

**MINUTES FOR BOARD MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE,
INTERIOR DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL DESIGN (NSBAIDRD)**

August 21, 2019

Hyatt Place –Meeting Space 2

1790 E. Plumb Lane, Reno, NV 89502

Wednesday, August 21, 2019

Chairman Kimberly Ciesynski called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

Ciesynski commenced the meeting by stating the Boards' current Mission Statement:

"The mission of the Board is to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public by assuring the quality of the built environment. The Board will empower and ensure that architects, registered interior designers and residential designers provide the highest quality of professional services."

Roll Call: Kimberly Ciesynski, Chairman; James Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer; Gregory Erny; George Garlock; John Morelli; William Snyder; Nathaniel Waugh. (*Ann Fleming Excused.*)

Also in attendance: Monica Harrison, Executive Director; Louis Ling, Board Counsel; Laura Bach, Chief Investigator; Terylle Kenani Aguada, Executive Assistant; Stacey Hatfield, Public Information Officer.

AGENDA ITEM 1 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

AGENDA ITEM 6A Architect Report – FYI: NCARB Update June/July 2019

This information was presented to the Board in the board meeting eBook.

Mickey shared that NCARB will be introducing a new Strategic Plan. Ciesynski asked if there are any updates from the NCARB annual meeting. Mickey replied that there are no resolutions and that their main focus was the strategic plan. He said that they also focused on community outreach and expanding the value of NCARB certificates.

Ciesynski inquired about WCARBs reduction of dues. Mickey reported that WCARB decided to leave the dues as is due to the possibility of having to raise the dues again in the future.

AGENDA ITEM 6B Architect Report – FYI: NCARB Fast Facts July 2019

This information was presented to the Board in the board meeting eBook.

AGENDA ITEM 6C Architect Report – FYI: NCARB June 2019 BOD Brief

This information was presented to the Board in the board meeting eBook.

AGENDA ITEM 6D

Architect Report – FYI: Introducing the Alliance for Responsible Professional Licensing

This information was presented to the Board in the board meeting eBook.

AGENDA ITEM 7A

Residential Design Report – FYI: Update Regarding the Residential Design Exam administered in August 8-9, 2019

Morelli reported that there were four candidates that took the RD Graphic exam on August 8, 2019 at the KGA firm office. He said that one candidate departed after the first two hours and did not complete the exam as he was not prepared. He shared the candidates' feedback and said that they prefer REVIT instead of AutoCAD. Morelli also reported that the RD Written exam was on August 9, 2019 in which six candidates took the exam in Las Vegas, none in Reno.

Morelli stated that the RD Exam has not been updated in a while and that the profession has changed. He said that he's unsure on which direction the Board will take to revise the exam and maintain the best interest of the residential design profession. He also said that he would like to reach out to other Residential Designers and Architects to assist the Residential Design Committee to update the exam.

Ling stated that if parts of the RD Exam are not up-to-date and is not aligned with the practice of residential design, then it must be revised in order to test the knowledge of the candidates and ensure that they have the minimum competence to become a Residential Designer.

Mickey said that there some areas in the RD Exam that are very technical and focuses on means, methods, materials, codes and design and there are no matters in regards to the industry, collaborations, or how to manage an office and contracts. He questioned whether or not the exam should be broken down into more categories and if it is necessary to include the managerial aspects of the profession.

Erny said that the practice analysis is relevant but it needs to be evaluated more holistically for a broad understanding of how the practice is provided in Northern and Southern Nevada. He said that the Residential Design Committee must take the lead in revising the exam and set a target date for completion. Ciesynski suggested inviting more Residential Designers from rural areas to get a better perspective on residential design services provided outside a metropolitan area.

Garlock said that the exam must be parallel to the scope and process to the exams offered by NCARB and to caution not to have an exam that is tailored on how to work in Nevada. He said that the exam must test the candidates' competencies on residential design and should be thorough and technical.

