

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

June 10, 2020

Virtual Board Meeting -Video conference and audio offered via Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85068588429> or 1(253)215-8782; Meeting Code: 850 6858 8429

Wednesday, June 10, 2020

Chairman Kimberly Ciesynski called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Roll Call: Kimberly Ciesynski, Chairman; James Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer; Gregory Erny; Ann Fleming; George Garlock; John Morelli; William Snyder; Nathaniel Waugh and Tina Wichmann.

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

NSBAIDRD Mission Statement:

"The mission of the NSBAIDRD is to promote, preserve, and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public by regulating architects, registered interior designers, and residential designers to provide competent professional services in the built environment."

AGENDA ITEM 1 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

AGENDA ITEM 2 Approval of Consent Agenda

Consent agenda included the following:

- A. Approval of Agenda
- B. Approval of Minutes: March 4, 2020
- 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. March 2020 QR Statement
- D. Ratification of Reciprocal Licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm Name Approval Requests
 - 1. 3D Klein Design, LLC
 - 2. Carroll Design Collaborative
 - 3. FOUBISTER DESIGN
 - 4. Interior Collective LLC
 - 5. Jeffrey Parker Architect, Inc.
 - 6. JZMK PARTNERS
 - 7. Myers Anderson Architects, LLC
 - 8. Orcutt Winslow Architecture USA, LLC
 - 9. Studio MH
 - 10. Wilkus Architects, P.A.

- F. Firm Registration Approval Requests
 - 1. CTA Inc.
 - 2. HOK Architects, Inc.
 - 3. Kollin Architecture
 - 4. Randall-Paulson Architects, Incorporated
 - 5. Rosemann & Associates, P.C.

Architects: Registration by Reciprocity

8318	David Scott Roselius	8347	Morgan James Thompson
8319	Travis E Bailey	8348	Brian J Harris
8320	Boutros Bou-Nahra	8349	Lonnie J Laffen
8321	Geoff L Nielson	8350	Geoffrey Scott Ax
8322	Gary Lee Bosz	8351	Glenn Paul Hooper
8323	Peter Gale Anderson Jr.	8352	Alan D Dostert
8324	Brian Curtis Sudduth	8353	Joshua E Smith
8325	Neil A Feaser	8354	Jeffrey S Lewis
8326	Nathan Paul Rosemann	8355	William Ray Price III
8327	Leslie T Lippich	8356	Mark Scherrer
8328	Steven Michael LaBruna	8357	Jennifer Waller McDaniel
8329	Matteo Rapallini Hough	8358	Tina Hovsepian
8330	Thomas James Rule	8359	Christopher G Brandon
8331	Tony K Rule	8360	James D Boudreau
8332	Brian Wickersham	8361	Lori Danielle Arnold
8333	Hyung Rok Lee	8362	Jordan Todd Behar
8334	Herbert K Guenther	8363	Juan Carlos Velasquez
8335	Deric Von Schlieder	8354	Kenneth Robert Toblesky
8336	Jose L Ceja Jr.	8365	John Cobb Berry
8337	Blake C Carlson	8366	Jennifer Klund
8338	Ariel Madlambayan	8367	Andrew Akerhielm
8339	Matthew Herbert McChesney	8368	Tracy A Gordon
8340	John C Stantz	8369	Bradley K Nederhoff
8341	Jason Anthony Gamache	8370	Carol Ann Bartolo
8342	Jonathan Courtney Lamar	8371	Ryan Rosche
8343	Blake Sullivan	8372	Steven D Ehrlich
8344	Joel P Trexler	8373	Leap H Chear
8345	Adam M Harding	8374	Ronald Andrew Larkins
8346	John Mueller	8375	Michael O Sikes

Residential Designers: Registration by Reciprocity

388-RD	Anastacio Martinez
389-RD	Rory Foubister

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the consent agenda items 2A through 2E-7, 2E-10, 2F-1, and 2F-3 through 2F-5. Motion seconded by Fleming.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2E-8

Firm Name Approval Request – Orcutt Winslow Architecture USA, LLC

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the firm name approval request for “Orcutt Winslow Architecture USA, LLC.” Motion seconded by Erny.

