

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

January 15, 2015

Board Conference Room, 2080 East Flamingo Road, Suite 120, Las Vegas, NV 89119

Thursday, January 15, 2015

Chairman George Garlock called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

Roll Call: George Garlock, Chairman; Jim Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer; Kimberly Ciesynski; Greg Erny; John Klai; William Snyder; Sean Tanner; Larry Tindall; Nathaniel Waugh

Also in attendance: Gina Spaulding, Executive Director; Louis Ling, Legal Counsel; Monica Harrison, Laura Bach, and Ginger Hahn, staff.

AGENDA ITEM 1 Public Comment

James Wadhams, lobbyist for NSBAIDRD, gave a brief summary of the upcoming State of Nevada 2015 Legislative Session.

AGENDA ITEM 2 Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. Approval of Agenda
- B. Approval of Minutes: October 22, 2014
- C. Secretary/Treasurer Report
 - 1. Nevada Architect, Registered Interior Designer and Residential Designer Licensing Statistics
 - 2. Wells Fargo Bank Statements
 - 3. December 2014 QR Statement
- D. Ratification of Reciprocal Licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm Name Approval Requests
 - 1. The Chait Company
 - 2. Board and Vellum, LLC
 - 3. JCJ Architecture, PC
 - 4. Design Sequence
 - 5. Caron Architecture, LLC
 - 6. Design Republic Partners Architects, LLP
 - 7. Lasky Architect
 - 8. VOI
 - 9. Dalton, Steelman, Arias and Anderson, LLC
- F. Firm Registration Approval Requests
 - 1. WPA Architecture, PC
 - 2. Winslow and Partners, LLC
 - 3. FXFOWLE ARCHITECTS LLP

Architects: Registration by Reciprocity

7160 Radim Blazej	7168 Darwin Lindahl	7176 James L. McClaren
7161 Aric Braselton	7169 Robert Norvell	7177 Philip Thorne
7162 Michael D. Jones	7170 Jeanette Ryman	7178 Lawrence E. Wood
7163 Richard Korchien	7171 Kevin TenBrook	7179 William Brunner
7164 Barry M. Ludlow	7172 Chad Billings	7180 Albert D. Gibson
7165 Ernest E. Staley	7173 Robert Boyle	7181 Russel Strobel
7166 Neil J. Tucker	7174 Moshe Cosicher	7182 Charles Ward, III
7167 Kristen Voros	7175 Anton Germishuizen	7183 Vasilis Papadatos

Board members requested agenda items 2C-2, 2F-2, 2E-6, and 2E-8 be pulled from the consent agenda.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve the consent agenda, items 1 through 2C-1, 2C-3 through 2E-5, 2E-7, 2E-9 through 2F-1, and 2F-3. Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2C-2 Secretary/Treasurer Report: Wells Fargo Bank Statements

Garlock suggested that NSBAIDRD bank account numbers, for security reasons, be whited out in future presentations of statements.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve agenda item 2C-2, and the whiting out of bank account numbers in future presentations of statements. Motion seconded by Tanner.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 2E-6 Firm Name Approval Request: Design Republic Partners Architects, LLP

Mickey stated that "Design Republic Partners Architects, LLP" is the exact same name that the firm is registered under in the state of New York. Spaulding said that the firm is a foreign business and therefore must register with the same name.

Motion: Erny moved to approve the firm name request for "Design Republic Partners Architect, LLP." Motion seconded by Tanner.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 2E-8 Firm Name Approval Request: VOI

Board members expressed concern that the Nevada State Business License of the applicant expired in 2014. Staff was able to verify that the applicant does have a current Nevada State Business License.

Motion: Erny moved to approve the firm name request for "VOI." Motion seconded by Tindall.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 2F-2 Firm Registration Approval Request: Winslow and Partners, LLC

Garlock inquired as to if the word "Partners" is acceptable as part of the firm name being that there is only one additional partner in the firm. The board agreed that it wants to be consistent with firm registrations.