Ciesynski requested that the Residential Design Committee prepare an outline with deadlines to reflect what course of action will be taken to move forward in updating the exam.

Harrison acknowledged KGA for allowing board staff to proctor the graphic portion of the RD Exam in their boardroom and for providing the equipment and software too. She also recognized the staff at KGA who provided assistance throughout the exam.

AGENDA ITEM 8A

Registered Interior Design Report – Discussion and Decision Regarding Who Will Attend the 2019 Annual Council of Delegates Meeting in San Antonio, TX on November 8-9, 2019

Ciesynski said that there will be 4 members from our Board that will attend the conference. Harrison confirmed that Ciesynski, Mickey, Erny and herself will attend the conference and represent the Nevada board.

AGENDA ITEM 8B

Registered Interior Design Report – Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding the Nominations for the 2020 CIDQ Board of Directors

This information was presented to the Board in the board meeting eBook.

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the nominations for the 2020 CIDQ Board of Directors. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 8C

Registered Interior Design Report – FYI: Q Connection 2019 3rd Quarter

This information was presented to the Board in the board meeting eBook.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Public Member Report

Waugh said that he is excited and looking forward to joining Mickey and the NCARB Examination Committee in September. Mickey shared that Waugh has been assigned to be the Public Member of the NCARB Examination Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Approval of Consent Agenda

Consent agenda included the following:

- A. Approval of Agenda
- B. Approval of Minutes: June 12, 2019
- C. Secretary/Treasurer Report (Reports and bank statements)
 - 1. Nevada Architect, Registered Interior Designer and Residential Designer Licensing Statistics
 - 2. Wells Fargo Bank Statements
 - 3. First Independent Bank Statements
 - 4. June 2019 Quarterly Report Statement
- D. Ratification of Reciprocal Licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm Name Approval Requests
 - 1. BKA Architects, Inc.
 - 2. KIRKOR ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN SOLUTIONS INC.
 - 3. KNIT
 - 4. Olivo Architecture, PC
 - 5. Spyder Ivie Studio PLLC
 - 6. Sweeney Architecture

7. TriForm Architecture, PLLC
8. WSM Architects, Inc.

- F. Firm Registration Approval Requests
1. BURKE ARCHITECTURE, INC
 2. GF55 ARCHITECTS, LLP
 3. LMG of Nevada

Architects: Registration by Reciprocity

8142	Paul W. Sieben	8168	Penelope Justine Diaz
8143	Timothy E. Dodt	8169	Jeffery Benjamin Weis
8144	Michael F. Deane	8170	H. Aaron Brown
8145	Justin Richard Hasbrouck	8171	Brendan L. Riley
8146	Charles Michael Busch	8172	Brett Donat
8147	T. John Price	8173	James Michael Huckestein
8149	J. Craig Mann	8174	Alex Stratton Paulson
8150	Daniel F. Joy	8175	Gary B. Bailey
8151	Carlos Tornelli	8176	Ryan R. Nicholson
8152	Gregory Scott Ferrell	8177	Taylor A. Pitelka
8153	William Feola	8178	Sean M. Wagner
8154	Nick Jonihakis	8179	George K. Wickwire
8155	Hal Edward Lynch	8180	Robert F. Uhrin
8156	Sean Michael O'Hara	8181	Mark Alan Stoller
8157	Gregory Joseph Frank	8182	Lawrance P. Jaccard
8158	Kevin William Grant	8183	Anthony Joseph Martin
8159	Edward J. Hurst	8184	J. Bruce Benner
8160	Robert S. Rule	8185	Joseph Jacoby
8161	Michael R. Hoopingarner	8186	Mark Ours
8162	Scott A. Reiter	8189	Jan Michael Martin
8163	Justin L. Sewell	8190	Jonathan Carroll Bradley
8164	John William Szerdi	8191	Jonathan Asuncion Cana
8165	Theresa Michelle English	8192	John Martin Skrivanich
8166	Stephanie Anne Clark	8193	Owen C. Kennerly
8167	Shane S. Williams	8194	Richard D. Van Diepen

Erny pointed out an error in the Minutes. He referred to page 14 of the eBook and said that the word "what" needed to be included in the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 8 of the Minutes.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve the consent agenda items 2A through 2E-1, 2E-4-2F-1, and 2F-3. Motion seconded by Garlock.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2E-2 Firm Name Approval Request – KIRKOR ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN SOLUTIONS INC.

