

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

**August 20, 2014**

**Peppermill Resort Spa Casino, Tuscany Room 4, 2707 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV 89502**

**Wednesday, August 20, 2014**

Chairman Greg Erny called the meeting to order at 9:12 a.m.

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

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

**AGENDA ITEM 1      Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**AGENDA ITEM 2      Approval of Consent Agenda**

Consent agenda included the following:

- A. Approval of Agenda
- B. Approval of Minutes: June 11, 2014
- C. Secretary/Treasurer Report
  - 1. Nevada Architect, Registered Interior Designer and Residential Designer Licensing Statistics
  - 2. Wells Fargo Bank Statements
  - 3. June 2014 QR Statement
- D. Ratification of Reciprocal Licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm Name Approval Requests
  - 1. Origin 8 Architecture, Inc.
  - 2. N8RD CORPORATION
  - 3. Daniel Joseph Chenin Ltd.
  - 4. PAGETHINK ARCHITECTURE
  - 5. Arcsine
  - 6. Richardson Wetzel Architects, LLC
  - 7. J. Renee Designs
  - 8. SIXFIFTY CORP.
- F. Firm Registration Approval Requests
  - 1. Davis Partnership, P.C.
  - 2. RS NV inc.

**Architects: Registration by Reciprocity**

7115	Kara Lurene Block	7128	Michael A. Mckay
7116	David J. Basinger	7129	Hans Nettel
7117	Domenic Cristofaro	7130	Gary A. Sorenson
7118	Daniel J. Kaplan	7131	Robert J. Tanay
7119	Gordon Sean Magnin	7132	Todd A. Wamback
7120	Adam Meyer	7133	Michael Wayne Wright
7121	Valerie Watson Nagasawa	7134	Renee Patricia Alexander

7122	Scott Michael Michael	7135	Joel G. Chamberlain
7123	Steven R. Olson	7136	Dyron Murphy
7124	Sylvia J. Smith	7137	Jason Sheets
7125	Mark E. Strauss	7139	Robert M. Wallis
7126	Philip Robert Moss	7140	Paul D. Waltz
7127	Jeffrey Alfred Pelletier	7141	Michele K. Solt

**Residential Designers: Registration by reciprocity**

331-RD David Barnes

Board members requested agenda items 2E-4, 2E-8, 2F-1, and 2F-2 be pulled from the consent agenda.

**Motion:** Tindall moved to approve the consent agenda, items 1 through 2E-3 and 2E-5 through 2E-7. Motion seconded by Ciensynski.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 2E-4 Firm name approval request: PAGETHINK ARCHITECTURE**

**Motion:** Mickey moved to approve the firm name request for "PAGETHINK ARCHITECTURE." Motion seconded by Tanner.

Mickey asked for clarification as to why this corporation uses three different firm names: PSP Architects; Page Southerland Page Architects, P.C.; and Pagethink Architecture.

Spaulding said that they are Page Southerland Page Architects, P.C. which doesn't comply with Nevada law. She further explained that this corporation currently has the active firm name of PSP Architects in Nevada. The corporation is requesting Pagethink Architecture as second firm name in Nevada. Spaulding said that Page Southerland Page Architects, P.C. amended their Certificate of Existence With Status In Good Standing in the state of Nevada to a dba under Pagethink Architecture.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 2E-8 Firm name approval request: SIXFIFTY CORP.**

**Motion:** Klai moved to approve the firm name request for "SIXFIFTY CORP." Motion seconded by Tindall.

Erny asked if the applicant's name is Bryan Hansen or Matt Hansen. Harrison said that the applicant's first name is Bryan and middle name is Matthew. Harrison said that the applicant usually goes by "Matt."

Garlock asked what "AIA-AP" stands for at the end of the applicant's name. Ruark said that "AP" stands for allied professional.

Erny said that Hansen's letterhead is inappropriate as it infers that Hansen is a building designer.