Mickey said that he was concerned about the usage of “USA.” Ling stated that there are no restrictions on firm’s using “USA” in their firm name. Garlock said that the use of “USA” would be misleading to the public. Erny agreed with Garlock and said that there was a lack of national presence.

Board Members requested that this item be tabled pending additional information.

AGENDA ITEM 2E-9

Firm Name Approval Request – Studio MH

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the firm name approval request for “Studio MH.” Motion seconded by Snyder.

Mickey stated that the information provided in the firm application and supporting documents were inconsistent. Harrison clarified that the firm’s corporate name is “M.H. Architecture, Inc.” and the firm is proposing the DBA of “Studio MH.” She stated that her concern is that the DBA certificate was never updated. Garlock said that the website on their cover letter, www.mha.us.com, also displays an inconsistency.

Ling said that the firm has submitted all that is necessary to meet the Board’s requirements. He also stated that the firm’s website address is irrelevant to whether the firm is approvable by this Board. Harrison referred to page 90 of the board eBook and stated that the DBA was originally filed under the former principal and that the DBA must be updated. Ling stated that the Stock Sale Agreement, the DBA and supporting documents that were provided are in order and filed properly to satisfy the requirements.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2F-2

Firm Registration Request – HOK Architects, P.A.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the firm registration request for “HOK Architects, P.A.” Motion seconded by Fleming.

Mickey referred to page 172 of the board eBook which illustrate that “HOK, Inc.” holds part ownership of the firm. He asked if a list was provided to link the individuals that make up the 13.33% that “HOK, Inc.” holds. Aguada referred to page 180 of the board eBook and confirmed that a list of members who control “HOK, Inc.” was provided.

Mickey inquired if “HOK Nevada” had been reviewed and approved by the Board. Bach replied that the firm is refiling to propose a new firm name and provide a list of new ownership since one of the owners of “HOK Nevada” is no longer with the firm. Mickey asked if the registrants listed on the application have ownership in other firms in Nevada. Bach said that the registrants on the application are different individuals from “HOK Nevada” and that they do not have ownership in any other firms.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Review and possible decision regarding application for architect registration of Catherine Reyes pursuant to NRS 623.260 and NAC 623.280

The application and supporting documents of Reyes's request for restoration of registration as an architect was presented in the board eBook.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the application and request for restoration of registration for Catherine Reyes as an architect. Motion seconded by Garlock.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Review and potential approval of revisions to the Blue Book

The Blue Book and its revisions were presented in the board eBook.

Harrison informed the board that the NCIRC Committee finalized the Blue Book 2020 version. She said that all the changes and revisions made by the NCIRC Committee are included in the 2020 version, but not all proposed changes were incorporated. She also said that the NCIRC Committee, collectively, decided not to print the 2020 version of the Blue Book due to budget restrictions.

Garlock asked if the NSBAIDRD Representatives on the committee were in agreement to the changes presented. Harrison confirmed that our representatives were in agreement.

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the revisions for the Blue Book 2020 version as presented in the board eBook. Motion seconded by Waugh.

Bach shared that the items removed from the new version of the Blue Book were questions regarding architects and residential designers providing engineering services. She said that the NCIRC Committee was not able to come to agreement regarding residential designers providing engineering services, however there is a section that allows architects to provide engineering services. Bach said that any engineering plans submitted by architects must meet the minimum industry standards to be accepted by the building officials. She also said that if the plans do not meet the minimum standards, then the building official can require an engineer to provide the service. Erny said that if individuals cross into areas of other professions that are not their own design profession and main scope of work, the building officials ultimately have the authority to determine if the plans are acceptable.

Bach said that there are some sections that were added to the Blue Book. The first section that was added is under the interior design profession that specifies what individuals can and cannot do to practice interior design with a Nevada Fire Marshal's certificate. Also, sections were added to architecture, interior design, and residential design to clarify whether an individual can call themselves an architect, registered interior designer or residential designer, as those terms are protected by this board. Bach said that language was also added to the contractor's section to state that contractors cannot have a design contract by themselves.