Motion: Erny moved to approve the firm name approval request for "KIRKOR ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN SOLUTIONS INC." Motion seconded by Snyder.

Erny commented on the type of services the firm will provide. He referred to the first page of the firm's application and stated that the term "architecturing," is not a word.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2E-3 Firm Name Approval Request – KNIT

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the firm name approval request for "KNIT." Motion seconded by Snyder.

Garlock referred to page 76 of the board eBook. To ensure that the firm structure meets the requirements, Garlock requested clarification of how the ESOP is broken down. Ling stated that the ESOP is governed and owned by the three Trustees listed on the application and that they are all licensed with our board. Erny asked if the three Trustees are the only individuals who are members of the ESOP and needed explanation of how the 61.84% of the ESOP is broken down.

Eric Roberts, President and CEO of SH Architecture/KNIT, stated that the ESOP is owned by three Trustees who are all registrants. He said that currently the ownership of the firm is held 91.94% by Nevada registrants and approximately 8% by non-registrants. He said that he will forward the breakdown of the ownership to Harrison for additional documentation. Roberts stated that the ESOP has no more than 60% value of the firm and the ESOP is maintained by the three Trustees. He said that the Trustees govern and oversee the ESOP and the ESOP owns value of the stock within the trust.

Motion: Garlock amended his motion to approve the firm name approval request of "KNIT" contingent upon receipt of additional supporting documentation that will clarify and breakdown the structure of the ESOP. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 3A Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration: Architects

Ciesynski welcomed the new registrants and all the families and friends. She briefly informed them of how the swearing-in ceremony will proceed.

Mickey swore-in the following individuals as architects:

- 1. Ryan W. Kronbetter.....8187
- 2. Daniel Orlando Martinez.....8188

Motion: Snyder moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individuals as architects. Motion seconded by Garlock.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 3B Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration: Registered Interior Designer

Mickey swore-in the following individuals as registered interior designers:

- 1. Brenda Jacquelyn Tena.....254-ID

2. Alex L. Woogmaster.....255-ID

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individuals as registered interior designers. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Ciesynski spoke to the new registrants and said that they are being recognized for their great achievement. She said that all of them have taken different paths to become licensed and with that license comes responsibility.

Harrison congratulated the new registrants. She informed them that if they wish to seek firm approvals, they can contact board staff to assist with the process. She also encouraged the two newly registered architects to become NCARB certified to allow them to receive licensure in other jurisdictions. She recommended that they contact the jurisdictions of which they are interested in becoming licensed in because all states have different requirements. Harrison reminded the new registrants that they are exempt from the Continuing Education Units (CEU) requirements for the first two years of their registration. She informed them that the board offers a CEU Seminar twice a year that will provide all eight CEUs required to renew their registration.

Nate Hudson, AIA Northern Nevada and fellow Nevada registered architect, congratulated the new registrants on behalf of AIA and welcomed them to the profession. He said that he hopes that the new registrants will refer to AIA as the advocacy for architecture and design. Hudson and Donna Koepp, Office Manager of AIA Northern Nevada, presented information regarding membership with AIA and encouraged the new registrants to join.

Ciesynski encouraged the new registrants to reach out to the board and staff to ask any questions about the profession as this industry is very diverse. She pointed out that some of the board members are very involved with the national organizations of NCARB and CIDQ.

Erny asked the new registrants if they had passports in which they all responded, yes. Erny promoted that an NCARB certificate is like a professional passport that will allow them to extend their career and pursue opportunities around the world. Ciesynski encouraged the interior designers to join the CIDQ Ambassador program. She said that by joining the Ambassador program, it will allow them to connect with other professionals and mentor others who are on the path to licensure.