Spaulding suggests that the board conditionally approve the firm name with the provision that Hansen must remove "building design" from his letterhead and must not use "AIA-AP" at the end of his name due to the scope of licensure restrictions for residential designers.

Ling said that the board can make approval contingent upon Hansen providing to the board a letter stating that he is no longer using the inappropriate letterhead or credentials at the end of his name. This letter should be printed on Hansen's new letterhead to serve as confirmation. The board concurred.

**Vote:** Garlock opposed. All others in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 2F-1 Firm registration approval request: Davis Partnership, P.C.**

**Motion:** Klai moved to approve the firm name request for "Davis Partnership, P.C." Motion seconded by Garlock.

Klai asked why three of the owners listed are not licensed in Nevada and are offering architectural services.

Spaulding said that Mr. Davis, now deceased, was a previous Nevada registrant and the original owner of the firm. She said that NAC 623.740 allows for the continuation of a firm name. Spaulding further explained that the application for firm registration is an internal document and that the three owners not registered in Nevada were asked what services they provide to the company. The firm, if approved, will receive a letter telling them that unlicensed owners cannot hold themselves out as architects in the state of Nevada and that they must practice under the responsible control of a Nevada registrant.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**Agenda Item 2F-2 Firm registration approval request: RS NV inc.**

**Motion:** Klai moved to approve the firm name request for "RS NV inc." Motion seconded by Tanner.

Erny said that Mr. Pitassi, not a Nevada registrant, needs to be reminded that he cannot hold himself out as an architect in the state of Nevada and that any services that he provides that fall under the practice of architecture must be practiced under the responsible control of a Nevada registrant.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 3 Deliberations/Action on applications for registration:  
Registered Interior Design**

Klai swore in the following individuals as registered interior designers:

1. Mandy Telleria.....210-ID

2. Terese LaMoureaux.....211-ID
3. Meagan Hurst.....212-ID

**Motion:** Tanner 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, Erny congratulated the three new registrants and asked for feedback concerning the exam and licensing process.

One registrant responded that the process was straight forward and that there was an abundance of resources available to help along the way. Another registrant responded that it was not a lonely process and that the practicum was not as difficult as it had been made out to be.

Spaulding congratulated the new registrants and told them that the registration ceremony is an opportunity for new registrants to meet their board and the board's staff. She said that anytime a registrant has a question concerning scope of work that it is best to call the board office for clarification before moving forward and having a problem arise later. She reiterated that the board staff is there to help them make informed decisions and that they should not hesitate to contact the board office.

**AGENDA ITEM 4      Discussion and possible decision regarding the architect application by examination and possible architect registration of Jae Uk Chung pursuant to NRS 623.190.**

Spaulding gave the board an overview of Chung's circumstance. She said that Chung had taken and passed all of the ARE's in the state of California and passed the open book quiz on Nevada law. Chung selected Nevada as his base state. Spaulding said Chung's grade report that was received from California indicated that Chung had enforcement action. She said that enforcement action is usually not seen on a grade report for someone who is not registered. Spaulding said that California did not initially send the correct and appropriate information to NSBAIDRD.

Spaulding said that many states do not regulate small commercial projects below a certain size or dollar amount. Those projects are exempt from the California Architects Practice Act. She explained that Chung worked on a tenant improvement project that was inside of that exemption. The work that Chung was doing was allowable and his work was fine. The problem was that Chung entered into an architectural services agreement, creating a device, which is holding oneself out as an architect.

Spaulding said that the California Architects Board (CAB) cited Chung for his action. The original fine of \$5,000 was modified to \$750 after CAB heard Chung's explanation. Spaulding further explained that CAB does not consider citations to be disciplinary actions, as disciplinary actions are reserved for registrants. Citations given to nonregistrants are considered to be enforcement actions.

Erny invited Chung to speak to the board and to give any statements that would facilitate board approval of his architectural licensure in Nevada.

Chung said that he and his wife started a design company in 2011. Chung is a licensed general contractor in California. Chung stated he was approached by a prospective client to provide design services, consisting of the construction of non-bearing partition walls, to create small offices. Chung accepted and completed the project. Chung said that when he tried to collect the final payment from the client, the client pointed out that Chung was unlicensed and that he had entered into an architectural services agreement. Chung said that he explained to CAB that he did not perform any work under the scope of architectural services, but due to ignorance he did sign a contract executing an architectural services agreement. Chung said that CAB was understanding of his mistake and modified the original citation to a lower fine amount.

Chung said that he is still studying for the California Supplemental Exam and intends to be eventually licensed as an architect in California as well as Nevada. He said that the reason that he would like to be licensed in Nevada is so that he can expand his career opportunities as well as enter into architectural competitions.

Chung said that his mistake follows him. He apologized to the Nevada board for his ignorance and mistake and asked them to understand his situation.

**Motion:** Ciesynski moved to approve the application of Jae Uk Chung for architect. Motion seconded by Snyder.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

Klai swore in Chung as an architect.

**Motion:** Klai moved to approve the registration of Jae Uk Chung as an architect. Motion seconded by Tanner.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

After the swearing-in and registration ceremony, the board congratulated Chung. Erny asked Chung for feedback regarding his path to licensure.

Chung thanked the board for its consideration and stated that this was an unforgettable, touching moment for him. He said that in California after the supplemental exam is passed only a letter is received announcing that the applicant has become a registered architect. There is no presentation or ceremony. Chung said he is very happy that he chose Nevada as his base state for architectural registration.

Spaulding said that NSBAIDRD requires applicants to come before the board to take their oath because the board wants it to be a special moment and also so that new registrants meet the board. She said that she wants registrants to be comfortable contacting board staff with questions and concerns. Spaulding said that the board wants registrants to have a good future in their profession and registrants should utilize the board whenever they have questions. Spaulding told Chung that the best advice that she can give him is to always contact the state in which he is an applicant for registration because what is allowed in one state may not be allowed in another.

Erny advised Chung to be certain that he is not crossing into restricted areas of practice or non-practice when approached to do work in other jurisdictions.

**AGENDA ITEM 5      Discussion and possible decision regarding NCARB's proposed changes to the Intern Development Program, Broadly Experienced Architect Program, and Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect Program**

Erny said that NCARB's board of directors (BOD) had staff do extensive research regarding these changes and then put together proposed directions for all three programs. The feedback period ends September 5, 2014 and all input will be reviewed at NCARB's September BOD meeting. Erny explained that review of the proposed changes is an opportunity for all 54 jurisdictions to offer comment about the proposals while choosing to endorse, reject, or cause for further review.

Changes to the IDP specifically relate to the hours required to complete the program and the categories and areas in which interns need to document their experience, while changes to the BEA and BEFA programs relate to eligibility requirements and review processes to complete the programs for NCARB certification.

Erny explained that there are 2 phases of the IDP proposal. The first phase involves eliminating the 1,860 elective hours and retaining only the 3,740 core hours.

Garlock asked why NCARB wants to make such a large directional change. Erny replied that with the changes the IDP may not be sequential as it has been in the past but will allow for a more integrated process. Erny said that the processes and components are still present. They are just being structured in a different manner.

Mickey said that he feels that NCARB is discounting the value of the additional hours currently required to complete the IDP. He said that the elective hours that are not of value should be replaced with content that is of value. He suggested that the elective hours be more defined and controlled in order to create value so that what is being produced in the profession is not being reduced. Mickey said that he is concerned about the additional hours being needed even more so with the proposed IDP model of the integrated exam and experience.

Klai said that the shrinking of required hours is not a good thing because the hours will never be regained in the internship experience.

Erny said that if the changes to the integrated experience are made that the responsibility will be put more on the individual to determine when he or she is ready to take the exam.

Snyder said that it looks like the proposed changes to the IDP are suggesting a substitution of an academic process in place of experience. Erny responded that the proposed change to the IDP is being driven a great deal by the practice analysis.

Spaulding recapped what she is heard from the board discussion. She said that what she heard is that the board members disagree with phase 1 of the proposed change to the IDP.

Spaulding asked the board if she is correct in saying that the board thinks that more experience hours, not less, are needed for interns to be entry level competent. The board agreed with Spaulding's statement. Spaulding further elaborated the point of keeping the current 5,600 hours required to complete the IDP by asking the board members if new registrants entering the profession are prepared to practice independently with 5,600 hours. Garlock and Mickey responded with a no.

Klai said that he felt that more hours of experience are needed in order to have competent entry level architects.

Tindall said that core credits need to be expanded if elective credits are being taken away and the credits that are added to the core should have value. He said meaningful hours should be put into every aspect of the IDP to allow for a broad experience. Hands-on experience is what is needed and interns should not receive credit just for going out to look at a building.

Klai asked Erny if he has seen a breakdown of the areas that candidates should be getting experience in. Erny said that he has not only because the practice analysis will not come into play until phase 2.

Spaulding said that it is very important that the board hold their ground if they disagree with the proposed changes because according to NAC 623.400 the board is bound by any changes that are made to the IDP. She wanted to make sure that everyone is cognitive of that.

Mickey pulled up the IDP chart for core experience hours. He said in Category 1 Pre-Design, only forty hours are required to meet the experience for project cost and feasibility. He said that this area is one where many architects get into trouble and that it is a perfect place to add more hours of value into core experience. He said that there is an opportunity here for meaningful hours to be added to the IDP.

Erny said that he is hearing that the board feels that there already is not enough internship time and that the additional 1,860 hours need to remain in place. He said he is hearing that our board does not want to adopt phase 1 of the proposed changes to the IDP. The board agreed.

Erny suggested the discussion of phase 2 of the proposed changes to the IDP.

Ciesynski asked why these changes have been proposed. Erny replied that the profession has changed while the program's structure remains as it was thirty years ago. The program needs to be brought in line with current practice so that it works better and so that it is in line with the Architect Registration Examination (ARE).

Erny asked the board members if they were in agreement that, depending on what the proposed changes are to the phase 2 effort, they would conceptually be willing to adopt the changes that will align the required programmatic experience areas with the phases of contemporary practice. The board agreed.

Erny moved to the discussion of NCARB's proposed changes to the Broadly Experienced Architect Program (BEA). Erny said that one of the proposed changes is that an applicant for

NCARB certification that does not meet the NCARB education requirement (a degree from a program in architecture accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)) will instead have to meet a member board's education and experience requirements for initial licensure. This means that the dossier requirement will go away. Erny said that with this proposed change the fundamental question is if the board is going to trust another board to evaluate an applicant's professional credentials deeming the applicant worthy to practice.

Erny explained that NCARB is trying to get alignment among all 54 jurisdictions for the BEA program. Erny said that he does not agree with the proposed change of requiring an applicant to have only one year of maintaining an architectural license in good standing. He said that there is an element missing to the proposal. It should include why a board gave an individual a license.

Erny said that he does see merit in allowing other boards to make decisions concerning education and experience. He said that NCARB feels that if an architect is good enough to be licensed in one jurisdiction demonstrating experience then the architect should be deemed competent crossing a state line.

Spaulding said that in the past long conversations have been had at the board table regarding acceptance of a BEA certificate. The rationale for acceptance was the applicant must have a lengthy amount of experience, had taken the ARE, and had completed the IDP. The applicant may not have had a NAAB accredited degree but the dossier and all of the vetting that occurred after the fact by NCARB served as justification to substantially meet the requirements of a NAAB accredited degree. She reminded the board how important vetting and the dossier have been in making decisions in the past on BEA applications.

Garlock questions how NCARB can call a program "broadly experienced" with only one year of experience. He said the BEA and BEFA programs work fairly well as they are today.

Erny asked the board if they are saying that they are not going to accept the proposed changes. The board agreed.

Erny reviewed the proposed changes to the BEFA program with the board.

After discussion the board agreed that the dossier is a very important component of the BEFA program and needs to remain in place. The board felt that the dossier is important in determining the validity of the rigor of an applicant's education and experience. The board agreed that the dossier needs to be made more efficient for both applicants and reviewers.

The board disagreed with the proposed changes to the BEFA program.

The board directed Spaulding to send in a written response to NCARB's letter on their behalf.



**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**Discussion and possible decision regarding draft notice pertaining to whether a Nevada architect is permitted to design a medical marijuana dispensary**

The board discussed whether a Nevada architect is permitted to design a medical marijuana dispensary at the June 11, 2014 meeting. The board directed staff to draft a notice to registrants concerning this issue for review and feedback. The draft has been completed and submitted to board members and counsel for final approval.

Ling said that he reviewed the draft and approves of the notice as it is written. Spaulding said that the draft will appear in the next newsletter and on the NSBAIDRD website.

**Motion:** Mickey moved to approve the notice. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Discussion and update regarding memorandum from Caleb Cage regarding Veteran's Licensure and Data Efforts**

Spaulding said that Caleb Cage is the director of Military and Veteran's Policy and works under the direction of Governor Sandoval. The governor has proclaimed 2014 to be the "Year of the Veteran" in Nevada. Spaulding said that the goal of this proclamation is to help veterans and their spouses by reducing barriers when transitioning into civilian licensure and employment.

Spaulding said that NSBAIDRD will need to amend renewal forms and licensure applications to ask the questions that the Veteran's Licensure and Data Efforts will require.

Ling said that the bill will require all state boards to capture and report data to the Nevada Department of Veterans Affairs. He said that this bill will also require the board to have a very general requirement for reciprocity in place. Ling said that the bill is not intended to lower standards for licensure but only to ease the licensing process for veterans.

Spaulding said that she will contact Cage and obtain a template regarding the questions that will need to be asked of registrants.

**Agenda Item 8**

**Discussion and possible decision regarding legality of Nevada public entities requesting free architectural work and design fees in Requests for Proposals for publicly funded projects**

After discussion among board members it was decided that the issue of Nevada public entities requesting free architectural work and design fees in Requests for Proposals for publicly funded projects would be forwarded AIA Nevada.

Spaulding said that she will forward this issue to Randy Lavigne, executive director of AIA Nevada. Spaulding also said that she will contact architect Michael Del Gatto and inform him that the board has forwarded this issue to AIA Nevada.

**AGENDA ITEM 9A-1 Case No. 13-027N In the matter of Dan Meis and Meis Architects**

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 in Nevada and engaging in the practice of architecture for a commercial project located in Nevada.

The board was contacted by an individual wishing to remain anonymous and inquiring if Dan Meis was a registered architect in the state of Nevada. The NSBA database was searched and revealed that Mr. Meis did not hold a certificate of registration as an architect. The individual indicated that he/she had just read a news article which stated that Dan Meis was the architect for the proposed stadium at UNLV.

Subsequent investigation revealed that Dan Meis and Meis Architects held themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture in Nevada by publicizing the UNLV stadium project on his website [www.meisarchitects.com](http://www.meisarchitects.com), and displaying color renderings of the stadium project. Mr. Meis also engaged in the practice of architecture for the UNLV stadium project by preparing, perspective studies; pricing drawings; site line comparison drawings; sections and vignettes, without having been issued a certificate of registration to practice architecture in the state of Nevada, and without the firm of Meis Architects having been approved by the board to practice architecture in Nevada.