Erny referred to page 13 of the 2020 Blue Book and stated that professional engineers can provide construction management, including materials testing and construction observations. He said that there are no limitations of those services performed by the engineer for their own projects, whether they are qualified or not. Erny stated that this matter should be expanded upon and clarified when the Blue Book is to be updated in the future. Bach said that there is language added to the architect

section that allows architects to provide construction management services on any project and not just their own.

Ciesynski stated that she hopes that the NSBAIDRD representatives of the next NCIRC Committee meeting will take the lead to revise and update the Blue Book in the future since creating the Blue Book was originally the idea of this board. Erny said that despite the challenges of updating the Blue Book, the committee produced good results. He also gave praise to Bach for her efforts to represent NSBAIDRD on the NCIRC Committee.

Ciesynski said that she was concerned as to why the Blue Book will not be printed and is worried that the Blue Book might not be used as much since it will be an electronic version. She said that its more accessible to have a physical book to flip through and read. Bach stated that individuals will have the option to print out their own paper copy generated from the electronic version. Erny asked what quantity of books were printed when the Blue Book was revised last and if all copies were used and/or distributed. He agreed that it is more valuable to have a printed Blue Book.

Garlock asked it is possible to include the printing of the Blue Book as a line item on the Board's budget. Harrison said that when the Blue Book was last updated, about 3,000 copies of the Blue Book were ordered. She stated that the NSBAIDRD paid for the printing of all books upfront and only received about 50% of the cost back from the other boards. She also said that there are about 500 to 1,000 books that are still undistributed and unused. Harrison asked the Board, how many copies of the new Blue Book do they hope to print and who specifically will the books be distributed to as it will be costly. Board members agreed that distributing Blue Books to the building departments, handing them out at various meetings or events and having them available for the general public, is valuable to the design profession and the information is very well received. Erny said that by this board taking lead in printing the Blue Book promotes ownership.

Board members directed staff to obtain quotes of how much it would cost to print the 2020 Blue Book and present the quotes at the next board meeting.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 7A-1 Case No. 20-057N in the matter of Timothy S. Adams and TS Adams Studio Architects Inc.

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a) (b) and (c) by holding himself out and engaging in the practice of architecture prior to having a certificate of registration issued by this Board.

Staff received a reciprocity application from the Respondent on March 26, 2020. When staff called the Respondent for the phone interview on March 30, it was discovered that he had issued a proposal and prepared conceptual drawings despite having answered no to the question that asks "*Have you or any firm or business at which you practice architecture provided a proposal to a client, entered into a contract or agreement with a client, prepared drawings for a client or otherwise performed architectural work for a project located or contemplated in Nevada?*"

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Investigation/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, an Effect on

Licensure clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$7,500 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of 1,500.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 7A-2 Case No. 20-059N in the matter of Aleksandr Sheykhnet and Obermeier Sheykhnet Architecture

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a) (b) and (c) by holding himself out and engaging in the practice of architecture prior to having a certificate of registration issued by this Board.

Staff received a reciprocity application from the Respondent on April 14, 2020. The Respondent had started his reciprocity application in July 2019. The Respondent had answered yes to the question that asks *“Have you or any firm or business at which you practice architecture provided a proposal to a client, entered into a contract or agreement with a client, prepared drawings for a client or otherwise performed architectural work for a project located or contemplated in Nevada?”* During the phone interview on April 17, he stated that he had issued a proposal and prepared conceptual drawings.

The Respondent was sent a Notice of Investigation/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, an Effect on Licensure clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$5,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,500.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 7B Discussion and possible decision regarding closure of enforcement cases

Bach recommended the following cases for closure without disciplinary action:

- | | | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 20-021R | 20-022N | 20-023N | 20-039R | 20-041N |
| 20-042N | 20-046N | 20-047R | 20-049R | 20-051N |
| 20-054N | 20-055N | 20-058N | | |

Motion: Waugh moved to close the above referenced cases. Motion seconded by Snyder.