Spaulding said firm registrations with the same circumstance have been approved in the past.

Motion: Tindall moved to approve the firm registration of "Winslow and Partners, LLC."

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 4 Review and Possible Decision Regarding Continuing Education Hardship Request

Spaulding gave background information in regard to Matteo Nardini's, registrant #3058, request for exemption from the continuing education requirements for 2014 to renew his architect registration for 2015. Mr. Nardini has an illness that would not allow him to travel. He was under the impression that he must attend the continuing education seminar hosted by NSBAIDRD and the AIA in order to receive the credits.

Motion: Erny moved to approve Mr. Nardini's request for exemption from the 2014 continuing education requirements for 2015 registration renewal. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 7 Discussion and Possible Decision of the Proposed Language for Policy Regarding Continuing Education Audits

Spaulding reminded the board of what was discussed during the October 22, 2014 board meeting in regard to what the consequences will be for registrants that are not in compliance with continuing education requirements upon audit.

Ling presented proposed language for policy regarding continuing education audits as follows:

NSBAIDRD POLICY REGARDING CONTINUING EDUCATION AUDITS

Every renewal cycle, the Board's staff shall randomly audit a percentage of the registrants for compliance with NAC 623.630 – NAC 623.646. For those registrants randomly selected for an audit, the Board's staff shall notify each by mail addressed to the registrants' last known address. The letter shall explain the audit process and require the submittal of all evidence of continuing education for the prescribed period by a certain date. Upon receipt of the evidence, the Board's staff shall review it to determine whether it complies with NAC 623.630 – NAC 623.646. If the Board's staff determines that the evidence demonstrates compliance with NAC 623.630 – NAC 623.646, it shall notify the registrant, either by mail or email that the audit demonstrated that the registrant had passed the audit.

If the Board's staff determines that a registrant has violated any of the provisions of NAC 623.630 – NAC 623.646, the Board's staff may, in lieu of filing a Notice of Charges, offer a summary resolution of the matter to the registrant. The offer of summary resolution shall:

- (a) Inform the registrant of the facts upon which the Board's staff relies;
- (b) Identify the statute or regulation that the Board's staff believes was violated;
- (c) Inform the registrant that the matter may be summarily resolved by the payment of a fine in the amount determined below;
- (d) Inform the registrant that if the matter is summarily resolved, it will not be treated by the Board as discipline; and
- (e) Explain to the registrant that he or she is not required to summarily resolve the matter and that if he or she desired, he or she could require the Board's staff to prepare a formal Complaint and to pursue the matter through the Board's usual disciplinary process.

In every case involving a violation of NAC 623.630 – NAC 623.646, the registrant shall be required to provide evidence of completion of the number of continuing education hours that he or she was found deficient within 30 days of the determination.

In addition to completing the requisite continuing education hours, the registrant who have been found in violation for the first time will be audited in the next registration renewal period and shall be assessed a fine (whether through an offer for a summary resolution or at a hearing) which shall be \$250. Registrants who have found in violation for a second time will be audited for the next three registration renewal periods, will have to personally appear before the board and will be assessed a fine of \$500.

For any registrant who has committed a third violation, no summary resolution shall be offered and, instead, the registrant shall be subject to a disciplinary proceeding in which the Board shall consider, among other things, whether the registration should not be renewed pursuant to NAC 623.646.

The board discussed the language, and directed staff to write a concise newsletter article concerning NSBAIDRD's continuing education audit process.

Motion: Erny moved to amend the policy so that upon the second violation of NSBAIDRD's continuing education requirements, the offending registrant must appear before the board and will be automatically audited the following three years. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 3 Deliberations/Action on Applications for Registration: Registered Interior Design

Mickey swore in the following individuals as registered interior designers:

- 1. Diane Cabral.....214-ID
- 2. Meredith Fuhrer.....215-RD
- 3. Vincenzo Iacobellis.....216-RD

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

After the board conducted the swearing-in and registration ceremony, Garlock introduced Randy Lavigne, Honorary AIA, Executive Director of AIA Nevada and AIA Las Vegas. The three new registrants were recognized for their milestone accomplishments of becoming registered in the state of Nevada and Lavigne presented each of them with a Certificate of Recognition on behalf of the AIA. She wished them continued success and best wishes in their future endeavors.

Spaulding congratulated the new registrants. She told them the registration ceremony is an opportunity for new registrants to meet their board and the board's staff. She urged the new registrants to call the board office with any questions they may have.

Agenda Item 8 Review and Discussion Regarding Applicable Statutes of Limitation or Repose Regarding Design Professionals

Ling explained his memorandum, presented in the board meeting eBook, concerning applicable statutes of limitation or repose regarding design professionals.

The memorandum read as follows:

A question has arisen regarding what statutes of limitation or repose may apply to design professionals. As it turns out, there are quite a few statutes at issue. My discussion of those statutes follows.

Discussion and Analysis

Statutes that limit when a civil suit can be brought come in two varieties: (1) Statutes of limitation, and (2) Statutes of repose. The difference between the two is largely based upon the event that triggers the alleged liability. In a statute of limitation, the time within which suit must be brought hinges from the happening of a triggering event (e.g. the date an accident occurs or the date a contract is breached). Statutes of limitation, therefore, are comparatively short (two to six years) and are often subjected to considerable legal analysis regarding the timing of the triggering event and when the triggering event became known to the plaintiff or otherwise became actionable.

Statutes of repose, on the other hand, apply to building construction issues and differ from statutes of limitation because the triggering event is always known, i.e. the "date of substantial completion." In fact, a whole statute (NRS 11.2055) is set aside just to define the "date of substantial completion." Once a project is deemed substantially complete, the statute of repose begins. After the passage of a period of time (the period of repose), no action can be brought regarding a construction or design defect. When a defect is discovered does not matter, and generally speaking, no event can extend a statute of repose. Therefore, statutes of repose are considerably longer than statutes of limitation (six to ten years) in order for the property owner to discover the potential problem, but because they end when the period of repose ends, they create certainty for contractors and design professionals.

Most notably for the present discussion, Nevada's statutes of repose do apply to the work performed by design professionals. With that explanation made, following are Nevada's statutes of repose that apply to design professionals:

NRS 11.202 Actions for damages for injury or wrongful death caused by deficiency in construction of improvements to real property: Deficiencies resulting from willful misconduct; fraudulently concealed deficiencies.

1. An action may be commenced against the owner, occupier or any person performing or furnishing the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction, or the construction of an improvement to real property at any time after the substantial completion of such an improvement, for the recovery of damages for:

- (a) Any deficiency in the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction or the construction of such an improvement which is the result of his or her willful misconduct or which he or she fraudulently concealed;
- (b) Injury to real or personal property caused by any such deficiency; or
- (c) Injury to or the wrongful death of a person caused by any such deficiency.

2. The provisions of this section do not apply in an action brought against:

- (a) The owner or keeper of any hotel, inn, motel, motor court, boardinghouse or lodging house in this State on account of his or her liability as an innkeeper.
- (b) Any person on account of a defect in a product.

(Added to NRS by 1983, 1238)

NRS 11.203 Actions for damages for injury or wrongful death caused by deficiency in construction of improvements to real property: Known deficiencies.

1. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 11.202 and 11.206, no action may be commenced against the owner, occupier or any person performing or furnishing the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction, or the construction of an improvement to real property more than 10 years after the substantial completion of such an improvement, for the recovery of damages for:

- (a) Any deficiency in the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction or the construction of such an improvement which is known or through the use of reasonable diligence should have been known to him or her;
- (b) Injury to real or personal property caused by any such deficiency; or
- (c) Injury to or the wrongful death of a person caused by any such deficiency.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of NRS 11.190 and subsection 1 of this section, if an injury occurs in the 10th year after the substantial completion of such an improvement, an action for damages for injury to property or person, damages for wrongful death resulting from such injury or damages for breach of contract may be commenced within 2 years after the date of such injury, irrespective of the date of death, but in no event may an action be commenced more than 12 years after the substantial completion of the improvement.

3. The provisions of this section do not apply to a claim for indemnity or contribution.

(Added to NRS by 1983, 1238; A 1999, 1444)

NRS 11.204 Actions for damages for injury or wrongful death caused by deficiency in construction of improvements to real property: Latent deficiencies.

1. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 11.202, 11.203 and 11.206, no action may be commenced against the owner, occupier or any person performing or furnishing the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction, or the construction of an improvement to real property more than 8 years after the substantial completion of such an improvement, for the recovery of damages for:

- (a) Any latent deficiency in the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction or the construction of such an improvement;
- (b) Injury to real or personal property caused by any such deficiency; or
- (c) Injury to or the wrongful death of a person caused by any such deficiency.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of NRS 11.190 and subsection 1 of this section, if an injury occurs in the eighth year after the substantial completion of such an improvement, an action for damages for injury to property or person, damages for wrongful death resulting from such injury or damages for breach of

contract may be commenced within 2 years after the date of such injury, irrespective of the date of death, but in no event may an action be commenced more than 10 years after the substantial completion of the improvement.

3. The provisions of this section do not apply to a claim for indemnity or contribution.

4. For the purposes of this section, “latent deficiency” means a deficiency which is not apparent by reasonable inspection.

(Added to NRS by 1983, 1237; A 1999, 1445)

NRS 11.205 Actions for damages for injury or wrongful death caused by deficiency in construction of improvements to real property: Patent deficiencies.

1. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 11.202, 11.203 and 11.206, no action may be commenced against the owner, occupier or any person performing or furnishing the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction, or the construction of an improvement to real property more than 6 years after the substantial completion of such an improvement, for the recovery of damages for:

(a) Any patent deficiency in the design, planning, supervision or observation of construction or the construction of such an improvement;

(b) Injury to real or personal property caused by any such deficiency; or

(c) Injury to or the wrongful death of a person caused by any such deficiency.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of NRS 11.190 and subsection 1 of this section, if an injury occurs in the sixth year after the substantial completion of such an improvement, an action for damages for injury to property or person, damages for wrongful death resulting from such injury or damages for breach of contract may be commenced within 2 years after the date of such injury, irrespective of the date of death, but in no event may an action be commenced more than 8 years after the substantial completion of the improvement.

3. The provisions of this section do not apply to a claim for indemnity or contribution.

4. For the purposes of this section, “patent deficiency” means a deficiency which is apparent by reasonable inspection.

(Added to NRS by 1965, 948; A 1983, 1239; 1999, 1445)

NRS 11.2055 Actions for damages for injury or wrongful death caused by deficiency in construction of improvements to real property: Determination of date of substantial completion of improvement to real property.

1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, for the purposes of NRS 11.202 to 11.206, inclusive, the date of substantial completion of an improvement to real property shall be deemed to be the date on which:

(a) The final building inspection of the improvement is conducted;

(b) A notice of completion is issued for the improvement; or

(c) A certificate of occupancy is issued for the improvement, whichever occurs later.

2. If none of the events described in subsection 1 occurs, the date of substantial completion of an improvement to real property must be determined by the rules of the common law.

(Added to NRS by 1999, 1444)

While this looks like a lot of statutes, the structure follows the following internal logic:

(1) Where the deficiency was the result of willful misconduct or was fraudulently concealed, there is no repose and the case can be brought at any time after the deficiency is discovered. This makes sense because such deficiencies were actively concealed or kept from the property owner by the contractor or design professional. NRS 11.202.

(2) Where the deficiency was known to the injured person or could have been known through reasonable diligence, the period of repose is ten years (except where the injury occurs, in which case two more years are added on). NRS 11.203.

- (3) Where the deficiency was latent (meaning not apparent by reasonable inspection), the period of repose is eight years (again with two more years added on if the injury occurs in year eight). NRS 11.204.
- (4) Where the deficiency was patent (meaning apparent by reasonable inspection), the period of repose is six years (again with two more years added on if the injury occurs in year six). NRS 11.205.

As an interesting added requirement related solely to design professionals, NRS 11.256 through 11.259 provide certain requisites that must be met by an attorney preparing a suit against a design professional on a nonresidential project.

After discussion of the memorandum, the board requested that Ling write an article for NSBAIDRD's newsletter and speak to registrants concerning this matter at the 2015 NSBAIDRD/AIA Continuing Education Seminar. Ling agreed.

Agenda Item 9A-1 Case No. 13-039N – In the Matter of Howard Fields and HFAI, Inc.

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture, registered interior design, and residential design and by engaging in the practice of architecture, registered interior design, and residential design for three projects located in Nevada, without having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Information was obtained from Howard Fields' website and various news articles showing that Fields and his firm, HFA International were holding themselves out as being qualified to provide architectural and registered interior design services for projects located in Nevada. Further investigation revealed that the respondent also engaged in the practice of architecture and registered interior design by providing advice and direction, preliminary studies, specifications, contract documents and plans for the Las Vegas Hard Rock Expansion and the Lady Luck Hotel and Casino renovation.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning the project and a response was received. The decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle the issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement and confession of judgment were negotiated. The settlement agreement incorporates a No Contest Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$30,000, of which \$15,000 is stayed upon the condition that the respondents remain in compliance with all terms and conditions of the settlement agreement. The respondents are required to pay Investigative Costs in the amount of \$13,985.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 9A-2 Case No. 14-025N – In the matter of Lisa Simeone, Jeanine Deary, and Simeone Deary Design Group

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b), and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture and registered interior design and by engaging in the practice of architecture and registered interior design for two projects located in Nevada without having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Staff located a newspaper article naming Simeone Deary Design Group (SDDG) as the designer for the Hyatt Lake Tahoe Cottages. Further investigation revealed that SDDG also worked on the Venetian Venezia remodel and had prepared preliminary drawings/renderings for both projects prior to a Nevada registrant being in responsible control. Additionally, SDDG disseminated proposals to the Hyatt and the Venetian to provide services that fall under the practice of architecture and registered interior design.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this project and a letter of response was received. The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue 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 \$15,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$2,300.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 9A-3 Case No. 14-027N – In the matter of Pamela Edwards, Michael White-Ryan, and Language of Space

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (b) by advertising services that fall under the practice of architecture on their website and in the Las Vegas Business Press magazine without having certificates of registration issued by this Board.

Staff located an article in the Las Vegas Business Press magazine called "the list" which featured a list of architectural firms. The respondents filled out the application and were published in "the list" as an architectural firm showing that they had one architect. Additionally, a review of their website and LinkedIn pages revealed they were advertising services which fall under the practice of architecture and residential design.

The respondents' case was discussed with Executive Director Spaulding and the decision was made to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement and confession of judgment were negotiated. The settlement agreement incorporates a Non Admission of Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$2,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,850.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Snyder moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Tanner.
Vote: Waugh recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 9A-4 Case No. 15-005N – In the matter of Michael R. Mayse and Mayse & Associates, Inc.

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a) and NRS 623.360.1 (b) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture for a project located in Nevada prior to having certificates of registration issued by this board.

Staff received a reciprocity application from the respondents. The respondents answered yes that they had held themselves out by submitting a proposal to the client for a project located in Nevada. The client was contacted and the information was verified. The respondents are licensed in several states and thought at the time of issuing the proposal that they were already licensed in Nevada.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this project and a response was received. The respondents' case was discussed with Chief Investigator Ruark and the decision was made to offer the respondents an opportunity to settle this issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A confession of judgment and settlement agreement were negotiated. The settlement agreement incorporates a Guilt Clause and an Administrative Penalty of \$1,000 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,000.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

Motion: Erny moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Snyder.
Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 9B Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Closure of Enforcement Cases

Garlock requested that case 15-007N be pulled from the agenda.

Bach recommended the following cases, which were investigated, for closure without disciplinary action:

14-028N 14-031N

Motion: Erny moved to close the above-referenced cases. Motion seconded by Mickey.
Vote: Garlock recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 9C Enforcement Report

Bach said there was nothing to report at this time.

AGENDA ITEM 10A Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Which Board Members and Staff Will Attend the 2015 Regional Summit in Long Beach, CA on March 12-14, 2015

Erny said all regions will be gathering in one location for the second time for the annual Regional Summit.

Spaulding, Erny, Garlock, and Mickey will be funded by NCARB and WCARB. The board will fund Klai, Snyder, and staff members Harrison and Hahn.

AGENDA ITEM 6 Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Florence Barber's Request that the Board Approve Her Interior Design Degree Pursuant to NRS 623.192 (1)(d)(2)

Barber gave background information on her education at Drexel University and work experience as an interior designer. She graduated from the interior design program at Drexel University in 1975. Drexel's interior design program received the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) accreditation in 1979. The board asked numerous questions about her education and professional background.

Motion: Erny moved to accept the interior design degree that Barber received from Drexel University in 1975 as substantially equivalent to a program of interior design accredited by CIDA. Motion seconded by Tanner.

Vote: Ciesynski recused herself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

Agenda Item 5 Review and Possible Decision Regarding the Council of Interior Design Qualifications (CIDQ)/Alternative Application Review Program (AARP)

Ciesynski presented CIDQ's Alternative Application Review Program to the board. She said this program was set up for broadly experienced applicants that were not able to document the minimum educational requirement for NCIDQ Examination eligibility. Ciesynski said that the AARP, if implemented, would replace the binder process that NSBAIDRD currently has in place.

An applicant's educational experience will be reviewed and evaluated by three educators that serve on a CIDQ committee, each educator completing a separate analysis. Transcripts are compared to current CIDA standards.

Ciesynski explained that any missing competencies found within the educational experience can be documented by the applicant in the Dossier Review Form. Evaluators will then determine which competencies were met as a result of interior design practice experience.

Motion: Erny moved to pursue CIDQ's Alternative Application Review Program, and to draft proposed language amending NSBAIDRD's regulations to be presented at a future board meeting. Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 10B Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding Proposed Modifications to NCARB's BEA and BEFA Programs

Erny went over NCARB's memorandums to Member Boards, provided in the board meeting eBook, concerning the proposed changes to the Broadly Experienced Architects Program (BEA) and the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect Program (BEFA).

The proposed changes to the BEA include elimination of the Education Evaluation Service for Architects (EESA) transcript review and elimination of the BEA Committee and its dossier review. Spaulding said that eliminating the EESA would be a mistake as it is part of the BEA Program's rigor. Several years ago when Nevada decided to accept BEA candidates for reciprocal licensure, the decision based on the rigor of the BEA Program, largely including the value of the EESA transcript review.

Board members discussed the material presented and voiced concerns.

Garlock suggested that board members consider the proposed changes over the next couple of months. The proposed modifications will be further discussed at the March 4, 2015 board meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 10C FYI: MBC/MBE Conference Summary

Garlock said this information was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 10D FYI: NCARB's CEO Update for October and November 2014

Garlock said this information was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 10E FYI: NCARB's BOD Brief for December 2014

Garlock said this information was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 11 Update Regarding the Nevada Residential Design Exam Content

Tindall said the Residential Design Exam Committee had met several times to rewrite three exams. The process is now complete. He thanked Erny, Mickey, and Snyder for the effort and time that they devoted to the committee.

AGENDA ITEM 12 Discussion and Possible Decision Regarding CIDQ's Proposed Bylaw Amendments

Ciesynski reported that Q-Connection, CIDQ's quarterly member board newsletter, is back in publication.

Ciesynski presented CIDQ's 2015 Proposed Bylaw Revisions as follows.

Proposed Revision #1:

“The Council Board of Directors shall be composed of the Officers of the Council as designated in Section 1, Article VIII, and five (5) Directors. Effective January 1, 2009, at least three (3) of the seven (7) Certificate-holder Directors shall have served as an official delegate, alternate delegate or as a member of an NCIDQ Member Board for at least two (2) years within the seven (7) preceding the commencement of each Director's term. The provisions of this act shall be null and of no force and effect on January 1, 2018.”

Proposed Revision #2:

“To be an Officer of the Council, a person shall:

A. Be a licensed, certified and/or registered interior designer if domiciled or employed in a jurisdiction where interior design is regulated.

B. Be an active NCIDQ Certificate Holder in good standing.

C. Meet at least two (2) of the four (4) following qualifications:

-Be an official delegate for at least two (2) years within the seven (7) preceding the commencement of the officer's term, or

-Be a member of the Council Board of Directors for at least one (1) year within the seven (7) years preceding the commencement of the Officer's term, or

-Be a Chair of a Standing Council Committee or Task Force for at least two (2) years within the seven (7) years preceding that commencement of the Officer's term, or

-Have been a president of an interior design professional organization (ASID, IIDA, IDC, CIDQ, IDEC, IDCEC, AAHID), for at least one (1) year within the seven (7) years preceding the commencement of the Officer's term.”

Proposed Revision #3:

“The Nominating Committee shall:

1. Be composed of a Past President, as a non-voting member, the most immediate Past President (defined as the most recent past president whose term has been completed on the board of directors), and three current or former Delegates, current or former Alternative Delegates, or current standing committee chairs only. Current officers or director may not serve on this committee. One current Delegate or Alternative Delegate, one current standing committee chair, and one current sitting board member (excluding the Past President and President). All members of the Nominating Committee shall be voting members. No other members are permitted in any capacity. At least two of the three voting members must be current or former delegates. The former Delegates or Alternative Delegates may be selected from those in service during the previous ten-year period. The members shall have knowledge of the Council's Member Boards and their concerns, the Council's history and leadership pool.”

Ciesynski asked that the board ratify the selection of public board member nominee, Cheryl Nichols, as the 2015 CIDQ public member.

Motion: Snyder moved to vote yes on CIDQ's proposed bylaw amendment #1, no on CIDQ's proposed bylaw amendment #2, yes on CIDQ's proposed bylaw amendment #3, and yes on the appointment of Cheryl Nichols as the 2015 CIDQ public member. Motion seconded by Mickey.

Vote: Erny abstained. All others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 13 Executive Director Report

Spaulding said the next board meeting will be on Wednesday, March 4, 2015. The master calendar for the next fiscal year will be provided at that time.

Spaulding, along with Erny, will attend the NCARB Regional Leadership Committee Meeting in San Diego, California January 29 through 31.

Spaulding announced that 75 percent of the registrants that renewed for 2015 used the online renewal process. The online renewal process went smoothly, especially considering that it was the first year it was offered.

Spaulding thanked Harrison for her dedication to launching the online renewal process.

AGENDA ITEM 14 Board Counsel Report

Ling said there was nothing to report at this time.

AGENDA ITEM 15 Public Information Report

Hahn said the newest edition of Focus was provided in the board eBook.

AGENDA ITEM 16 Items for future agenda

- Presentation and review of proposed language amending NSBAIDRD's regulations in acceptance of CIDQ's Alternative Application Review Process.
- Further Discussion of the proposed changes to NCARB's BEA and BEFA programs.

AGENDA ITEM 17 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Chairman Garlock adjourned the meeting at 01:57 p.m.

Gina Spaulding, Executive Director

Jim Mickey, Secretary/Treasurer