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 was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause, an Administrative Penalty of \$15,000 and Investigative Costs in the amount of \$6,633.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

**Motion:** Tindall moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Tanner.

**Vote:** Garlock and Klai recused themselves. All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 9A-2 Case No. 13-042R – In the matter of Patrick R. Daly and Patrick R. Daly Architect**

The respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.270.1(b), NRS 623.270.1(c), NRS 623.270.1(d), NRS 623.270.1(e), NRS 623.270.1 (f), NRS 623.325 and NAC 623.740 (1) when the respondent improperly modified documents; deviated from the normal standard of professional care; permitted the use of his name to assist a person to evade any provision of chapter 623; aided and abetted a firm in practicing architecture in Nevada; did not execute any written contracts with clients; and used an unapproved firm name.

Information was obtained from a related case which indicated that Patrick R. Daly may be aiding and abetting the unlicensed practice of architecture by permitting an individual to use the respondent's name and hold himself out as the "architect" designing the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) proposed Stadium/Mega Event Center.

A review of Mr. Daly's administrative file revealed that he agreed to practice architecture in Nevada under the name of Patrick R. Daly Architect; however subsequent investigation revealed that Patrick R. Daly knowingly allowed the documentation pertaining to the UNLV stadium project, including but not limited to proposals, request for qualifications, design concepts, renderings, diagrams and invoices, to be disseminated using a firm name that is not approved by the board. Furthermore, Mr. Daly did not execute a contract for the UNLV stadium project, nor did he have any documentation to show that he was in responsible control of the work being performed for the UNLV stadium project.

Based upon continued concerns staff requested a list of all Daly's work in Nevada, which revealed that he was currently working on the remodel of an Apple retail store (Apple Project) located in the Fashion Show Mall. Staff obtained copies of the proposals, contracts, consultant agreements, invoices, and construction drawings for the Apple project that also revealed that all documentation for the Apple project was disseminated using a firm name that is not approved by the board.

Many documents had to be subpoenaed during this investigation, which resulted in some duplication; staff compared thirteen invoices that were obtained from Mr. Daly (Daly invoices) with the same thirteen invoices obtained from Apple, Inc. (Apple invoices); the comparison revealed the Daly invoices provided for the board's investigation were improperly modified in an attempt to comply with the board's firm requirements.

The respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning the projects and a response was received. The decision was made to offer the respondent an opportunity to settle the issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement was negotiated wherein the respondent agrees to voluntarily surrender his certificate of registration effective immediately upon the board's acceptance of the settlement agreement. The agreement also incorporates a Guilt Clause, an Administrative Penalty of \$10,000 and Investigative Costs in the amount of \$6,633.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

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

**Vote:** Garlock and Klai recused themselves. All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 9A-3 Case No. 14-019N – In the matter of Woods Bagot and Woods Bagot Architects, P.C.**

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a), NRS 623.360.1 (b) and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by holding itself out as being qualified to practice architecture in Nevada and engaging in the practice of architecture for a commercial project located in Nevada.

Subsequent investigation revealed that Woods Bagot held itself out as being qualified to practice architecture in Nevada by advertising the UNLV stadium project on its website [www.woodsbagot.com](http://www.woodsbagot.com); disseminating various documentation on Woods Bagot letterhead which includes but is not limited to: Request for Qualifications, Proposals and Invoices for the UNLV stadium project. Woods Bagot also engaged in the practice of architecture by preparing design concepts, renderings, diagrams, and sections for the UNLV stadium project, without having a Nevada registered architect in responsible control of the work, and without the firm of Woods Bagot having been approved by the board to practice architecture in Nevada.

The respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning the project and a response was received. The decision was made to offer the respondent an opportunity to settle the issue informally rather than face a disciplinary hearing before the board. A settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating a Guilt Clause, an Administrative Penalty of \$10,000 and Investigative Costs in the amount of \$6,633.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

**Motion:** Tindall moved to approve the settlement agreement. Motion seconded by Mickey.

**Vote:** Garlock and Klai recused themselves. All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 9A-4 Case No. 14-023N – In the matter of Andy Nguyen, Tony Nguyen, and K&N Construction, Inc.**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.330.1(d), NAC 623.0195, NRS 623.360.1 (b) and NRS 623.360.1 (c) by signing and submitting architectural drawings to Clark County Development Services for a tenant improvement project that were not prepared by the respondents, a bona-fide employee of the respondents, or a Nevada registered architect.

A plans examiner from Clark County Development Services contacted the Board office to explain they had received a set of architectural drawings that were prepared by a designer from New York, but the plans were signed and submitted to the building department by a general contractor.

Subsequent investigation revealed that K&N Construction sealed, signed and submitted the architectural drawings to the Clark County Building Department using the contractor's exemption; however, K&N Construction did not prepare the architectural drawings pursuant to NRS 623.330.1 (d).

Because K&N Construction signed and submitted architectural drawings to the Clark County Building Department for the Gyu-Kaku Japanese restaurant that were not prepared by K&N Construction or their bona-fide employee, K&N Construction is not exempt from Chapter 623

and K&N Construction's actions constitute the unlicensed practice of architecture under NRS 623.360.

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-5 Case No. 14-034N – In the matter of Georgia Coundoussias, Keith Clarke, and MCA Architecture**

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (b) and (c) by engaging in the practice of architecture, for a project located in Nevada without having certificates of registration issued by this Board.

During a reciprocity interview with Ms. Coundoussias, she disclosed that her firm had performed a site visit and prepared schematic drawings for a project contemplated for Nevada. Staff received copies of the drawings and found that they were site specific consisting of four buildings to be utilized for warehouse space.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this project. 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 settlement agreement was negotiated incorporating No Contest and Effect on Licensure Clauses and an Administrative Penalty of \$3,500 plus Investigative Costs in the amount of \$1,575.

Staff recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

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

**Vote:** All in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 9B Discussion and possible decision regarding closure of enforcement cases**

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

13-034N	13-038R	14-001R	14-008N
14-015N	14-016N	14-020N	14-030N
14-032R			

**Motion:** Tindall moved to close the above-referenced cases. Motion seconded by Tanner.

**Vote:** Garlock recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

**AGENDA ITEM 9C Enforcement Report**

Ruark said there was nothing to report at this time.

**AGENDA ITEM 10A Architect Issues-FYI: NCARB 2014 Town Hall Outcomes**

Erny said that this information was provided for board members' information.

**AGENDA ITEM 10B Architect Issues-FYI: NCARB 2014 Pre-Annual Meeting BOD Brief**

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

**AGENDA ITEM 10C Architect Issues-FYI: NCARB 2014 Post-Annual Meeting BOD Brief**

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

**AGENDA ITEM 10D Architect Issues-FYI: NCARB CEO Update for May, June and July 2014**

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

**AGENDA ITEM 10E Architect Issues-FYI: NCARB Fast Facts August 2014**

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

**AGENDA ITEM 11 Update regarding the Nevada Residential Design Exam content and set date for next exam writing session**

Tindall said that the first half of the residential design examination was reviewed and rewritten in July by the appointed committee of Erny, Mickey, and himself. The second half will be reviewed and rewritten by the same committee before the second half of the exam is administered in February, 2015.

Spaulding asked that a date be set for the committee to meet. It was agreed by the committee members that the next meeting would be held November 19-20, 2014.

**AGENDA ITEM 12 Registered Interior Design Issues**

After discussion it was decided that Ciesynski, Erny, Klai, Mickey, Tanner, Spaulding, Hahn, and Harrison will be attending the 2014 CIDQ Council of Delegates meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico on November 14 and 15, 2014.

Ciesynski said that she would like to see a CIDQ bylaw change to reduce the number of required regulatory board members from 4 to 3. Some boards are not participating because they are not able to meet the required minimum. She said that another alternative would be to make representation from each member board mandatory with no minimum or maximum limit. Ciesynski said that representation of registered interior designers is needed at CIDQ.

Ciesynski also said that she would like to see the RID licensing process streamlined. She said that one way to incorporate this would be for Nevada's RID Non-CIDA binder to follow the NCIDQ binder process.

Erny asked Ciesynski to compile a comparison of the Nevada RID Non-CIDA binder and the NCIDQ binder process for review at a future board meeting.

### **AGENDA ITEM 13A    Executive Director Report-Board Office updates**

Spaulding said she and Harrison have spent the past year working on setting up the online registration renewal process that will go live in October. She said that testers are needed and asked for volunteers to test the system in September so that problems are corrected before system deployment. All board members volunteered.

Spaulding said that it is not yet known how much the online renewal process will cost the board in credit card fees. A percentage of the dollar amount of payments processed will have to be paid to the payment processor.

Spaulding said another change to the renewal process this year will be that registrants will not be notified in advance of CEU auditing. Random auditing will occur after registration renewal submittal. Spaulding said that renewal reminders will be mailed out in October explaining renewal options and CEU auditing procedures.

Spaulding announced that the annual election of officers and reappointments will occur at the next board meeting to be held on October 22, 2014 at the board office. She said that Erny, Klai, and Garlock have terms expiring on October 31, 2014. Spaulding said that she will be sending a letter to the governor for recommendations and reappointments soon. She asked that board members inform her as to if they are interested in reappointment or have recommendations for replacements. Spaulding also asked for recommendations for a public member.

Spaulding asked for board member volunteers to assist with 2015 CEU efforts. She said that suggestions are needed for CEU topics as well as speakers. Spaulding said from past experience that she has learned that having only one speaker in an eight hour CEU course is not a good idea. There should be at least two speakers in an eight hour session.

Garlock suggested having an attorney conduct a two to four hour CEU session in regard to statute of limitations on document retention. Ling said that he thinks it is a good subject to cover.

Erny asked for volunteers to form a CEU Committee with Spaulding. Garlock and Mickey volunteered.

Spaulding said that the annual NSBAIDRD/AIA CEU Seminar will be held in Reno on December 4, 2014 at Silver Legacy.

Spaulding told the board that she has been appointed to NCARB Regional Leadership Committee. The next two meetings of the committee are in October and January.

**AGENDA ITEM 13B     Executive Director Report-Discussion and possible decision regarding the implementation of Senate Bill 21 (2013 Legislative Session)**

Spaulding informed the board that in 2013 Legislative SB21 was passed which affects all Nevada regulatory boards. The State Controller is requiring that state boards start collecting and providing to them licensing information of registrants so that the Controller may ascertain whether the registrant owes money to the state. This means that if a registrant owes a debt to NSBAIDRD he or she may not be able to license or certify with other Nevada state agencies or boards and vice-versa.

Spaulding said that an article will run in the next newsletter informing registrants of SB21.

**AGENDA ITEM 14     Board Counsel Report**

Ling said that Mr. Rusk, a former registrant, is currently involved in civil litigation. A subpoena has been issued of NSBAIDRD and its records. Ling said that he will be objecting to a large part of the subpoena which will cause litigation with Rusk's present counsel resulting in costs.

Ling further explained the case to the board members.

**AGENDA ITEM 15     Public Information Report**

Hahn introduced herself as the new public information coordinator to the board. She said that the next *Focus* newsletter would be published at the end of August.

**AGENDA ITEM 16     Items for future agenda**

There were no items presented for a future agenda.

**AGENDA ITEM 17     Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

Chairman Erny adjourned the meeting at 3:37 p.m.

---

Gina Spaulding, Executive Director

---

John Klai, Secretary/Treasurer