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

AGENDA ITEM 7C-1

Review and update of the Board’s interpretation of NRS 623.035.1(d) commonly known as the “contractor’s exemption”

An article published in a 2008 NSBAIDRD Focus Newsletter titled “Contractor’s Exemption in NRS 623 Strictly Interpreted” and the statute of NRS 623.035.1(d) was presented in the board eBook.

Bach asked for the Board’s position regarding the exemption for contractors. She said that the article is unclear and needs to be refreshed. She stated that the article currently states that “a contractor cannot redesign only the portion that they are building, but must redesign the entire project.” Bach said that it would be impossible for a contractor to redesign the entire project if construction has already started. She inquired what would happen to the drawings and how should clients proceed if the contractor is terminated or the company has closed.

Erny asked why this topic is being reevaluated and requested more context. He said that this type of situation seems like a rare occurrence. Bach said that recently, she received an uptick of inquiries regarding contractors leaving projects due to differences with the clients and how clients should proceed. She said that the contractors are not able to provide the drawings to anyone since they must also build the project, which prohibits clients from moving forward.

Morelli shared that he’s experienced this type of situation in residential projects. He said that he informs clients that the drawings and permits are owned by the contractor if the contractor has done the drawings and must also build the project. He stated that if the contractor is to part ways with the client, the drawings are not transferrable and that the client would have to start over with a new set of plans. Morelli also stated that if the drawings were to be transferred, the design service provided by the contractor would be prohibited as it is considered to be the practice of a residential designer or an architect.

Ciesynski directed staff to update the interpretation of the Contractor’s Exemption and formulate a new article to be discussed at the next board meeting. Morelli and Wichmann volunteered to assist Bach and provide guidance regarding the interpretation of the Contractor’s Exemption in NRS 623.035.1(d).

AGENDA ITEM 3A

Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration: Architects

Ciesynski welcomed all attendees to the Board’s first virtual swearing-in ceremony. She informed the applicants who will be sworn-in that the oath will be read by Mickey, followed by a presentation from AIA.

Mickey swore in the following individual as an architect:

- 1. Santiago M Gesell 8376

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individual as an architect. Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 3B

Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration: Registered Interior Designers

Mickey swore in the following individuals as registered interior designers:

- 1. Breanne Antos 258-ID

2. Julie Anne Brezina 259-ID
3. Ajla Kopicic 260-ID
4. Dana B Merck 261-ID
5. Stephenie Nash 262-ID
6. Cinthy M Stauss 263-ID

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

Randy Lavigne, AIA Las Vegas Executive Director, thanked the Board for inviting AIA to take part in the celebration and to congratulate the new registrants. Lavigne encouraged the new registrants to join AIA and to use the organization to advocate and promote the design profession. She informed them that she has sent a certificate of recognition and an AIA welcome packet to each new registrant. Lavigne welcomed and congratulated the new registrants on behalf of AIA Las Vegas.

Ciesynski encouraged the new registrants to get to know the Board and to reach out to staff if they have any questions or need guidance. She also informed the new registrants that each jurisdiction is different and that it is important to contact the boards of the states that they may have potential projects in before providing design services.

Harrison congratulated the new registrants and said that she is excited to see the creative designs that they will produce in their future. She encouraged the new registrants to use the Board as a resource and that staff is available to answer any questions that they might have regarding firm approvals, registration and reciprocity processes or any other inquiries. Harrison informed them that they are exempt from obtaining continuing education units for the first two years of their registration. She also stated that new registrants should expect to receive their wall certificate and stamp in the mail.

Erny extended the congratulations to the new registrants for their monumental efforts in achieving licensure. He said that they are now embarking on a new facet in life and beginning their professional level of their careers. He said that the registrants should maintain their certifications and credentials to utilize them as a passport to allow them to take on professional design opportunities in different jurisdictions.

Ciesynski expressed how proud of the six registered interior designers that have challenged themselves to complete registration and achieve licensure in Nevada. She mentioned that the CIDQ organization is not as large as NCARB since interior design is not regulated in every state. She also said that the interior design profession has been regulated in Nevada for the past 25 years. Ciesynski encouraged the registered interior designers to become part of the CIDQ Ambassador Program to have access to various materials and to help future candidates who are pursuing licensure.