Mickey addressed the architects and asked which version of the ARE they took. Kronbetter said that he started the in 4.0 and finished in the 5.0 version. He said that the biggest issue he experienced was finding relevant study materials to prepare for the exam. Martinez stated that he also took the ARE 4.0 and transitioned to 5.0. He said that he found a study group and other good resources through social media to help him prepare for the exam. Mickey asked the architects if they had any issues with the speed or the process of the exam. Both Kronbetter and Martinez stated that they did not experience any negative issues.

Ciesynski addressed the interior designers and asked for feedback in regards to the NCIDQ exams. Tena said that she took all portions of the exam on the computer and said that the first two exams were more straight-forward than the last section. She said that her overall experience went well but thought that the Practicum Exam needs to be updated and more user-friendly. Woogmaster agreed with Tena and said that the Practicum Exam was a little challenging. He said that it was difficult to see the resolutions and were frustrating at times just to move items or open attachments.

The Board asked the registrants for feedback in regards to their experience with the application and registration process. Woogmaster said that the Board's website was a little disorienting and found it easier to speak with staff. He said that the staff was very helpful in guiding him throughout the process and made the experience easy.

Erny asked the new registrants if the registration process and ceremony was an experience to value. Martinez shared that he was excited to be sworn-in and registered in Nevada because he is new to the state. Tena said that she feels that it is special and there is great value to the ceremony because becoming licensed is a big achievement. Woogmaster stated that having this event humanizes the Board and blends well with personalizing their success.

AGENDA ITEM 4 **Review and Possible Approval of the Firm Woogmaster Studio**

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the firm name approval request for "Woogmaster Studio." Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2F-2 **Firm Registration Approval Request – GF55 ARCHITECTS, LLP**

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the firm registration approval request for "GF55 ARCHITECTS, LLP." Motion seconded by Snyder.

Garlock referred to page 123 of the board eBook to discuss the information that was on the application. He said that it was clear that percentages of ownership has met the requirements and totaled 100% with two owners holding 33.33% and one owner holding 33.34%. His concern is that the application also asked how the ownership is held and the applicant specified that the ownership is held equally between 3 partners but the percentages did not reflect that it is equal.

Bach stated that there has been confusion when firm applicants are completing that section of the form and that applicants misinterpret what is being asked. She said that some applicants answered the question of how the ownership is held by using the term "stock" or "shares." Garlock suggested that if this issue occurs again, staff should ask the applicants to change their response to something that's more proper. Hatfield recommended that the application be updated to include examples or options that they could use for their response, such as i.e. stock.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5A-1 **Case No. 19-035R In the Matter of James Veltman and JVA Designs**

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.270.1(d), NRS 623.270.1(e), NRS 623.270.1(f) and ROC 5.2 by allowing the use of his seal by an unlicensed individual and not being in responsible control.

Staff received a complaint from Byron Lee and Adriana Rodriguez regarding the Respondent, registrant James Veltman alleging that he had no involvement in the preparation or design of their plans for a single family home. The complainants hired an unlicensed individual to prepare plans for their residence. The individual prepared the plans and intended to have a registrant stamp the plans. The

Respondent had given an electronic copy of his stamp and signature to the unlicensed individual who then stamped the plans without the Respondent's involvement. The Respondent was unable to produce any evidence that he was in responsible control. He was not copied on any emails and had never met the complainants.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The Respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Harrison and the decision was made to offer the Respondent an opportunity to settle this matter informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$10,000 of which \$5,000 is ordered in restitution to the complainants and \$5,000 is stayed providing that the Respondent voluntarily surrender his certificate of registration, remains in compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement and pays Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,600.

Staff recommended the approval of the settlement agreement.

Bach announced that the settlement agreement and the administrative penalty provided in the Board's eBook is not the updated version. She said that the updated settlement agreement was just signed and dated by the respondent. She stated that the amended settlement agreement is as follows:

"The Board will stay \$10,000 of the Administrative Penalty provided that the Respondent voluntarily surrenders his certificate of registration to practice architecture in the State of Nevada and remains in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement."

Garlock asked Bach to confirm that the cost is being waived and that the responded will surrender his license and not pay any monetary amount to the board. Bach responded yes.

Mickey asked if the voluntary surrender of his license will be indefinite. Bach replied that the respondent will not be eligible to reapply and will no longer practice architecture due to medical reasons.

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the amended settlement agreement with the updated language. Motion seconded by Erny.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 5A-2 Case No. 19-048N In the Matter of Dylan Yorke and Streamline
Concept Drafting and Design, LLC**

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (c) by engaging in the practice of architecture without having a certificate of registration issued by this Board.

Staff received anonymous information that the Respondent had submitted drawings to the Clark County Planning Department for a project located in Las Vegas. A case file was opened and a notice of investigation was sent. The Respondent had email correspondence with a technician from Clark County stating that while the Board requires any submittal to a public authority to be stamped by a registrant they do not uphold that policy. Based on that email he submitted the plans.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The Respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Harrison and the decision was made to offer the Respondent an opportunity to settle this matter informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A

settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Non Admission of Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$5,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,500.

Staff recommended the approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Garlock said that severity of the Administrative Penalty was not adequate and the Non Admission Guilt Clause was difficult for him to accept. Bach stated the mitigating circumstances were that the building department allowed the Respondent to submit drawings without them being stamped. She said that she's had difficulties with the planning departments around this state and that they are not following the laws. Garlock stated that he understands the issue with the planning departments but the plans that were submitted were construction documents and not planning documents.

Erny said that the board needs to get the other agencies to follow the laws and asked if it's considered aiding and abetting. Ling responded that the planning departments are aware of our laws but there is not much that the board can do as the board does not have authority or jurisdiction over other state, city or county agencies.

Garlock asked how this investigation came about. Bach informed the board that the complaint was submitted by a registrant and did not come from the planning department. Morelli stated that the Respondent explained to the client that he could draw the plans but they couldn't be used for permits.

Ciesynski recommended that a letter be sent to the planning departments who are accepting draft plans without stamps to inform them of the law and that they are exposing themselves to a possible lawsuit. Garlock voiced that the planning department is not a factor because the individual exposed himself of practicing architecture without being licensed. Bach shared that the majority of the business that the respondent provides is drafting services for other registrants and that he also has intentions of becoming registered in this state.

Vote: Morelli abstained, Garlock and Erny opposed, and all others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5A-3 **Case No. 19-050R In the Matter of Richard Sambucetti and Borges Architectural Group**

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.185.3, NRS 623.270.1(f) and NAC 623.740 by completing architectural work and using an unapproved firm name while his certificate of registration had lapsed.

Staff received a complaint from registrant Wayne Ford that Borges Architectural Group had submitted drawings to the Washoe County Planning Department for a new cell tower and the firm had no Nevada registrants nor was the firm name approved. A case file was opened and a notice of investigation was sent. The Respondent replied that he had been registered in Nevada but had allowed his license to lapse at the end of 2016. Also he stated that the namesake for the firm name had retired in 2012 and had transferred ownership to three partners. He further stated that he was unaware that his individual registration had lapsed and that the firm ownership had not been updated.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The Respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Harrison and the decision was made to offer the Respondent an opportunity to settle this matter informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A

settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$10,000, of which \$5,000 is stayed as long as the Respondent remains in compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement, re-instates his registration and seeks firm name approval by the October Board meeting. There were also Investigative Costs in the amount of \$2,000.

Staff recommended the approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Erny.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5A-4

Case No. 19-051R In the Matter of Christopher Serrao and Forza Design Group

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.270.1 (f), NRS 623.350.1 and NAC 623.740.1 by completing architectural work in a Nevada office without having a resident registrant working at that location and by using an unapproved firm name.

Staff received information regarding the Respondent alleging that he was operating a Nevada office providing architectural services without having a resident registrant working there. A case file was opened and a notice of investigation was sent. The Respondent's attorney replied that going forward they would only provide construction administration services out of that office until they can hire a Nevada registrant that lived in Nevada. Further investigation revealed that two projects had been completed by Forza Design Group out of the Las Vegas office. One of the projects was completed before the firm name was approved for use and was written under CSA (the Respondent's initials) which is an unapproved name but similar to an approved name CSA Architect.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The Respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Harrison and the decision was made to offer the Respondent an opportunity to settle this matter informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$7,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$2,000.

Staff recommended the approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Mickey said that the evolution of the internet has made it easier to work remotely and to connect with clients or partners to possibly provide architectural services outside the state of Nevada. He requested that this matter be discussed as a future agenda item as it may cause conflicts with our laws pursuant to NRS 623.350.

AGENDA ITEM 5A-5

Case No. 19-052N In the Matter of Kyle Boothe and Bluestone Drafting and Design

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (c) by engaging in the practice of architecture without having a certificate of registration issued by this Board.

Staff received anonymous information that the Respondent had prepared drawings for a Nestle Toll House project located in Las Vegas. A case file was opened and a notice of investigation was sent. The Respondent stated that he received prototypical drawings from Nestle that he just resized them to fit on the intended site. Bach obtained a copy of both sets of plans and had an architect advisory member (AAM) compare them. The AAM stated that there was no new design works in the Respondent's drawings only FF&E.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The Respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Harrison and the decision was made to offer the Respondent an opportunity to settle this matter informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a No Contest Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$1,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,000.

Staff recommended the approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5A-6 Case No. 19-023N In the Matter of Dan Flannagan and DM Novo Consulting, LLC

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.035.1(d) NRS 623.360.1 (a) (b) and (c) by working outside the parameters of the contractor's exemption therefore holding himself out as an architect and engaging in the practice of architecture without having a certificate of registration with this Board.

Staff received a complaint forwarded from the contractor's board that the Respondent and DM Novo, LLC prepared architectural drawings for a medical marijuana facility in NV without the intention of building, and without having anyone registered in Nevada. Further investigation revealed that they had issued a proposal offering to prepare architectural drawings for permitting and prepared architectural drawings for a Medical Marijuana Facility located in northern Nevada.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this matter. The Respondent's case was discussed with Executive Director Harrison and the decision was made to offer the Respondent an opportunity to settle this matter informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the Board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause with an Administrative Penalty of \$5,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$4,070.

Bach announced that the settlement agreement that's provided in the eBook was amended to incorporate the "Non Admission of Guilt Clause."

Staff recommended the approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Bach provided printed copies to the Board of the amended settlement agreement that were signed and received the day before this board meeting. Ling praised Bach for dealing with the complex litigation issues and for negotiating an agreement for such a difficult case.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5B

Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Closure of Enforcement Cases

Bach recommended the following cases for closure without disciplinary action:

19-038R 19-041N 19-053N

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the closure of the above referenced cases without disciplinary action. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: Ciesynski recused herself and all others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5C

Enforcement Report

Bach requested the Board’s opinions in regards to design competitions held for architecture students or individuals of private businesses. She said that the designs from the competition would be assessed to determine who has the better architectural design and would not be built. She questioned whether or not a design competition would constitute the practice of architecture if it will not be built in Nevada. To eliminate the possibility of using the designs of the non-registrants in the competition, Bach suggested informing the organizers of the competition to include language in their competition application stating that their design is prohibited for construction use and strictly for the design competition. Bach requested that this matter be a future agenda item to discuss how the board would handle this instance should this matter arise.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Board Counsel Report

Ling reported that a panel has been assigned to the case against Dennis Rusk. He also said that he received an Order from the panel stating that they will rule on the petition for the Writ without an oral argument. Ling stated that he is unsure what course will take place but it will be less expensive for the board and is hoping to have a ruling soon.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Executive Director Report

Harrison reminded Board Members whose terms will end soon, that they must submit their application if they have interest in being reappointed.

Harrison shared that she is looking forward to serving on NCARB’s Experience Committee.

Harrison reported that the Board office has been experiencing plumbing issues. She said that due the location of the pipe lines for the plumbing, maintenance needed to cut through carpet and drill through the flooring in the Boardroom to access the issue in the pipes. She also said that they carpet must be replaced and that it would be difficult to match the existing carpet.

Harrison also reported that the office lease will be ending in 2021 and asked the Board if they would like to renew the lease, negotiate the leasing agreement or relocate the office. She stated that since staff has downsized, the office space seems too large. Erny suggested sub-leasing some of the space to alleviate some of the cost.

AGENDA ITEM 10A

Executive Director Report – Discussion about Potential Alteration of the Renewal/Registration Fee

Harrison reported that within the last three years, the Board has monitored the budget more efficiently and are more frugal on expenses. She said that one of the reasons why the expenses have increased is because of the cost of technology. As a state agency, she stated that the Board must offer online renewals and accept online payments to keep-up with new electronic advancements. Harrison said that new technology, databases, memberships, services and I.T. support can be costly and asked the Board to consider increasing registration renewal fees. Harrison recommended increasing the renewal fee by \$25 or \$30.

Mickey inquired about the recent bill that was introduced to the Legislature that allowed boards to charge merchant fees. Harrison said that the bill was passed but will not be effective until January 2020. She said that she spoke with the Board's accountant to discuss whether or not it would be good to implement a convenience fee or processing fee for online payments. Harrison stated that she considered and calculated the convenience fee and processing fee options with the accountant and he said that it's not necessary to implement a processing fee if the renewal was increased by \$25 or \$30.

Erny reminded that if the Board decides to increase fees, a public hearing and workshops must be scheduled because it would be a regulation change. Waugh said that if the Board decides to increase the renewal fee than they must ensure that it is more palatable and be able to offer the registrants a tangible service or change.

Harrison also reported that as of July 1, 2019, the Board will no longer be able to keep the fines. Erny said that not keeping fines could be considered a direct repercussion for the registrants. Ciesynski stated that the Board has not increased the renewal fee since 2003 and that this board has been reasonable compared to other jurisdictions.

Ling stated that if the board opts to increase the fee than it wouldn't be effective until the fiscal year of 2020 for the 2021 license renewals.

Motion: Erny moved to go forward with the process to increase the Registration Renewal Fee by \$30 for the 2021 license renewal. Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Public Information Report

Information regarding the Public Information Report was provided by Hatfield to the Board in an informational packet.

Hatfield reported that she plans to update the Board's publications and will start off by updating the Filing a Complaint Brochure. She also reported that the all the speakers for the upcoming CEU Seminar have been confirmed but the location has not been determined.

Hatfield shared her upcoming plans for community outreach. Since the academic school year has just begun, she said that she will start reaching out to schools again. Hatfield stated that she identified four career technical academies in Washoe County that have CADD programs and plans to reach out to those schools soon. Hatfield also reached out to ASID Nevada and the IIDA Southwest Chapter to speak with the Interior Designers and reached out to the ACE mentoring program that works with high school students who have interest in the architecture, construction or engineering industry.

Hatfield also mentioned that the Focus Newsletter and quarterly plan for social media were available in their packets.

AGENDA ITEM 13 **Items for Future Agenda**

- Language Clarification of NRS 623.350
- Design competitions amongst non-registrants and the possibilities of using their designs in Nevada
- Registration Renewal fee increase

AGENDA ITEM 14 **Public Comment**

There was no public present.

Chairman Ciesynski adjourned the meeting at 11:13 a.m.

Monica Harrison, Executive Director

James Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer