out there with a lack of information, people will make stuff up right if there's no information. They're going to fill that void with what they make up. And we as a board, if we have, we need to educate of what the board does you know some of the implications of this to the Board? You know, we would go from 8 or 9 board members with multiple surveyors, multiple different specialties of engineering, an efficient operations to just being come up, you know, 2 engineers, 2 surveyors, and become part of the bureaucratic cog in the whole system, and that, you know, I can't see how that's benefit. And you know, in my opinion, I think we should take a position. Even now I think we could take a position that we're skeptical about this and then but be open to speak to get more information. And I think we should commit now to start doing something to educate to public and specifically our profession about what this is and what this isn't right, and some of the some of the unanswered questions and implications of this and this position paper is fairly neutral. I mean, it's pretty neutral, but you know people are smart. You tell them the implications. They're going to figure it out for themselves, right? And then, you know, if I ACEC, NSPE or ASCE or SEASN has lobbyists, and they want to go and all of them loudly say, we think this is a horrible idea, and we also are saying we don't think it's in the best interest of the public. And you know they might have a different reason for thinking it's a different idea. But our reason would be based on our mission as we currently stand today, because currently we are a board and we still exist. And we still have them statutes that we're upholding.

Mr Matter

And I think I think the way it has to be done, Greg and I think you're exactly right, is. And Brent said it as well is there's 3. I'm still very adamant about this. You know. There are 3 boards that really impact the safety of the public. The medical. You have a bad doctor that impacts somebody. You have a bad contractor, build something faulty that impacts somebody. Somebody dies. You have a bad engineer or a bad land surveyor especially, you know, Brent, you know, hires any willy-nilly as a structural engineer, and the guy doesn't do a very good job, and a building falls down that impacts people. I mean, I know these are oversimplifications. But I mean those 3 boards to me impact this health, health, safety and well-being of our community more than anything else as a general public, not as an engineer, not as a contractor. Nothing. And I think we do need to take that position not necessarily so much about the fact that we're efficient. We're a good board, and we're really good with what with what we do. But you guys are experts in an industry that most people don't understand if they're not part of that industry. So who's going to determine whether or not someone is competent enough to be a part of that industry. It needs to be a board of their peers similar to the Medical Board. Right? I mean, that's the way I look at it.

Mr MacKenzie

Thank you, Mr Chair. If you want to go down this road. One thing to keep in mind is the one of the

kickstart for this process in other States was the overlying concern with professions policing themselves, and protectionism and lack of oversight from the State. This has been a fairly autonomous board, and if you have alternatives it shouldn't. I don't think you can go. The route don't mess with this. This is great. Don't change anything. I think you're going to have to get more looking at alternatives for still providing state oversight to ensure that it's not protectionism which this board is not obviously the reciprocity licensing and all that stuff. But that's the main impetus for a lot of this happening across the country. So just saying, Don't change. Anything's probably not going to fly. But it's like, Okay, if this is your concern about having state oversight, this is how we fix that. And so that's going to have to be part of the conversation. It's not just. This is a bad idea, because the health safety you're also going to have to say. We need to make sure we're not preventing people from becoming engineers or land surveyors, and how you're facilitating that, and how you can have state oversight. I mean, there's there are multiple ways. You could do that. But that's another huge discussion, too. I just want to throw that out there.

Ms Bouzidi

So it's a position, and then an argument on how to help. But the other thing that the Board is against, too, is how is it working in other States where the boards have been merged like Arizona. There is one engineer, one architect. That's it. No, I think there is some research there that needs to be done. How is it working for that? Because if it's successful. then there is no argument of saying 2 engineers and 2 land surveyors is not enough.

Ms Wilson

So the entire bill is based off of Iowa. And that's what they're going to, that's the model the website that if this does pass would be a website that Iowa created. And so this exact board would be off of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Virginia. So if you look at those States that's like the complementary boards United States. That's how it'll operate. That's per Dr Sanchez.

Mr Wright

It sounds like what Karen suggested is might be a wise course of action that the paper is going to come out in a week, or whatever, and in 4 weeks we'll have another interim meeting in which at which time will have had time to review the paper collect our thoughts, and then we can have maybe more effective and discussion and solidify what we want to do.

Ms Wilson

Mark. I'm not usually a part of the meetings. But if this is an item, I can attend.

Mr Wright

Would seem like it would be really helpful for us to have someone who's understands how the political machine works.

Mr DeSart

Also, I, you know, just to add on to what Chris said I agree, if somebody comes to me things I hate your idea. It's a bad idea. I don't think it's fair. Don't do this. Then they walk out of my office. That's not very helpful, right? If they if they come in, and they say I hate that idea. They don't think it's fair. I think you should do this instead. That's going to be much more better received right? And I. So I do think part of our position needs to be we really, I mean, this will require some thought and some research has suggested we should. So what would we propose to accomplish what he's trying to accomplish? You know what that looks like? I don't have any idea at this moment, but I think that if we're going to come up with a position that needs to be part of our position

Mr Kidd

And the footprint and influence. This Board has nationally is a huge asset to the citizens, and the licensees of Nevada, and this new configuration would drastically cut that.

Mr Wright

Do we need a motion, or just? We're just added to the agenda?

Mr MacKenzie

I think it's we have possible action.

Mr Wright

We could just have it added to the agenda for the interim meeting.

Mr MacKenzie

You could do an action on this based on discussion.

Mr Dixon

I have a suggestion. I don't know if it's for Mark or Cassidy, but I'll just mention 3 is I'm most familiar with ASCE, APWA, and ACEC. I know their lobby on a national level. I don't know if they lobby in the State. I'm not aware that they have. But we need to find out. ACEC does okay, yes, and we need to be prepared to go on an education tour and have that discussion about. You know.

Mr Wright

It'd be a major. Yeah, major initiative of the PAL committee. Right? Yeah.

Mr Dixon

But that's just a suggestion.

Mr Matter

Cassidy's opinion on what we should do with regards to this, you know are we going to, you know, ruffle so many feathers that it's going to be the worst idea ever, or is it something where we do need to be a little bit squeaky, and make a little bit of noise.

Ms Wilson

I think you should obviously voice your opinions and your concerns before the Legislature. I think we do need to wait for this policy position paper to come out on the 21st Since we have been waiting for it for so long. We have been working with other groups on getting information and gathering that. Mark, like I said earlier, has been very proactive, and he has background documents. And so I think we continue to go down that road. And then once you guys have the full picture and the bill drops and we go from there. But I we have been meeting with the appropriate people. We've been in conversations. We're gathering as much data right now. And so I think we continue to do this. And then whatever you feel is best. That's what we'll go with next.

Ms Purcell

So quick question. So that paper does come out next week, and then our interim, I believe, is scheduled for the 13th of February and session starts the 3rd, is that sufficient time, or should we move it up? Should we have it sooner?

Ms Wilson

You're fine. 1st month of session is usually pretty slow. March is sometimes slow, and then April it tends to pick up, and then it's a full blown sprint from about the middle of April to June.

Mr Kidd

As soon as that drops could that get distributed to the board instead of us waiting for that?

Mr Fakler

As soon as I have that.

Ms Wilson

And I will continue to email you guys updates, Mark, we talk 3, 4 times a week. And I will show Mark how to go on analysis where the bills are and he can get notifications on when this bill is mentioned, or different things like that.

Mr MacKenzie

Sorry, just along with Cassidy, is talking about timing wise. The last session with Bill that started. All this

was much larger and it didn't get a hearing until the like the last day.

Ms Wilson

It was the last day last day.

Mr MacKenzie

And it was they cut out huge chunks of it, and passed enough to at least appease the governor to a bit it because it was something that was one of the Governor's bills they cared about, and they were mad about all the vetoes as Democrats, and so he didn't get a hearing until the last day they cut it way back and got it through. So there's your sausage making that's the part that you know. This will probably be. He has to be careful about saying what bills are. Priorities in the other side knows which one he cares about, and use it as bargaining chips, and put it in the desk, or, you know, put in the drawer, and don't hear it for a while. And so this is. This could be part of all that. And so you wish it was just like everything you formally, and there was good notice and everything. They're not subject meeting law. They're not subject to anything. It just all of a sudden it's boom there and they go.

Ms Wilson

I would like to echo that. For example, like you'll be sitting on the assembly floor, the Senate floor, and they will call behind the bar meeting, and that is a committee meeting, and they can vote and get it pushed to the floor in the chambers. So this can all happen within an hour of time. On the last day that SB 431 which I believe I sent Mark a copy of that bill. That's the one that kind of laid the footing for. This. This bill goes back all the way to governors Sisolak last days, like they've each governor has tried to reform boards and commissions and so that bill it was the last day it was heard in the past.

Mr Wright

It seems like we pretty much know what our position is going to be. So it seems like what we really need now is to convey it in the smartest, most effective way. Right? And you guys will advise us on.

Ms Bouzidi

What's the insight on the other boards. What do they think about it? Maybe somebody else is going to make more noise.

Ms Wilson

Majority of them have big concerns from what I've heard from other lobbyists that represent boards they are not excited about this bill, and they're still trying to collect all the info and see what the agency is wanting to do. But majority of the folks that I've heard from are not very happy about this.

Mr MacKenzie

I'm sorry one last strategically. Again, if you do want to go this route it might be good to also. Besides, the professional organizations have some non-engineering, non-land surveyor groups, protection, affairs, health and safety. Something along those lines. That's like, it's not just you guys, hey, this is ours don't mess with it. Protecting ourselves. You have somebody from the outside that if they could become educated and care enough, and to spend the time to lobby. That would be good to hear from people that aren't just you guys.

17. Consider any bill draft requests proposed by the Legislature to amend Nevada Revised Statutes related to regulatory boards and/or changes to Nevada Revised Statutes chapter 625, 329, and 327.

Mr Fakler said there were no additional bill draft requests proposed by the Legislature to be considered by the board at the moment.

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

Mr Blaney reviewed the staff assignments and highlighted scheduled production of YouTube videos to demonstrate the process of electronic submittals and digitally signing documents – as outlined in the best practice guide available on the board’s website.

Mr Dixon said with the recent passing of a bill water rights survey maps can now be digitally submitted. He said the Division of Water Resources (NDWR) are developing infrastructure, protocol and processes, but a lot of the community of water rights surveyors are struggling with the new process. Mr Dixon said he has been invited to present to a water rights and surveying committee in March to explain how the process works from a board perspective, and to make sure NDWR publishes its requirements in a clear and concise way.

Mr Blaney said board staff can help with information for the presentation, and possibly be a resource for NDWR in developing their receiving and processing procedures.

Mr Kidd said a number of entities have been through the transformation from paper/mylar to electronic submittals and digital signatures and have been through the teething problems, and could help the NDWR with some best practice guidance.

Mr Blaney said Mr McGuire is very familiar with the board’s electronic submittal and digital signature process and also has entity experience and contacts on the receiving, reviewing and routing side of the process. Mr Blaney said he would have Mr McGuire connect with Mr Dixon to assist as needed.

(ACTION Item)

19. Discussion and possible action on meeting dates.

Mr Fakler said meeting dates have been set through January 2026 and based on the earlier discussion, the March 12, 2025, strategic date will be removed and following the outcome of the legislative session, a new date will be proposed.

20. 10:00 AM - Request by Michael Yevtovich for Board to consider reinstatement of licensure.

Mr Yevtovich

I'm ready. Okay, good morning again. Everybody. Let's go on the record.

Mr Wright

Reconvene the meeting of the Nevada State Board of professional Engineers and land surveyors, and we will move to item Number 20 on the agenda to consider the reinstatement of the licensure for Michael Yevtovich, and I'll pass the baton to you, Mr Mackenzie.

Mr MacKenzie

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hello, Mr Yevtovich. I'm Chris Mackenzie Board counsel. We had the opportunity to talk.

Mr Yevtovich

Nice to meet you, sir. Thank you.

Mr MacKenize

Nice to meet you in person. Just letting the board know Mr Yevtovich is requested to reinstate his license. That was revoked quite some time ago in 2002.

Mr Yevtovich

Can you just speak a little bit louder?

Mr MacKenzie

Yes.

Mr Yevtovich

Thank you, sir.

Mr MacKenzie

You're seeking to reinstate your license was revoked in 2002, if I believe if correct there, there'd been a

couple of disciplinary matters back then. And at that time there was an avenue for you to reapply after 2 years if certain matters were taken care of. Obviously it's been the elapse of quite a bit of time and there is a statute that allows for a revoked someone who's had their license revoked to have their license reinstated, and that's NRS 625.470 and by a by a majority of the Board a revoked land license can be reinstated there. I imagine you have some things to say on the matter. I have some questions as we go along, too. I just wanted to give the some history. After the Revocation there was a District Court order that was obtained by the Board and the Board Counsel to get a permanent injunction from Mr Yevtovich practicing engineering. Best I can cobble together. It was after the revocation there was some practice of engineering, at least alleged and based on that a court order was sought by counsel at that time, and a District court order is still pending that says it's that it was a per excuse me, a permanent injunction from allowing Mr Yevtovich to be able to practice engineering been some quite some time. That's 2006. So logistically, I guess the question for the Board wishes to proceed is whether Mr Yevtovich would have to get that injunction vacated. I'm not sure whether the Board could at least make a preliminary determination based on whether or not he's able to have that injunction removed that is his pending court order that had no it didn't have a beginning or an end on it. It just, or if the Board determines that Mr Yevtovich is worthy of potentially being licensed. Again, it would be contingent on him getting that injunction removed. There are several ways to skin this cat, I believe, but I think the main question for the Board is are you license worthy? And I think that's up, for, you know. Present to them, and you do your presentation. However, you'd like, but I think that's the question before the Board is, are you someone that can be licensed and be, and them still protect the public and uphold their obligations as a board to license you, and allow you to go back out there and engineer.

Mr Yevtovich

It's my turn now, or?

Mr MacKenzie

I'm just providing some background. So it's all yours.

Mr Yevtovich

Thank you so much. I appreciate that, you can interrupt me anytime. Okay? And again, we said, we have 2 hours available at least. Who is Mr Fakler. Mark.

Mr Fakler

I am Mark Fakler, I am the executive director.

Mr Yevtovich

I remember the gentleman now, I would like to reference to them. And then, now, yeah, we'll go later on. But again I I'm coming from the Government with the help, I was asking them just to put my name to you

on your agenda and your list as of today. Just again I did not ask for this hearing and I want to be straightforward on the records. There that's exactly. I have here copies to show you all that I was asking, just because I spoke to Mr Mark Fakler at October The first, at least we spoke 2, 3 times. It's on the records there, and I mentioned to him that I spoke to Mr Murray last year as well few months before him, and the question was without soliciting, without questioning, even without asking, to talk to him. I just was in good faith in trying to get in touch with the on monthly basis, yearly basis. Whatsoever. Are you right. Mr Council? Already 25 years pass by. I'll tell you guys the reason, but I want to just make sure that I appreciate every minute of yours. I'd be more than glad to be here and to go through the process whatever there is. But again I didn't ask for this hearing, I thought would be enough if the Board just considers on my email I sent to Mr Mark was there just asking for reinstatement of my license CE 12008. And he said again, since I referenced to my conversation previously with Mr Murray, he said, hey, what is your question again to the Board? Why, you have to have your license back. Why, the Board has to give you license back. That's the same question Mr Murray had several months before, that you can interrupt me, Mr Mark. Anytime I appreciate. But let's be straightforward. And here I'm telling you guys again, Mr Murray that time told me. Hey, Michael? He picked up. He recognized. He remembers my call of telephone number but he said again, without any question, Michael, I did review all hearings with S at the end. In other words, not 1st one or second. I reviewed your hearings, and I found that everything was misunderstanding. I can give you guys oath or whatever there would be required just if you go. And with cross-examination. But that was my question to Mr Mark, after talking to him. Would you please just give me writing something from the Board that I can call upon Mr Murray's statement, because definitely to me all these for 25 years was not misunderstanding. And Mr Mark said again, I have here on the records my minutes everything! They are under oath, he said. Hey, Mr Murray is a nice young man, which I did not object nothing personally, but he said he is not a member of the Board, neither he voted on your revocation and I found this over offensive to me, with no explanation whatsoever. What was his statement what he was trying, you know, to tell me, and so on, because I just was asking to have something that I can show you all guys. Hey, listen! Here is misunderstanding in, according to you guys, to the Board, rather than having my case heard in the court of law or in front of you guys. And I was also very explicit to him. I said, You guys are talking about a misunderstanding. I'm talking about prejudice. I'm talking about the previous just. I have still business with the previous Board. Now here, I'm 1st time with you guys with the new but I was telling him I have an issues. I didn't have due process. I have records here, I think, in your short conversation the other day I mentioned to you, for example, in my records here. I don't have any minutes. I don't have any court judgment in Reno. I took a road, a ride from here all the way there, and I told you that Mr Bruce Robb, the previous council, came forward me. Hey, Mr Yevtovich it's nice to see you, and so on for walking me, really acting up, and so on, because after the 1st hearing at New Orleans Casino, there I was sitting, few rows, several chairs away. We didn't have contact eye contact. I didn't even who was presiding. I didn't know even who was the main chairwoman at that time, because that was my 1st hearing, and he so irrigated, Miss. He! He! That was a lynch mob, lynch mob that was different. Everything else than fair, civil, a respectful conversation, or hearing, or anything,

going both ways. He came to my chair in present of Mr Arestis, and I hope you guys had a chance at least to read these decisions in the orders, and that's what I found here on your agenda, just under Number 20 there, respectfully I disagree again, and please forgive me just jumping over and trying from one item to the other one. But definitely, I spent entire night just reading transcript copies I received from Mr Blaney last night and, like I said, I have here everything. I don't know how much can take it, I think for this, which I really appreciate trying to save your guys time would take only 5 min more of this hearing. If you, the counsel, can tell me again I did question if there is no any rem legal remedy to that injunction. There is no reason to going now over back 25 years. I'm ready for my goal was from very 1st minute. My goal was just to have pro bono, and just to go through by the law to the jury trial. Just to present my case, I tried my best. I can show you guys being on food stamps with 2 master degrees. This was totally disgrace, not throughout that this Board, the Government, or the governor's office. And like, I said again, it's up to you guys. If you want. I just ask to consider my license here. If you want to go ahead with my presentation. That's fine. There are so many questions like, I said. Again I checked these transcripts. There they are totally manipulated. We have tapes on the records there. And now, like I said, 1st hearing. I just got transcripts. I apologize. Give me a sec. I was reading those transcripts. I can't believe it. Also, I'll go specifically. The second transcript was, they're not mentioning anything and just having one of those Board members asking, suggesting that my California license be suspended, revoked whatsoever. Okay, in the decision door orders. There is no anything mentioning about my California license. Also, in regard to that. Again, going back to the main. What I'm trying to show you guys, is that Mr Bruce Robb from very beginning he had his personal agenda against me to destroy me and my business and my good name here in this Las Vegas Valley, with all these building departments, and I have here copies, I have here records, I can show you positively. That's the reason. Coming back to the 1st hearing, when he came to my chair, sitting there telling me, Hey, Mr Yevtovich you are a liar! You're lying all the time this and that, and Mr Arestis the Greek, my ex-friend, and so on, who was one of complaints, complaining at that time he said, yes, you were lying, you were lying, and I'm telling you there was nothing about greenhouse there. And so on, regarding the 1st hearing. There it was undeveloped, undeveloped property. He was there in just a mobile home, with no hookups, nothing there but definitely. That's not my business. The business was that he brought me in, hired me, and wanted to do. He started. He was dreaming all the time. Oh, I want a house. I want to make my business here with a new building. Blah blah this and it, and I told him, listen we have to go to the planning commission. There is a zoning, there is a planning, there is a procedure there. This won't be a couple \$100, whatever there is. But again, you are my countrymen there on Greek and Serbs. I'm proud American Serb now, after being in this our beautiful country for 45 years since seventies. Okay, now it's 2025, and I told him, hey, write down whatever you want. I feel more than comfortable. You can come to my place because I was running all my businesses from my home, from my one bedroom, almost apartment. Okay? And I said, you are more than welcome to any time. I'll help you out whatever needed. I don't need even money, but if you don't have it, we can go and progress, and so on was his definition of retainers. And I again undergoes. I'm telling you all guys, I never lied. I never played games, and I have not stolen anybody's money. I am more than competent to do this

business. I passed exam here. SE. Exam. Here. I passed CE exam. In California. There, I know more about engineering. I don't think it's fair at this time to address to anybody else about my competency passing all those exams, and never had any complaints before, that these 4 complaints were forced through what was it? 2,000 or something? Within few months all those 4 guys are on the same bandwagon, and they jumped on me, and they were supported so badly by Mr Bruce. I'm telling you again on the records there. 1st contact I'd had with him was by the phone, and he was calling me day and night. I was doing my post graduate studies at UNLV. You don't need to know in details this one that I was there day and nights. Okay.

Mr MacKenize

Can I interrupt you?

Mr Yevtovich

Yes, sir.

Mr MacKenzie

I think what you're talking about now is very relevant as to what your capabilities are. I mean, you have a brand new Board got brand new counsel. You got brand new executive director. None of these people were here before all those activities, and we have no way to prove or disprove them here at this point. So I think the question for this are you if they want to entertain it is, are you? Do you have the capability to be a licensed engineer in the State? And they might have questions for you to make them feel better as to why reinstating your license is a good idea, and how you conduct your business. If you did and I think it's more of a going forward. You're welcome to present evidence on what happened back then, but we're not having a hearing on who did what wrong back then I think this is your opportunity to present to the Board why you should be licensed now, and why they can. You know you're worthy of licensure. Should they show to choose to do it, and that's my opinion.

Mr Yevtovich

But I respectfully disagree, and I'll tell the reason why. I'm 75 years old, senior citizen. I stopped dreaming. Let's put it this way at least recently. Now again. I'm offering to your to your guys here if needed. Let's sit down with any structural engineer. Mr. Brent is here, and I think he is more than competent to examine me, to investigate, or whatever other, with all my respect to public members, or so on. But I think it's irrelevant now. Afte 40 years I passed my California exam in eighties. Okay, I passed my exam here in 96. I have here records participating in all those webinars, free Webinars. Okay, I have about 100 FEMA books there. I read, and I'm willing to sit down and talk to anybody, but it's totally irrelevant now to talk about gasset plates, talk about chevron braces, or talked about composite, you know, decks and or put foundation mats, and so on. I can talk for an hour about dynamics, of structures. Okay. I can talk everything else. But like I said again, supposed to be somebody there, who can say? Oh,

Michael, now I understand who you're talking about. But now I understood you, your concern telling me when we spoke. Let's forget everything else. Just let's talk again for what the future is going to be, and so on. That's fine. But what about my license being revoked in California? I went to the Superior Court over there. I went to their administrative hearing, they told me, go back to your Nevada state and come back to us. Let's them, you know. Clear up that mess, and the judge, the Superior Court almost has thrown me out. Hey? Why are you being here? What you're doing? What you're talking about. I went to that administrative hearing there, and the judge said, watching to me, You won't believe it. I had our one of our colleagues who I was teaching, supporting engineering. Wise. He's a minority as I am just talking, you know, not good English, whatsoever he helped me out to have a ride to that officer hearing, and I told him about this, and in front of the judge he said, oh, I didn't know. He didn't know that you're going through all this and so on. And he supported judge opinion just to have it to come back to Nevada State and solve my issues problems with them 1st with you guys here. Now. At that time I lost my privilege of going to the structural exam. I was qualified that time. They told me, Michael, you have no license with California State anymore. Okay, now, here we are. Now you have those decisions and orders nothing about rather than suggesting one of those members that my California was supposed to be contacted. That's all. Nothing about revocation, and so on. And now here you want me to forget all about this.

Mr MacKenzie

Can I ask them, sure, what would you like from this Board?

Mr Yevtovich

What I would like you? I don't think so. It's necessary to go. I agree with you guys all to open up a can full war. And just what I was told by Mr Bruce Robb, or anybody else. What happens? Why, I just want to assure you that I'm more than confident I'm proud. But let me sound humble. Okay, I'm not the smartest. I'm not the best, especially, you know, with my English and so on my experience. I spent 40 years just from 7 to 7, talking nothing rather than just doing calculations, mostly high rise. Okay. Now I was accused before them that I was not competent at all. Talking about something, didn't know anything about forcing me to provide blocking for trusses which were not approved, and blaming me. Why, I didn't approve those trusses, and so on. I have very long list of personal reason why. But again, I want to make sure on you guys, just you guys, if you cannot do it. Now review those transcriptions, and I'm asking the if they have available fund to have you just to compare those transcriptions and the tapes there, just to see that what Mr Robb Bruce did is a crime, not fraud only, but it's a crime just trying, deliberately setting up all those hearings hurting me so badly like. Have being a judge, putting me in jail, but without food, and only what I'm saying is, if you can guys decide now with me whatever you needed to support or sit down together without me and say, okay, Michael, you can, or you cannot have the license and practice engineering in this. But I'm telling you from very 1st day my name was badly stained, and would be very hard for me, being 75 again, without your guys support. Okay, to start from scratches. I was active member of the season. Our engineering community. Here I did do hunting. I did nothing rather than just

failing on a couple issues providing for \$400. No, no. Written contract. Okay. And being accused of retainers, and so on, and so on, because there is no a retainer for \$400 around Mr Counsel just to quickly give you an example. How frustrated I am. You are a driver. If you go to a mechanical shop. Okay? You are being asked. Okay, let's go and have diagnosis first and now and pay for diagnosis, and you want to keep going fine. Just pay more whatever your bill at that time, or you go to somewhere else. If you go to DMV of Nevada State, okay? And if you want to, if you want to have a driver's license, you have to pass smog check. What I'm suggesting to our here, respectful again. We're missing a lot within the Legislature there. I was told years after my exam with you guys that I have to follow, you know. 625 whatever. No, no other device. Statue. I had nothing given from the Counsel. I have nothing in writing from them. But again, let's put everything on the side. If the Board can give me my license back now in a Nevada state and clear up that mess California State and have me reinstate my license. Who I paid with blood for so many years. Okay, working, getting qualified, losing my structure exam. There. I was a candidate like everybody else there, and also I lost my postgraduate study here at the UNLV. Everybody knows that, and would be very hard now for me again I hate to keep repeating, but very important is without your support. To proceed with these 2 licenses. I am naturalized route, American Serb. I I'm not stipulating with you guys now anything at all. But I'm telling you on the record here. I will not keep harm our government or any lawsuit I am not looking for, to get money to the court through lies and fighting back, and so on. I was not able from very 1st day. Okay, just to have my gosh and authority there to represent me in a small court. I went to the legal aid center here, everything there. But I'm telling you, especially these days before January 20th and so on, very hard. Even anybody to hear a voice with Mike there is doing what he's in it, for again. I have here all my records. I want to give you guys back your property. I think it's not fair. I spoke yesterday respectfully, kindly, with Mr Murray again and he gave me this binder. I don't know what was his reason. I was asking all the way along just to have a matrix just to have some guidelines. How we supposed to conduct this hearing. Okay, and he gave me this here, which doesn't have anything to do rather than with my case, 20, which is not here on your agenda even not being told that I was not approved to be too present to you guys. Case number 2, which is again doesn't have anything to do with my 1st revoked license having Mr Murray telling me that he reviewed my hearings, and he found it was misunderstanding only. And now here we are, if you can vote and decide because, like I said again, I told you frankly that time, with my respect, it's not worth it to waste your guys time here if we cannot overcome over bridge data injunction there, because it says over there with no dates, with nothing there, coming from Reno court, that my license is being reformed, and I'm telling you again on the records here. I was summoned 5 times, 5 times by the at that time to go through the legal process, and I will set up, and I'm telling you again there is the fact. I was in that particular room in the Court District court here for half hour, waiting for my appointment, given time 15 20 min before the hearing. Here comes Mr Bruce Robb passing by getting into that room there. I checked on that. And I apologize to you guys, it's going to take less than 2h definitely. But I just want to tell you, how much I upset and how I tried my best to go to follow the legal process. I'm not asking the members to give me my litigation, or to give me any quarter days or so on. But I want to emphasize to you guys, and it's a good lesson to all of us

what we supposed to be helping our legislation. I contacted senators I contacted throughout the you know, the chain of command from the bottom to the to the top. But again, here is Mr Robb coming talking, whispering on with the judge. There, right and I approached. Good afternoon, the judge, and he just took off like to me, and he said, case dismissed and...

Mr MacKenzie

If I may, if I may?

Mr Yevtovich

Sure.

Mr MacKenzie

And I know all those things are very relevant to your life, and it's been something you live through. But it's not something this Board can make a 20 year later determination on. You know what happened at that court that day, and you had your perception. You know we don't have anybody else here. I think this is your opportunity to talk to this Board as to why you should be. Have your license reinstated and I think this is your opportunity. I know you have some old axes to grind, and I understand that if it was, if that happened to you, but we don't have the capacity or the capability to retry. What happened to you in 2002 or 2006 or 2008. We have to deal with the present, and we can't. We cannot go back and fix what happened back then. This is your opportunity now, if this Board wishes to say Okay, you know we'll give you this license if you do this, this and this and if you know whether it's take an oral exam, take it. There's a specific statute that allows them to. If you wanted to. If they wanted to give you the opportunity to be relicensed you could take a written exam, or you could. They could administer an oral exam.

Mr Yevtovich

I apologize for interrupting. I was not given all those. I was going ready, you know, just to give you guys whatever you needed. I was asking for the matrix.

Mr MacKenzie

That's why you're here right now. The Board makes the Board has to hear your case and make a decision as to what.

Mr Yevtovich

Here is, Mr Brent. He is a structure engineer. I understood here on the Board. Okay, let's open the code. And let's talk.

Mr MacKenzie

Okay, that's where I was going.

Mr Yevtovich

No, but, like, I said again, I cannot go to the future without my California license either.

Mr MacKenzie

Well, that's this. Is you're dealing with State Board and Nevada State license.

Mr Yevtovich

Please. That's not true. That's not fair. I'm dealing with you guys here, but you are the government. I respect you, and that's fine, and I'm cooperating with you. But I was not born yesterday. I you know, definitely, with a license here, whether I is granted or not, I supposed to have another sword where I'm going to kill myself, or leave, or work, or so on. I just insist I want our respectfully, without granting my license or not for the future. I just want them to help you guys to help me out. I want my California license back, because again.

Mr MacKenzie

We don't have, we don't have jurisdiction there that we could. We could make a decision. We, this Board can make a decision about whether or not. You could be licensed in Nevada, and you could take that to California and say, if you get your license back in Nevada you could take it to California and say, look that I got my Nevada license back. Give me my California license now.

Mr Yevtovich

They told me that I never was disciplined by them. They told me. Hey, we're going to give you your license here, but you have to go back to Nevada Board because Nevada Board told them to revoke my license there. And now what I'm such understanding. You is okay. Forget to California. Forget everything else. Let's talk about the future, hey? I'm 75. I don't know who can give me guarantee for another 25 years just to wait for to work here, and so on. I'm telling you I'll be more than welcome. I'll be proud to have your license back, but would be really hard for me just to go now from scratches and talk to Ted Dresser or talk to anybody else from the season there, telling him, Hey, here is Michael here. I just want you guys the to clear my name and my children's and my grandchildren's name. Michael Yevtovich was accused of crime, or being competent or not, or whatsoever there. And let's forget anything else. I may not sue anybody. I am not threatening anybody. I'm just telling you again. I appreciate your license if you can grant me back, but I cannot forget what is behind it there, and what was happening before there. And if you cannot just call California Board and tell them, hey, listen! We, the Board our granted Michael Yevtovich , we have to try to give him his privileges back in California there, because they were the cause. They are the base of all this mess. The board at that time, and I respectfully again. I do not blame any one of you guys, and they understood. When I spoke to council again. You, said Michael. I have no problems with all those issues rather than just this injunction there, and now you're telling me something

totally different.

Mr Wright

Can I interrupt you? You and I know each other a little.

Mr Yevtovich

Don't make me crying. Please let's forget about that, knowing each other, and so on, and what you did good to me like nobody else. I don't want to go on records on personal issues.

Mr Wright

We can't help you unless you can understand what Mr MacKenzie is trying to say.

Mr Yevtovich

Okay, I'm listening.

Mr Wright

So if you'll hopefully, you can understand we can't do anything about your California license. If you lose your license in one state, whether it's Nevada or another State. All the rest of the States that you're licensed in will probably take your license there, too. Not because you did anything.

Mr Yevtovich

I can't hear you. Well, please. I cannot hear you wherever please, if you can.

Mr Wright

We can't do anything about your California license. There's nothing we can do. All we can do is consider your Nevada license and then California will have to consider if we decide is the if the Board decides to reinstate your Nevada license. Then you could go back to California and apply to have your California. That's the only way to do it. We can't do anything about California. So it doesn't do any good to talk about California, because there's nothing we can do and it and there's in my mind there's really nothing to talk about as necessarily about. I mean, we're obviously the Board is concerned about your competence as a structural engineer. But as I read the Disciplinary Council Notes and the disposition based on the Council that occurred in 2000 and 2002. The allegations were not necessarily that you were incompetent. They were based on you, not being an honest and faithful agent to your client, getting retainers and not returning it. In fact, that was the case for every one of them, as I recall. So it wasn't necessarily that even back then they claimed that you were incompetent as a structural engineer, and your work was substandard. That wasn't the main substance of the complaint as I read it. Maybe there was. I'm just telling you. All I know is what I've read, and that's all that all of us know.

Mr Yevtovich

Excuse me for interrupting you again. You guys are now being misled, you are being given just a decision orders. And I was asking all the way along, okay, you guys supposed to be given. You're supposed to read or go through, or whatever the transcripts there from those reading you do not have. You guys do not have all facts on your hand to decide.

Mr DeSart

The last thing where your license was permanently revoked. Right in Washoe County. You know what I'm talking about.

Mr Yevtovich

Washington?

Mr DeSart

March 27th at the Second Judicial District Court in Washoe County. Your license was permanently revoked. Right?

Mr Yevtovich

No, I'm not aware of it at all.

Mr DeSart

That's in the documents.

Mr Yevtovich

Well, sir.

Mr DeSart

So I have a question. Okay, it says it was permanently revoked because, while it was temporarily revoked, you practiced engineering. Is that true?

Mr Yevtovich

No, totally incorrect. I don't have any records of that hearing took place in Reno there at all I just mentioned at the beginning, at the council. Well, that's fine. Give it to me, please.

Mr Wright

Michael, that's what I'm trying to say. We would like to be. We want obviously want to be fair and impartial, and we have a soft spot in our hearts for engineers so nobody is trying to persecute you. But I think we could be here all day and not accomplish anything. If you don't, you don't listen and comprehend what we're trying to tell you. We can't. There's nothing we can do about any wrongs or

alleged wrongs of the past. But what we're here to consider is if today you are competent and it makes and it's in the best interest of the profession in public safety to have your license renewed. That's it, that's all.

Mr Yevtovich

Mr Brent with all due respect I think it's a little bit disappointing from you. Let me tell to this Board again, just to be on record what you did great to me. And now telling me, calling on this requirements, now for the board just to check my competency that I'm not denying it. I'm not denying it. Let's sit down and talk, but I don't want just to be go on records being punished by this because you guys didn't have a chance to read and check transcriptions and to see whether this is legal or not. What you're calling upon. You're calling, questioning the Board, you guys again. I'm not disputing it. I'm ready. But you're saying that I'm not listening to you guys. If I didn't listen to you guys, I wouldn't be here. I came here with all respect to you. But again your counsel here was silent. At least that's what I understood telling me that legally this he told me that time I didn't hear from you guys today whether this injunction there legally can be solved. There is any legal remedy to it. Now you want guys me to talk. Let's talk about the code again. But now what you're going to tell me. Listen. Here. We have ordered in 2006 there that you cannot practice anymore, and there is no legal way of.

Mr MacKenzie

I never said that there was no legal way to do it, and I'm not your attorney.

Mr Yevtovich

And that's what you said. I agree with that.

Mr MacKenzie

I am not your attorney, and there might be a way to get that injunction removed. And I'm saying here at this opportunity, if you want to get your license back it's going to matter whether this Board wants to give you your license back, and then we'll worry about the injunction and there's a way to. There could be a way for that injunction removed or not. I'm not going to do that for you. You have to hire your own attorney, or do it yourself.

Mr Yevtovich

I cannot do that without any money, without a license, and so on. It's a catch 22.

Mr MacKenzie

But exactly no. Well, you can present your case to the Board, and one of those, one of the conditions they could put on if they decide that you should be have. Your license granted is to get the injunction removed, and they could direct me to work with you, or whoever else, to get that injunction removed.

Mr Yevtovich

I don't understand, to work with me to remove? I think.

Mr MacKenzie

No, this would. This would be now to determine whether or not you should get your license back. That's what this opportunity is. Right now.

Mr Yevtovich

I'm not questioning that. That's up to you guys.

Mr MacKenzie

Why don't we give them an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr Yevtovich

Counsel, please. My question to you guys is, why, now we have to go through all this. If that legal remedy cannot be over breached. What if there is no there? And I was respectfully expecting from you, from the legal point to advise the Board today? Yes, there is a chance, or there is no chance, or would be required, Michael, to have by the Governor's office pro bono attorney, or he has to put another \$25,000 just to have somebody to have his case cleared, and so on. These are all issues to me. Now, you guys calling upon something upon something, what happened, forgetting what happened, but now not giving me any anything to any tools to proceed with this and that. We will proceed with telling you again, please, if you give you the board gives me license today what I'm going to do with that process do I have to go back to the entire community here? I call Channel 13. Okay, just to interview, to give me a chance to speak up. I was asking you guys all to put my clear my name in your booklet there for such engineers, for Nevadans people there just to read and see what the previous board did to me, if you want me to. But it. Yeah, under quote, give the license and let me to work here because I have no other country. I have no other place to go to. I'm telling you, sir. You know most of you guys know, structure engineer failed that Hilton signed years back again he went to California. He was able to practice. And now these 2 guys totally irrelevant what happened to me and that's fine. And like I said again, I do not blame anything what happened. But now telling me just to go through all this again with the competency, and so on, which I found no question about my competency at all. It has not been proven in the court of law in this country. I did not have a chance to talk to. Please ask the Supreme Court of Nevada why I contacted, why, I was begging them to get involved, and gave me my courting day, and the civil court refused even to see to give me a chance. And now you guys wanted to forget you wanted to start again.

Mr MacKenzie

I'm not telling you. You should forget. That's part of your history. This is what we are limited as to what

we can do. And this is your opportunity again to answer questions from these Board members as to why you should be licensed.

Mr Yevtovich

Okay, let's like, I said again, that was a question before, and I thought totally unacceptable. Without attorney, without presentation, without you guys to submit in writing to submit in writing to you guys the new Board, what are the reasons why, I think, why I think I supposed to have my license back reinstated if I tell to anybody there. Hey! This is totally what happened. Discrimination totally. My constitutional rights were deprived. And now I'm having your employee working for the Board, telling me that he doesn't remember what he was, what he was telling me last year, and again I the second, please. I know my patience is running out as well, and I don't want to talk much. But again, we cannot proceed with the with the license just now being granted, or being granted or declined just again taking care of the other issues. And I'm trying to tell you, with all my respect, what the other issues are. As I'm concerned the code, questions or examination or anything. It's not. I just want to be treated like everybody else. And I want to start with you guys from, not from today, because we had to take care of those issues happened before if you count on me to work together with you guys. If licenses granted.

Mr MacKenzie

Personally, I'll give you my opinion. If there's not a determination by this Board that you are competent to have a license. Why do we spend the time to try to get rid of the injunction?

Mr Yevtovich

But that was my question to you as well. I was expecting. And that's what in my correspondence to you guys by email with Mr Mark, I told him. Let's I was asking him. Hey? Listen, let's have the Counsel told me I told yesterday to Mr Murray as well. Let's have the Counsel to speak up first, and tell to the Board whether there is any legal remedy to overcome the injection. And I have not heard from you guys. And you said probably maybe or so on. Now, to go through all this.

Mr MacKenzie

I had that discussion with you this week. I have not had time to do the research to all to do all this.

Mr Yevtovich

That's fine.

Mr MacKenzie

And so if you want to postpone and we can work on, and I can get come back the next the next meeting of the Board and let them know. But that's more time you're going to lose is if okay, we get the injunction off. Then you still have to go through the board process of determining whether or not you can be re-

licensed. That's the bottom line is. You need to take this opportunity to satisfy the Board that you are worthy of re-licensure and if you if it is, and if they say yes, they think you are, then one of the conditions could be to work to get the injunction removed. But you're putting the cart before the horse, because at least you need to get, you need to listen to these people, answer questions and give them the opportunity to determine whether you could be relicensed again. And then we'll worry about the injunction.

Mr Wright

Mr Gingerich, do you have a question?

Mr Gingerich

I do. And I think it's more for the staff. And I guess we're talking potentially about the license. But is he compliant with the orders that were from 2002 and 8, and all those? Because you satisfied all those conditions? Paid the fines and...

Mr Blaney

With the 2001 order Mr Yevtovich did pay back Mr Clawson, and he has paid back Mr Christophis. Mr Clawson was confirmed, paid on May 22nd, 2001. Mr Christophis confirmed, paid on July 5, 2001, and the administrative fine was paid on March 2002. We understand Mr Yevtovich did submit payment to do the Texas tech course, but I don't have a record of Mr Yevtovich completing the Texas course.

Mr Yevtovich

I paid them \$500 at that time, and I received, no, no, you're supposed to have that on the records. Please, sir, please, you're supposed to have that on records. I contacted the very same day after reviewing that, and I told them, Please, hey. I do not understand. I am not a legal attorney here. I don't know what's going on this advanced course. My English and so on, is more than enough for the code, or doing construction or engineering. But I'm not an attorney. Please let me have my \$500 back, and here is your copy there. And she said, no she refused.

Mr Blaney

So you paid for the course. You just didn't complete it.

Mr Yevtovich

I didn't complete because I was not able to do it. Yeah, I had choice, I was told. Hey, pay me in a couple \$1,000. I'll do that for you. What's the purpose of it? I don't want to get involved in this kind of mishmash, and so on, and the school over there, they know. And Mr Murray again. After that, hearing. Okay, BJ Castle, I was collapsing in the alley, sitting the curb there, and she refused to cooperate to work. And she's supposed to be doing the same job like you do these days. Okay? And instead of that she forwarded

escalate to the counsel board, and passing by, seeing me almost laying down on the concrete curb. There, she said, don't worry too much. Go to the court, go to the court, and she refused to cooperate, to work, even to listen. And now you're talking about what she was pushing what she was suggesting to take that Murdoch test. That test is for advanced. This is not for 1st time offenders at least to me. And now you're calling, and that was a good question by the member there. But, like I said again I tried my best to follow all those. Mr Brent again, please. You are a structure engineer, you know what means, what means, retainer, and you are highly respected engineer here with company and so on. There is no retainer on \$400. There is no retainer around there when you have on cod a plumber coming to your door just to write a retainer, and so on. And I agree with you. There is no common sense talking about this stuff. But now just give me sort of a listen here is just go ahead. Yeah, just question me. Any structural question.

Mr Wright

If I give you some advice. It would be just listen and answer exactly what they ask, and then don't, just listen and answer exactly what's asked. Is there any more questions?

Mr Gingerich

Well, I'm concerned. I mean, there's some concerns there. I mean. It sounds to me like some of the stipulations. Haven't been satisfied. He's challenging the ethic portion of it, which is why he was there, to begin with, so I have some. I'm not. I'm not satisfied that he's fulfilled those obligations to begin with, just to get so...

Mr Wright

Mr Kidd?

Mr Kidd

I am hearing you get advice and direction to talk about now what the Board can do for you now, moving forward, you are reluctant, for whatever reason, to have that discussion, you keep slipping back into the past. I don't, and your English is fine. There's no problem with your English. You speak great English. I don't understand why you're reluctant to talk about what's in front of us today, now, and don't talk about the past. That's not helping you.

Mr Yevtovich

Again respectfully. I do not understand, you guys, if that's the opinion of the Board here. Because again, my future depends, you cannot build a house or a building without foundation. If I have nothing to step to stand up on. How can I proceed? I told you guys honestly, respectfully, even granting me a license here I have without your support would be hard within this community to start from beginning, because I want to have my name and my children's name clean to start from by you guys, because we heard Michael's case, and this is now our standing, whether we're going to give him license or not, but just

telling him, telling me without know, like the counsel said, now I'm pushing up what? The cart in front of horse, and so on, and I can tell you also the same opposite question to him. You're telling me, Michael, jump over the river and don't worry whether a croc is waiting for you over there or not.

Mr Kidd

So if I can use your analogy?

Mr Yevtovich

Please.

Mr Kidd

Your foundation is in place. It's there we're wanting to talk to you about the walls and roofs. You keep going back to the foundation. It's there, we understand that.

Mr Yevtovich

And how can I get back to that foundation if I cannot get a California license without your support? And I understood Mr. Brent is saying, Hey, we cannot do anything about it. : Is that fair statement to me? Question to you.

Mr Kidd

You're in Nevada. You're in front of the Nevada Board. We are dealing with a Nevada issue.

Mr Yevtovich

But Nevada issue is at least that part of the foundation plus the substructure over the foundation there. And now, like, I said again, that's fine. I never refused. And you're telling me now you're telling to the Board members that I'm refusing to cooperate, that I'm not just go any structural questions here, please. I'm listening.

Mr Kidd

No one's telling you, not. We're trying to get you to understand the opportunity in front of you, which is today you seem, don't seem to want to have that discussion. You keep slipping back.

Mr Yevtovich

Because again, I don't know what is what is in the future. There, I don't. I have nothing here just to say, okay, fine. Okay. Here we are, Michael. See, I heard the negative opinion about this Board member there decreasing my chances to even to consider this license, or whatever to be wanted by you guys, and so on. And now you're telling me again, I am refusing just to be just to listen you guys. No, I never refused. I am here just because I came here to listen. You guys to respect you guys and go forward. But there are some issues attached to the future. There, we have to take care of it. Now, what you're telling me for, guys for

1st time. We cannot get involved with the California license. We cannot create your name and your children's name here in the publication of the Structuring and the Nevada Board there, you know, used to be monthly report statements to engineers on how you want to go to the billing department tomorrow. Yes, sir.

Mr DeSart

The way we can clear your name is by reinstating your license. That's the only thing we can do is reinstate your license. The only way we're going to reinstate your license is, if you can demonstrate to us and convince us that you're currently confident to be an engineer.

Mr Yevtovich

I was told, sir, I was told the building department, hey, you are a liar, you are a thief. I was begging people in front of the Clark County Building department, looking for jobs without being fool at the time. And they sent Security Guy and told them, Hey, leave the property. Leave the property. I'm telling you. Positively. Trust me. Yeah, it's unbelievable.

Mr DeSart

I believe, but again we can't do anything about that.

Mr Yevtovich

Okay, I'm asking you, can the Board just put in their bulletin to okay, to the Nevadans, to Las Vegas people here. Michael Yevtovich got his license back. If that was your guys final decision, I'm just asking that just to show somebody calling me a liar again, or a thief just to tell them here I my license here because they don't know if they don't check my plans, or if they, if they don't hear me, and so on. I was with 2 with 2 here totally personal issues are not relevant to you guys. I don't want to go back there. Let's stop right there. Please go ahead and let's again be on the records what the questions are as far of my competency. Yes, sir.

Mr Wright

Mr Dixon?

Mr Dixon

To maintain your competency since 2006. I think that's the most recent court order injunction there. What have you done to demonstrate? How can you demonstrate to us that you are competent still. Have you been? Have you been working? What kind of work have you been doing? I know you're not using your PE stamp, you're not allowed to.

Mr Yevtovich

From very 1st day, not when the license was suspended or revoked rather from very 1st day, very 1st day. If you've been around here practicing and being accused of stealing, and so on. There, totally. Your name is gone. Your practice is gone. Forget about stamps, and so on. Okay, and I'm telling you, since 2006 I was not. My license was not revoked in 2006. My license was revoked right after the second hearing of the Board at that time.

Mr Dixon

Okay, so what? How can you demonstrate that you are currently right now, competent and worthy of this reinstatement that we are considering. That's what we got to understand.

Mr Yevtovich

Okay, let me, please let me let me show you. Let me design a retaining wall. Let me design whatever you want. Let me show you here again. I told you guys I did keep reading for all these years. Okay, just to relieve my stress, just like, I said, to keep in touch. And I have no other trade. I have no other profession than just, you know, reading, just working, hoping, or at least for this one dreaming, thinking about something. What? I spent half of my life into it. Let's see here what is the question to just show you guys that I am competent, that I cannot guarantee you tomorrow whether it's going to have another person here just to come back and accuse me with no questions, no proofs, no facts, nothing to you, guys rather than okay. I was given forms to fill out. Submit to the Board regarding my regarding my probation, so on I did. I put it back to him on April 15th and he received it, and he said, It's vague to me. I don't know what you're talking about, I said, Sir, please give me something. What is vague all about it. I'll submit to you guys. In other words, tomorrow, even with your license, without your support. Let's put it on the records there. How I can work together with you guys. I can promise you now I won't touch a stamp. Your stamp given to me. If I don't have written contract in details, and you give me guys the copy of it, I'll follow. I never refused.

Mr Wright

Let us ask you some more questions, so we can...

Mr Yevtovich

Pardon me?

Mr Wright

Let us ask you some more questions, so we can understand better. Mr DeSart?

Mr DeSart

I'm not sure I have any more questions. I think the question's been asked several times different way and I don't think you've answered it, so I guess in my opinion he has not convinced me that he's currently eligible to become, have his license reinstated. I am under the impression he has not satisfied the

conditions of the previous orders. I don't, unless he comes back at a later date and I would recommend that he provide something in writing before he shows up again that I would see something from you in writing.

Mr Yevtovich

I cannot hear from you, excuse me?

Mr DeSart

That shows what you've done to maintain your competency and examples of you doing design work. I want to see all of that in writing before you show up again at another hearing, if you're interested in doing that. But as of today, I am not convinced.

Mr Yevtovich

I do not understand at all what this gentleman is talking about. I do not understand. I told you guys I told you guys I didn't have stamps.

Mr Wright

Let me ask you a question.

Mr Yevtovich

I was not able to do, retaining even walls. There. I was digging holes. Come on in front of home depot.

Mr Wright

Without a without a stamp you can't work independently because you can't stamp drawings right? Can you hear me?

Mr Yevtovich

No.

Mr Wright

You haven't had a stamp for the last 20 years. So you've not been able to. You couldn't work independently. You couldn't go out and get a client and do engineering for them because you don't have your own stamp. But that didn't. That doesn't stop you from working under another engineer that is licensed. Have you worked under an engineer that's been licensed since your license was suspended back in 2000? What have you been doing? Have you been doing structural engineering work?

Mr Yevtovich

Mr Brent.

Mr Wright

Let me just finish. Make sure you just understand my question. That's all I want to know. I don't want to know anything else. Have you worked and done structural engineering work under a licensed structural engineer? When was the last time you did that? Is it. Have you done that since you had your license suspended, and when?

Mr Yevtovich

Mr Brent directly and it's known everything, the records there. Yes, I did for Mr Clair Stewart and Mr Mark and Mr Murray, they know.

Mr Wright

So you worked under Clair Stewart. What were the dates?

Mr Yevtovich

Yeah, for months. For how many, at least 6 months or something.

Mr Wright

When? When was that?

Mr Yevtovich

That was definitely after my license was revoked.

Mr Wright

What year? About was it like 2003?

Mr Yevtovich

His letter is dated to me December 20th, I worked in 2018, I worked for Clair and associates 2017.

Mr Wright

Okay, for a few months in 17. Did you work for anyone else?

Mr Yevtovich

And I'm telling you he's my church member, and that he.

Mr Wright

No, that's all I am asking.

Mr Yevtovich

I did not, was not possible even with stamp, with that accusation by the by, the Board at that time within our community here to do it. If I had.

Mr Wright

You were looking for employment, but you couldn't find it.

Mr Yevtovich

It's on the records I'm being on full.

Mr Wright

I'm just asking the question.

Mr Yevtovich

Yes, sir, I'm on food stamps even these days, medical aid, and so on, and so on. And here I'm having your member here telling me that he doesn't understand what I'm talking about.

Mr Wright

It's hard because you don't seem to be comprehending what we're asking. Let me just ask. So other than a few months working for Clair Stewart in 2018, or whatever that year was. You've really not done any structural engineering work.

Mr Yevtovich

Positive. I could deny nobody would. Nobody would hire somebody these days. My understanding is at least I'm telling you from my experience, because I tried very hard. I wanted. And I'm telling you guys, I did not have stamps, you know, and I was not able to find engineering job. And I think it's not fair just to condition me now, telling me you can do work anything else. I put into this license my gosh! Two-thirds of my life by now you know that, everybody knows.

Mr Wright

You think that we're telling you can't do anything else, I'm not understanding. What do you mean?

Mr Yevtovich

No, no, what I'm saying is what I'm saying is, I understood what was the question by you what I did after 2006, when my license were revoked, I said my license was not revoked.

Mr Wright

We're just trying to understand what you've done.

Mr Yevtovich

Going back to the work. I was not able to find and I can document because I was investigating by the government for years. I was left in one room without cold air for 4 months. In other words, I'm telling you they are all over me checking Michael. Did you work? Can you work? And so on, and so on. And I'm telling you I wasn't our church support for years, and my bishop told me. Hey, Michael, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Mr Wright

The reason you couldn't work you couldn't find a job?

Mr Yevtovich

No, I was not able to pay my tithings to. I lost my privilege of going to Temple just because I was not able to work. And that's what I'm telling you tomorrow. Who is, how can I work with your stamp here, if they call me liar, and so on. If you don't put your at least fair statement there. Michael Yevtovich's license has been granted or denied. If that and please, I am being respectful. I'm not threatening anyone. I have no choice. I will not give up to my last breath into my grave. There I'm going to stand for my principles, and my principles are the same as yours, only my problem is, I have no money. I'm going to ask waiting for January 20th Let me ask our new president there just to have real help on pro bono, and let's go to the jury trial, and if that's the location, that's solution for you guys. Fine, let it be. I'm punished more than enough.

Mr Wright

Mr Kidd?

Mr Kidd

Mr Chair, Mr MacKenzie, would it be appropriate to make a motion?

Mr MacKenzie

You can make a motion whenever you'd like. If I mean, this is the opportunity for the Board to ask any questions to you know, as to determine competency for reissuing a license. That's why we're here. And so if there are other questions from board members, I don't know.

Mr Dixon

I got a question, staff. It has, have you been provided with information that answers some of these questions we're trying to get at?

Mr Yevtovich

None.

Mr Dixon

This for them.

Mr Yevtovich

I know I want to help them.

Mr MacKenzie

Okay.

Mr Kidd

I'd like to make a motion. I cannot support reinstatement. I would ask that this gentleman work with Board staff for a more complete presentation and package of the history where it's at, if he wants to come back to the board. But I would have made a motion not to support re-licensure at this time.

Mr Wright

How about a second?

Mr DeSart

I will second.

Mr Wright

Is there any other discussion?

Mr Gingerich

I agree with you, Michael, but I think we probably should maybe put a little bit of guidance in the motion, because I mean to me it seems like what the stipulations need to be set before he can come back to us. The stipulation should be satisfied in the original discipline. Yes, and then he needs to provide some evidence of practicing under a structural engineer or civil, whatever. I mean, because it's just. It's it seems like a waste of time just to come back with something that's not somewhat satisfactory to us. And it's at least from my perspective. Those 2 things need to happen at a minimum.

Mr DeSart

I would add one other thing to that, and that's some evidence of some continuing education that has taken place.

Mr Gingerich

Yeah. Well, that was one of the steps. Right?

Mr DeSart

What? Continuing education, if any, so that we have the opportunity to evaluate that in addition to what work has he done under another licensed engineer? And what was the other thing that you had? But meeting all of the stipulations from everything, moving all the way to the 2006 order.

Mr Wright

I think I would add also recommendation at least to bring counsel someone who can help counsel you, so we can be more productive because this this has not been productive.

Mr Yevtovich

Well, I was asking Mr. Brent, I was asking at that time the Board okay, just to help me on getting pro bono, or some cancellation, or whatever I was told by Mr Mark. There again. This is totally killing me even more because I heard you guys definitely, you know, I'm not counting on your license. That's fine. Only what I'm saying. He told me, Michael, I don't like your the way I think the reasoning, and so on. In other words, I don't want to sound weird here, or insisting on something or fighting with you guys. I have not heard any question, any structural question from you guys, and you guys keep repeating that I'm refusing to cooperate, or just to listen.

Mr Wright

You're just not comprehending what we're trying to say to you.

Mr Yevtovich

But if you don't understand, I'll repeat, I'll repeat. If you want me, I'll put it in writing.

Mr Wright

We are not asking you to repeat. We're just asking you to listen and understand.

Mr Yevtovich

I am, I am. I am listening. I came. Well, you don't believe it, that's fine. Only what I'm saying is again I cannot understand again. I cannot be heard just telling me something. Even I didn't hear these gentlemen what their objections are, what their concerns are about.

Mr DeSart

Because you haven't answered our questions.

Mr Yevtovich

Did I answer your question? What? What, please? What? Let me have a second chance? What's the what was the question?

Mr DeSart

What? How? What have you done? What engineering have you done since 2006, under the direction of an engineer? You said 6 months, working for one firm in 2017. Have you done anything else other than that? Yes or no?

Mr Yevtovich

No.

Mr DeSart

Okay. Then you answered that question. The other thing is, have you done any continuing education between 2006 and now about engineering?

Mr Yevtovich

Any?

Mr DeSart

Continuing education?

Mr Yevtovich

Formally, None. Because...

Mr DeSart

That answers my question.

Mr Yevtovich

Yes.

Mr DeSart

And then the other question is, have you satisfied all of the administrative fines and satisfied everything for all the judgments against you, including taking the ethics course, and all that? Have you done all that?

Mr Yevtovich

I did not. No.

Mr DeSart

Okay. Then you've answered the questions.

Mr Yevtovich

Okay, thank you. And I gave you. I gave you my reasoning and facts before his question. There, why and what was happening now, what your guys saying, hey? And this is totally relevant to his question. There, we are not going back just to consider what happened. And now, can somebody just see that these are 2, the same both issues, you know, tied, or at least, you know.

Mr Dixon

We have regulations that we have to comply with based on your answers. We're not allowed to reinstate your license and we can't. We can't just go off the rails and say, Well.

Mr Yevtovich

No, I'm not asking you that I'm asking. Just give me what are your requirements. Let me have a chance to fulfill them. And you said.

Mr Dixon

The requirements are that you answer yes to every question Mr DeSart just asked. That's a requirement. We can't do anything about it.

Mr Yevtovich

No, I'm not asking for shortcuts or anything else. I'm not. I'm just being upset because I was not told. I didn't have a chance to be told or heard before that. Give me in writing. And let's see, I heard you guys now saying, Hey, I didn't fulfill those board requirements, and I told you the reason why, and you don't. You don't want to listen. You think it's not necessary to go back?

Mr Wright

We listen. It's just not relevant to what we're talking about. We have a motion on the table.

Mr Kidd

Mr Gingerich's suggestions are acceptable to me.

Mr Wright

So could we maybe restate the motions.

Mr Matter

Can we add.

Mr Kidd

Being not to support re-licensure, asked the gentleman to work with the Board to satisfy all the requirements from the previous agreements and stipulations and just provide a job history to the Board with this gap. What have you been doing? What have you been doing? Competency is one leg of the stool.

It's there's it's not the only thing, so, and I don't know if there was other. (FIRST)

Mr Gingerich

So paying the steps or satisfying the steps, providing a work history satisfactory to, you know, working underneath a structural engineer and continuing education.

Mr Dixon

That's it. Yep.

Mr Wright

And we had a second. By Greg, I think if you're still second?

Mr DeSart

I will second that I guess I would just maybe just clarify that until he satisfies that to the satisfaction of staff, he would need to satisfy Staff that he's met the requirements before he's scheduled to be on the board agenda again after he's done that. When he does that, if he satisfies that he's got sufficient continuing education. He's got sufficient work experience under the direction of an engineer, and he has satisfied all previous stipulations and judgments. After that has happened, then he would be eligible to come back to the board and present his case, but not until then. (SECOND)

Mr Wright

With a recommendation to bring counsel.

Mr DeSart

That's a recommendation.

Mr MacKenzie

Yeah. How much time for continuing education? Hour of continuing education?

Mr Blaney

Well 30.

Mr DeSart

Well, I think that could be up to the Board's judgment. But I mean for this giving staff direction. I think you should have 30hrs.

Mr Blaney

What about we've got under Clair Stewart. Mr Yevtovich, was it 6 months? Do you know the timeframe. How long you worked for CS design?

Mr Yevtovich

Let me tell you something. That was that was my second here, a case. I submitted to the board. And you said you said you said, it's not an agenda, and we won't be talking about that. Is that correct, Mr Murray?

Mr Fakler

Yeah, that's correct.

Mr Yevtovich

Is that correct? Is that correct? That you knew at that time when I was working for him, that he knew, and you knew that my license was revoked.

Mr Wright

That's not an issue.

Mr Fakler

That's okay. We're just trying to establish your work experience with this.

Mr Yevtovich

I'm telling you. Everybody knows here without license. Even you cannot find a job there, my gosh! Without a license, without having gosh! I can't understand that. You cannot understand me, that I tried.

Mr Wright

That's why I was telling you that you don't need a license to work. You can work under somebody.

Mr Yevtovich

Would you please hire me tomorrow, or give me a chance to present my experience and my knowledge at your office with license definitely, you will not. And I was knocking at your door. You know that. Okay, you know that?

Mr Wright

We have a motion, we have second. Can we take a vote all in favor?

All ayes, except for Mr Spata and Mr Fyda who were excused. Motion # 25-08

Mr Wright

Okay, motion carries

Mr Yevtovich

Respectfully your board members. Please let me have me writing, and let me proceed with it on my own.

Mr Wright

We wish you the best.

Mr Yevtovich

Let's make sure this time. Around this time around the Administration. Your people have my mailing address on records on all, on all your corresponds to me. There they had my email. They had my telephone number. They had my address. I don't want to miss your certified letter, please. I'm serious about it, and let's go forward.

Mr MacKenzie

Would you state that address for me, please, while we're sitting here?

Mr Yevtovich

Michael Yevtovich, 3, 9, 2, 5. South Jones Boulevard, apartment number 1054, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89103-7104.

Mr MacKenzie

Thank you.

Mr Kidd

Thank you.

Mr Yevtovich

Thank you, all of you.

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.

Mr Kidd suggested an agenda item for a board meeting or APOC to discuss the process of nominations for board leadership, and whether it would require the formation of sub-committee of the current board chair and the executive director.

Mr Wright suggested the topic by directed to APOC to consider and make a recommendation.

Mr Blaney said the topic has been noted and will be added to the next APOC meeting agenda. (ACTION)

Item)

22. Public comment.

There was no public comment in-person, virtually, or via email.

23. Adjournment.

Mr Wright thanked the board members and thanked Ms Bouzidi for her participation and valuable input. He adjourned the meeting at 11:20am.

Respectfully,

Mark Fakler
Executive Director