Fleming said that she was excited to see such a large group of interior designers being completing registration today. She asked for feedback from the new registered interior designers and inquired of their path to licensure and if their firms and/or peers were supportive.

Kopicic shared that she is really fortunate to work for a firm that highly encourages certification and licensure. She said that she spent numerous hours devoted to studying and having a supportive team had a good impact. Ciesynski asked if there were any issues at the testing centers. Kopicic said that she did not experience any issues and was able to manage her time well.

Fleming asked the registered interior designers if they have any peers or close friends in the industry that are contemplating licensing. Antos responded that she has been working for a licensed firm in

Reno for many years while trying to complete her studies and juggle life. She stated that she was able to learn a lot from her mentor and see how she developed. Antos said that her overall training and preparation was a great experience.

Ciesynski asked Gesell for his feedback regarding this experience with NCARB and the registration process. Gesell shared that he began his career as an architect in Argentina then moved to the United States 2006. He expressed his passion for architecture and said that he was determined to become an architect in the United States. He stated that his journey to achieve licensure was different and longer than most. Gesell said that he started out as a general contractor shortly after moving to Las Vegas then gained hours of architectural experience to be able to sit for the NCARB exams. He said that the registration process with the Board staff has been wonderful and also gave thanks to Lavigne of AIA for being very helpful and a great resource.

Erny asked Gesell to elaborate more on his education and experiences to achieve Nevada licensure, since he has taken a non-traditional path. Gesell stated that Argentina's process is different and that there was only one architectural program offered in Argentina. He said that he completed the 6-year program and received his architectural degree at the University of Buenos Aires. He also said that upon completing the 6-year program, candidates are able to get licensed in any province in Argentina. Gesell chose Buenos Aires to receive his first architectural license and decided to move to Las Vegas shortly after. Gesell stated that he did not obtain enough experience in Buenos Aires to establish a record with NCARB, so he submitted his academic transcripts to NAAB to be evaluated and approved to allow him to open an NCARB record. He expressed that he found the process easier and more encouraging because NCARB allowed candidates to start testing while obtaining Intern Development Program (IDP) hours. Gesell stated that NCARB is a great resource and that he plans to obtain his NCARB Certificate to pursue licensure in other states.

Erny stated that NCARB made the change to allow candidates to start testing while obtaining IDP hours to help facilitate the path to licensure and to encourage foreign candidates. Erny was moved by his journey to success and asked that Hatfield reach out to Gesell to capture his story to share with a broader audience. Gesell said that he would love to share his story to provide inspiration for others.

Garlock congratulated all the new registrants and said the he hopes the Board will be able to invite them back to a future board meeting to have the opportunity to meet them in person.

AGENDA ITEM 2E-8 Firm Name Approval Request – Orcutt Winslow Architecture USA, LLC (continued)

Harrison recalled this item and informed the Board that Erik Clinite, Business Leader of Orcutt Winslow Architecture USA, LLC, was in attendance.

Mickey said that there were concerns regarding the use of "USA" in the proposed firm name. Clinite said that the firm was previously formed as a partnership and caused difficulties when trying to registered in other states. He said that the new entity was created to distinguish from the former entity and added "USA." He stated that the intent of this new entity is to use "Orcutt Winslow Architecture USA, LLC" in other states and obtain registration under one name instead of have different partnerships in various states.

Harrison informed that in the past, the Board approved a firm that utilized "USA" in their firm name, "FW USA" in 2015. Garlock stated that he is still not completely satisfied by the firm name not to be misleading to the public.

Vote: Garlock and Erny opposed. All others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 4 **Review and possible approval of the firm name “Cachet Studios, LLC”**

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the firm name approval request for “Cachet Studios, LLC.” Motion seconded by Snyder.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 8A **Architect Report - Appointment of Voting Delegate for the 2020 Annual Virtual Business Meeting and Pre-Meeting Briefing**

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

Harrison informed the Board that today is the last day to register for the 2020 NCARB Annual Virtual Business Meeting. Erny and Mickey stated that they plan attend and Ciesynski will be the voting delegate.

Motion: Waugh moved to approve the appointment of Ciesynski as voting delegate for the 2020 Annual Virtual Business Meeting and Pre-Meeting Briefing. Motion seconded by Erny.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Board Members reviewed and discussed information provided in the board eBook regarding the qualifications of candidates who are running for office and shared their views on who to consider for the elections. Ling stated that since Ciesynski is the voting delegate, she will ultimately make the final decision based on the opinion of the Board and any additional information she may receive from now until voting takes place.

AGENDA ITEM 8B **Architect Report - FYI: FY21 Candidates for National and Regional Office**

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

AGENDA ITEM 8C **Architect Report - FYI: NCARB Fast Fact – April & May 2020**

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

AGENDA ITEM 8D **Architect Report - FYI: NCARB Update – April 2020**

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

AGENDA ITEM 8E **Architect Report - FYI: NCARB BOD Brief April 2020**

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

AGENDA ITEM 8F

**Architect Report - FYI: Open Meetings Act Research Summary
April 2020**

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

AGENDA ITEM 9A

**Residential Design Report – Update regarding the residential
design exam practice analysis**

Morelli reported that the Residential Design (RD) Exam Practice Analysis Committee met last Thursday. He said that there were nine meeting participants, including committee members, NCARB staff and board staff. Harrison stated that the contract consists of four phases and that the committee is currently in phase 1. She said that phase 1 is expected to be completed by mid-July, phase 2 by mid-September, phase 3 by early-December and phase 4 completed by mid-January of 2021.

Ciesynski asked when will the updated RD Exam be ready. Morelli stated that the 4 phases does not include writing a new RD Exam. Harrison said that phase 5 is the test specification development phase, which will take about 10-12 weeks, and is expected to be completed by April 2021. Ciesynski asked if there is a committee for test writing upon completion of the practice analysis. Erny stated that the RD Exam Practice Analysis Committee will decide how to proceed in test writing after the analysis is done.

Morelli stated that one of the residential designers had concerns regarding NCARB and how they might not really understand what residential designers do and how they operate. He said that they must focus on the residential design profession and veer away from associating the practice of residential design to architecture. Erny said that the profession serves the whole state of Nevada and the committee must study how the profession practices everywhere.

AGENDA ITEM 10A

**Registered Interior Design Report - FYI: CIDQ Video #1:
Experience the value of NCIDQ Certification**

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

Fleming reported that NCDIQ's April testing session was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. She also reported that the nominations for CIDQ are open and the due date for applications is June 12, 2020.

Fleming informed that Board that several CIDQ video links were shared in the board meeting eBook. She said that the videos were intended to help candidates refresh and reflect on the interior design profession.

Mickey asked if there are more videos and resources available that he can share with NCARB Committees. Fleming said that she will share more materials with Mickey. Ciesynski said that the CIDQ has been working on the videos for years and these were the first videos released. She also said that she plans to upload her presentation regarding Nevada registration and have it available online. Harrison said that NCARB Region 6 hopes to upload Ciesynski's presentation on their website.

AGENDA ITEM 10B

**Registered Interior Design Report - FYI: CIDQ Video #2:
Experience the value of NCIDQ Certification**

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

AGENDA ITEM 10C

Registered Interior Design Report - FYI: CIDQ Video #3: What Does an Interior Designer Do?

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

AGENDA ITEM 10D

**Registered Interior Design Report - FYI: CIDQ Video #4:
Interior Designers – Educated Professionals**

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

AGENDA ITEM 10E

**Registered Interior Design Report - FYI: CIDQ Video in
collaboration with ASID and IIDA: The Case of Reasonable
Regulation**

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

AGENDA ITEM 11

Public Member Report

Waugh reported that NCARB committee members will be changing and that he has been appointed to the Credentials Committee. He said that he has never participated in the Credentials Committee before and is excited to learn more.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Executive Director Report

Harrison informed the Board that the board office is still not open to the public due to the COVID-19 pandemic and that staff is working remotely from home. She said that staff is practicing social distancing and are still able to come to the office for a couple days a week to complete tasks that they are not able to complete from home. Harrison thanked staff for adjusting and transitioning to a remote work setting.

Harrison reported that on June 5, the Legislative Commission approved Regulation R092-19 regarding the increase of the renewal registration fee. She said that registrants will be notified of the increase as soon as the regulation is filed with the Nevada Secretary of State.

Harrison also reported that on June 9, the Board of Examiners approved the renewal of the board office lease agreement. She said that new lease will expire in the year 2028 and that the lease has decreased by \$247 for the first three years.

Harrison stated that the Sunset Subcommittee plans to meet on June 23 to follow-up on some of the recommendations that were made at the Sunset Review. She said that she provided a full report to

the Sunset Subcommittee and is confident that this Board is in compliance to the committee's recommendations. She also said that she and Ciesynski will attend the meeting virtually.

Harrison said that was reappointed to serve on NCARBs Experience Committee for a second year. She is also a member of the Digital Stamp Task Force which is comprised of the Board of Engineers, City of Reno, City of Henderson and Clark County. Harrison stated that some state agencies already require digital stamping. She also stated that the NSBAIDRD currently does not require digital stamping but may want to consider implementing digital stamping in the future.

Harrison said that Erny, Garlock and Wichmann are next for reappointment and that they must notify her if they wish to be reappointed.

Harrison reported that since April, staff has licensed 31 architects by reciprocity and has 21 pending applications. Staff has also received seven architect applications for first-time licenses, 15 firms, seven enforcement cases and 13 closed cases without disciplinary action. She stated that staff has continued to stay very busy even though they are working from home.

Harrison informed the Board that the next board meeting will be held on August 19th and will most likely be held via Zoom again.

Waugh thanked board staff and praised them for their phenomenal efforts.

AGENDA ITEM 13 Board Counsel Report

Ling had nothing to report.

AGENDA ITEM 14 Public Information Report

Hatfield reported that there was outreach planned in March and April to high schools in Las Vegas, but those events were cancelled. She said that she is a part of AIAs Education Outreach Committee and that the chair has asked her to become the Secretary. She stated that she is very involved with the committee and has great opportunity to increase the Board's outreach. Hatfield said that the committee will wait to see how schools will operate in the fall and whether they will be allowed to give presentations remotely or at the schools.

Hatfield reported that the Continuing Education Seminar was originally scheduled in Reno for May then rescheduled for July, but later decided jointly with AIA that all in-person seminars will be cancelled for this year. She said that the Continuing Education Seminar will be held virtually on November 19 and that the agenda for the seminar is available in the board eBook.

Hatfield stated that she has been very active on social media and updating the website during this quarantine to have updated information available for the registrants and the public. She referred to blog in the eBook and said that the firm, Knit, celebrated their newest registered architect and how they attended the registration ceremony to show support.

Hatfield reported that she published two issues of Focus since the last board meeting. She said that the last Focus was a special issue to inform the registrants of the office closure and updates on CIDQ and NCARB. She also said that the next issue of Focus will be published in early-July and plans to interview Santiago Gesell to share his story in the next issue.

Mickey suggested for Hatfield to reach out to NCARB regarding their testing centers. He said that Prometric is in the process of classifying NCARB tests as non-essential and that they are only allowing 50 percent capacity in testing centers. He asked Hatfield to include information regarding testing centers in the Focus Newsletter. Harrison asked if there is virtual testing. Mickey said that NCARB is trying to figure out how to proctor a virtual test and hope to offer it soon.

Ciesynski praised Hatfield for her hard work and providing various communications to the registrants and the public.

AGENDA ITEM 15 **Items for Future Agenda**

- Cost comparison of printing new 2020 version of the Blue Book
- Updated Contractor's Exemption in NRS 623.035.1(d)
- Task Committee for Digital Stamping

AGENDA ITEM 16 **Public Comment**

There was no public present.

Chairman Ciesynski adjourned the meeting at 1:00p.m.

Monica Harrison, Executive Director

James Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer