

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

March 16, 2011

Board Conference Room, 2080 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 120, Las Vegas, NV 89119

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Chairman Larry Henry called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

Roll Call: Larry Henry, Kimberly Ciesynski, George Garlock, John Klai, JoAnn Oppenheimer, Sean Tanner and Larry Tindall. Greg Erny and Bill Snyder were excused.

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

AGENDA ITEM 1 Approval of consent agenda

Consent agenda included the following:

- A. Approval of agenda
- B. Approval of minutes: January 19, 2011
- C. Secretary/Treasurer report
 - 1. Nevada architect, registered interior designer and residential designer licensing statistics
 - 2. Bank of America, Wells Fargo, and Smith Barney monthly/quarterly statements
- D. Ratification of reciprocal licenses (see attached list)
- E. Firm name approval requests
 - 1. GJNelson Architecture, P.C.
 - 2. HERNANDEZ DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.
 - 3. HOOGLAND ARCHITECTURE, LTD.
 - 4. MDAI – MUSKETEER DESIGNS AND INTERIORS
 - 5. Plan Check Associates, Inc.
 - 6. Ward Howes Lyden Design Group PC
 - 7. Encompass Studio
 - 8. r6studio
- F. Firm registration approval requests
 - 1. Blue Heron Architecture, LLC
 - 2. Creative FIT, LLC

Architects: Registration by reciprocity

6630	Michael D. Coleman	6636	Derek J. Soltes	6644	Martin M. Byrnes
6631	Michael A. Comulada	6637	Thomas O. Bath	6645	Nathan L. Colkitt
6632	Shirley A. Ghannam	6638	John H. Mahoney	6646	Kenner B. Kingston
6633	Francis H. Hofheins	6639	David D. Ross	6647	Edward S. Wilms
6634	Wayne A. Nelson	6640	Vinicius Gorgati	6648	Lee R. Winn
6635	Paul J. Rupp	6641	Paul M. Hamel		

Board members requested agenda items 1E-2, 1E-4, 1E-5 and 1E-7 be pulled from the consent agenda.

Motion: Klai moved to approve the consent agenda, items 1A through 1E-1, 1E-3, 1E-6 and 1E-8 through 1F-2. Motion seconded by Tindall.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 1E-2 Firm name approval request: HERNANDEZ DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.

Motion: Klai moved to approve the firm name request for “HERNANDEZ DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.” Motion seconded by Garlock.

Henry asked about use of the term “associates.” Spaulding explained that the board allows use of the term “associates” even if there are no other registrants. She said that term is not the same as “architects,” which requires other licensed architects be employed at the firm.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 1E-4 Firm name approval request: MDAI – MUSKETEER DESIGNS AND INTERIORS

Motion: Tanner moved to approve the firm name request for “MDAI – MUSKETEER DESIGNS AND INTERIORS.” Motion seconded by Tindall.

Henry asked for clarification of the name.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 1E-5 Firm name approval request: Plan Check Associates, Inc.

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the firm name request for “Plan Check Associates, Inc.” Motion seconded by Klai.

Garlock asked if the firm is named Plan Check Associates or Pettit/Chenot Associates. He said both firm names have the same acronym. Spaulding said it appeared the firm is using PC Associates, which was previously approved, until this firm name is approved. The application indicates PC Associates will become inactive. Spaulding suggested the item be tabled while staff contacts the applicant to see if she intends to keep the firm name PC Associates.

Board members asked if a firm name, such as “Plan Check Consultants,” could be approved for use if this request is approved. Spaulding said she believes it is too close to “Plan Check Associates.” Board members agreed. Board members said the name was problematic because it takes a piece of the practice and ties it exclusively to a firm. Board members said approval of this firm name does not give this firm exclusive right to the term, “plan check.” It is possible that another firm could be approved using “plan check,” but it would have to clearly be a different firm name, such as “John Doe Plan Checking.”

Chairman Henry tabled the item.

AGENDA ITEM 1E-7 Firm name approval request: Encompass Studio

Motion: Garlock moved to approve the firm name request for “Encompass Studio.” Motion seconded by Klai.

Henry asked if this firm had a DBA. Spaulding said he is requesting another firm name. Registrants are not limited to the number of firm names they can have approved.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 2 **Discussion and possible decision regarding Jamie Moss’s request that the board approve her interior design degree pursuant to NRS 623.192(1)(d)(2)**

Spaulding said that Jamie Moss is appearing before the board to ask that the board would find her interior design degree from the University of Texas at San Antonio equivalent to a degree from a CIDA-accredited (formerly FIDER) program, per NRS 623.191(1)(d)(2). Ms. Moss graduated in 1998, and the program received FIDER accreditation in 2000. Her schoolwork was part of the body of work the FIDER team considered when granting accreditation.

Ms. Moss presented evidence to support her request.

Motion: Oppenheimer Gore moved that Jamie Moss’s interior design degree from University of Texas at San Antonio was equivalent to a degree from a CIDA-accredited program. Motion seconded by Klai.

Vote: Tanner recused himself. All others in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 3 **Discussion and possible decision regarding Heather Soto’s request that the board approve her interior design degree pursuant to NRS 623.192(1)(d)(2)**

Spaulding said this agenda item was similar to the previous agenda item. Heather Soto is appearing before the board to ask that the board would find her interior design degree from the Bellevue Community College equivalent to a degree from a CIDA-accredited program, per NRS 623.191(1)(d)(2). Ms. Soto graduated in 2005, and the program received CIDA accreditation in 2006. Her schoolwork was part of the body of work the CIDA team considered when granting accreditation.

Ms. Soto presented evidence to support her request.

Motion: Klai moved that Heather Soto’s interior design degree from Bellevue Community College was equivalent to a degree from a CIDA-accredited program. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 1E-5 **Firm name approval request: Plan Check Associates, Inc.**

Henry recalled the tabled item.

Spaulding said that PC Associates was approved in July 1992. The applicant, Michelle Pettit, said that PC Associates will become inactive if Plan Check Associates is approved.

Board members discussed if and when someone else could apply for use of the name “PC Associates,” once it was inactive. Spaulding said there is currently no policy for how to handle this since the board has never tracked “inactive” firms; once a firm name is approved, no one else has been able to apply for its use. Spaulding said she will bring this issue forward at a future board meeting once the database is able to track firm names.

Board members asked if registrants could report firm name use on the registration form each year. Spaulding said that she will include the registration/renewal form and firm naming policies on the next board agenda to see if there is obsolete information that can be deleted.

Vote: Ciesynski, Klai, Oppenheimer Gore and Tindall in favor. Garlock, Henry and Tanner opposed. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Discussion and possible decision regarding Brett Fowkes request that the board approve his IDP exemption request so he can take the Architect Registration Examination

Spaulding explained the background for this agenda item. She said backup information was included in the agenda books.

Spaulding explained that the board adopted a requirement for NAAB-accredited degrees in 1988. Prior to that an applicant could meet the education requirement based on work experience. When the board implemented the degree requirement, it also allowed current interns to complete a letter of intent. The letter of intent exempted applicants from the degree requirement. 93 letters of intent were submitted; Brett Fowkes was among those.

Spaulding went on to explain that Mr. Fowkes has not tested as a Nevada candidate for the ARE. He has tested in Arizona. Because he has a letter of intent on file he will be able to test for Nevada once he meets the experience requirement, which is completion of IDP. Mr. Fowkes is appearing before the board to ask that the board waive the IDP requirement.

Spaulding said that there is no longer a file for Mr. Fowkes, but his letter of intent is on file. She explained that the board's retention schedule for inactive examination files is 10 years. She said that Mr. Fowkes requested a copy of his file in 1993 and has provided a copy of that in the board books.

Spaulding said that Mr. Fowkes told her that some of the 93 letter of intent applicants had not completed IDP and become registered. Based on this, Spaulding and staff researched the status of those 93 people. Twenty of the applicants became registered architects and 18 of those completed IDP. The other two applicants were exempt from IDP because the law states that if a person had seven years of experience credits before January 1, 1986, they were exempt from IDP.

Ciesynski asked if an applicant could retroactively document 20 years of experience to complete IDP. Spaulding explained that they could until two years ago when NCARB implemented the six-month rule. Now applicants can only submit experience in 6-month increments.

Brett Fowkes addressed the board. His father, was also in attendance and seated at the table with him. Mr. Fowkes stated that he had disagreements with Spaulding over facts in the case. He explained his frustration with the registration process, which he started in 1980. At that time he said he only had to have seven years of experience. After two changes to the law, he was required to have 13 years of experience. He stated that when he applied to the board in 1993 they said they couldn't find his letter of intent and would not let him sit for the exam. He decided to test in Arizona instead. Mr. Fowkes passed six of the nine sections of the ARE, but those are invalid now under Arizona's five-year rolling clock. Mr. Fowkes said it was his understanding, from NCARB, that they would allow him to sit for the exam if Nevada says he is exempt from the education and experience requirements.

Mr. Fowkes said that he has a letter from NCARB saying that they will allow him to submit his experience for IDP if the Nevada board requests it. Spaulding said she hadn't seen the letter from NCARB, but would be able to provide a letter from the Nevada board. She reiterated that NCARB will allow him to sit for the ARE if Nevada says he meets the requirements for registration in the state, but that he must complete the experience requirement – IDP – to meet Nevada's requirements.

Board members said the board would do what it could to assist Mr. Fowkes, but that they could not make an exception to the experience requirement.

Motion: Klai moved to grant Brett Fowkes's request that the board waive the IDP requirement and allow him to sit for the ARE. Motion seconded by Oppenheimer Gore.

Vote: All opposed. Motion fails.

Motion: Garlock moved to deny Brett Fowkes’s request that the board waive the IDP requirement and allow him to sit for the ARE. Motion seconded by Klai.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Board members instructed staff to assist Mr. Fowkes with his application to NCARB. Spaulding said that Mr. Fowkes must complete his application with the board, including all relevant work experience. Then he must apply to NCARB so that there is a number attached to his file. At that point, Spaulding said she could submit a letter to NCARB requesting they allow him to submit his experience retroactively to complete IDP. She stressed that she did not know if they would honor the request. She said that once she receives notice from NCARB that he has completed the IDP, she would enter him into the database to test as a Nevada candidate.

Mr. Fowkes said that NCARB would not allow him to open a file. Spaulding said he should contact her that next day and she would help him through the process.

AGENDA ITEM 5A Deliberations/Action on applications for registration: Architectural

Garlock swore in the following individuals as architects:

1. Timothy Grantham 6642
2. Lei Su 6643
3. Jack F. Shively, III..... 6649

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 5B Deliberations/Action on applications for registration: Registered interior design

Garlock swore in the following individual as a registered interior designer:

1. Amy L. Jones..... 189-ID

Motion: Tanner moved to approve the registration of the above referenced individual as a registered interior designer. Motion seconded by Ciesynski.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

Henry asked new registrants if they had any comments regarding the registration process or any questions. There were no comments or questions.

AGENDA ITEM 6A-1 Case No. 10-036N – In the matter of Robert Briggs, Terri Dell Briggs and TEBO Planet Architecture

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

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

Staff received a complaint from an electrical engineer who was hired by the respondents to provide the electrical construction drawings for the Cadillac Ranch restaurant located in The Legends at Sparks Marina Shopping

Center. The engineer stated he was filing a complaint against the architect and firm for non-payment of contract. A review of board databases and web sites revealed the respondents did not hold certificates of registration to practice architecture or engineering, nor did they hold a contractor's license. Subsequent investigation revealed the respondents also held themselves out and engaged in the practice of architecture and registered interior design for the Cadillac Ranch project located in the Town Square Shopping Center located in Las Vegas.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning the projects and a letter of 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 Guilt Clause, an administrative penalty of \$15,000 and investigative costs in the amount of \$2,000. Staff recommends approval of the settlement agreement.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 6A-2 Case No. 10-037N – In the matter of Jack Tam and Team 7 International

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

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1 (a)(b)(c) by holding themselves and their firm out as being qualified to practice architecture and registered interior design, and by engaging in the practices of architecture and registered interior design for a commercial tenant improvement project located in Las Vegas, Nevada, without having certificates of registration issued by the board.

Information was obtained from a registered architect who had been asked by the respondents to be the architect of record for the HANNspree retail store located in the Miracle Mile Shops in Las Vegas, Nevada. The respondents did not relinquish control of the project and terminated the registered architect. The registered architect met with board staff to discuss his concerns.

Subsequent investigation revealed documentation showing the respondents had entered into a contract with the client to provide services that fall under the practice of architecture, travelled to Nevada and met with the clients and Miracle Mile Shop management, and prepared and submitted preliminary drawings to the Miracle Mile Shops in Planet Hollywood, without having certificates of registration issued by the Board.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this 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 Guilt Clause, an administrative penalty of \$7,500 and investigative costs in the amount of \$2,000. Staff recommends approval of the settlement agreement.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 6A-3 Case No. 11-014N – In the matter of Jason Foster, Jesse Hulse and Atlas Architects, Inc.

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

The respondents are alleged to have violated NRS 623.182 and NRS 623.360.1(a)(b) by holding themselves out as being qualified to practice architecture for an elementary school project located in Wendover, Nevada without having been certificates of registration by the board.

The respondents submitted a Statement of Qualifications to the Elko County School District (ECSD) in response to an advertised request the district disseminated for architectural services for an elementary school project in

Wendover, Nevada. A review of the Statement of Qualifications revealed information listed under the firm's profile and on the respondent's resumes that was misleading to the ECSD. The firm's profile stated "The Atlas Architects design team consists of two licensed architects" and the respondents' resumes showed Mr. Foster as having professional licensure since 2002 and Mr. Hulse as having professional licensure since 2003 (no state was listed), thus leading the reader to believe that the respondents were in compliance with the requirements of the ECSD's Request for Qualifications from architects registered in the state of Nevada.

The respondents were sent a Notice of Charges concerning this 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 No Contest Clause, an Effect on Licensure Clause, an administrative penalty of \$5,000 and investigative costs in the amount of \$1,500. Staff recommends approval of the settlement agreement.

Garlock disclosed that his firm responded to the same RFQ. Board counsel advised that he could vote on the matter since he had no knowledge of this particular case.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 6A-4 Case No. 11-015N – In the matter of Kevin Madson and Kevin Madson and Associates

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

The respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.182 and NRS 623.360.1(a)(b) by holding himself and the firm out as being qualified to practice architecture for an elementary school project located in Wendover, Nevada without having a certificate of registration issued by the board.

The respondents submitted a Statement of Qualifications to the Elko County School District (ECSD) in response to an advertised request the district disseminated for architectural services for an elementary school project in Wendover, Nevada. A review of the NSBA database revealed that the Respondent Madson and his employees are not licensed architects in the state of Nevada. A review of the Nevada State Land Surveyors and Engineers Board website revealed the consulting "engineers" listed in the Statement of Qualifications (i.e. Civil, Structural, Mechanical and Plumbing) were not licensed in the state of Nevada.

A response to the Notice of Investigation was received. The respondent stated in part, "I am certified with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards and proposed services knowing that with certification from NCARB, I am registered as a licensed architect nationwide."

The respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning this 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 \$2,500 and investigative costs in the amount of \$1,500. Staff recommends approval of the settlement agreement.

Garlock disclosed that his firm responded to the same RFQ.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 6B **Discussion and possible decision regarding closure of enforcement cases**

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

08-091N 11-012N 11-016N

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 6C **Enforcement report**

There was no report.

AGENDA ITEM 7 **Board review of continuing education waiver requests**

Request from Jeffrey Dacks, #2236

Spaulding stated that Mr. Dacks is carrying over four structured units from 2010. She said that because he is requesting a two-year waiver, the board must decide if it should make a decision for only 2011 and require Mr. Dacks to reapply for 2012, or address the request for both years today.

Board members read the request from Jeffrey Dacks and discussed its merits.

Motion: Garlock moved to deny Jeffery Dacks's request for an exemption from the 2011 and 2012 continuing education requirement because the board found Mr. Dacks did not meet the requirements of NAC 623.638.

Motion seconded by Tanner

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 8 **Review and decision regarding the Master Calendar for FY 2011-2012**

Board members moved the proposed October 2011 meeting to October 18.

Motion: Ciesynski moved to approve the Master Calendar for FY 2011-2012. Motion seconded by Tindall.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 9A **Discussion and possible decision regarding the draft NCARB Resolutions which will be presented for discussion at the Regional Meeting on March 25-26, 2011**

Spaulding led board members through the draft NCARB Resolutions.

Resolution 2011-A: Spaulding said this is NCARB's first attempt to create uniformity in CEU regulations. Board members said it was a good effort at model regulations, but Nevada would not be changing its law.

Resolution 2011-B: Spaulding said this is another change to model regulation. Board members expressed frustration over the watering-down of IDP. They are neutral on this resolution.

Resolution 2011-C: Spaulding said this is a clarification to language in the BEA requirements. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-D: Spaulding said this is a change to the BEFA program. Board members expressed opposition to the BEFA program and this resolution.

Resolution 2011-E: Spaulding said this is clarification to language in the *Handbook for Interns and Architects*. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-F: Spaulding said this is clarification to language in the *Handbook for Interns and Architects*. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-G: Spaulding said this is clarification to language in the *Handbook for Interns and Architects*. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-H: Spaulding said this is NCARB's attempt to increase dues. Board members said they want to hear the discussion on this item to see why the increase is necessary.

Resolution 2011-I: Spaulding said this is a bylaw amendment to create an audit committee. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-J: Spaulding said this is a bylaw amendment to change the treasurer's responsibilities. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-K: Spaulding said this is a bylaw amendment with committee descriptions. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-L: Spaulding said this is a bylaw amendment to create a method for reinstatement. Board members did not express opposition to this resolution.

Resolution 2011-M: Spaulding said this makes numerous "housekeeping" changes to the bylaws. Spaulding said she wanted clarification on the additional language on page 28 that says, "with whom NCARB has an agreement for mutual reciprocity." Board members said they should get clarification.

AGENDA ITEM 9B **FYI: 2011 Candidate Resumes for NCARB officer positions**

Spaulding said this item was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 9C **FYI: NCARB Fast Facts, March 2011**

Spaulding said this item was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 9D **FYI: NCARB News Clip: NCARB Grant Recipients**

Spaulding said this item was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 9E **FYI: ARE Pass Rates for 2010**

Spaulding said this item was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 10A **FYI: NCIDQ BOD meeting minutes: March-December 2010 and January 2011**

Spaulding said this item was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 10B **FYI: NCIDQ Council of Delegates meeting minutes: 11/12-13/10**

Spaulding said this item was provided for board members' information.

AGENDA ITEM 11 **Residential design issues**

Spaulding said there were eight candidates for the spring written exam. Two of those candidates passed and will be getting registered at the June meeting.

Tindall said he has almost finalized a new stamp design for residential designers. He said he is trying to get feedback from all residential designers.

AGENDA ITEM 12 **Executive director report**

Spaulding reported that 531 registrants did not renew their certificates, which is a 15 percent attrition rate. Spaulding said she predicted a 20 percent rate. In a "normal" year, the attrition rate is 10 percent.

Spaulding updated board members on board financial reports. She reported that she is moving board accounts to "public fund accounts," as required by the state.

Spaulding said the June board meeting will be June 15, instead of June 8 as originally planned.

Spaulding updated board member on bill tracking for the 2011 Legislative Session.

Ling discussed the governor's Executive Order regarding administrative regulations. Spaulding said she and Ling could go through the review and present recommendations to the board, prior to the December 2011 deadline. She added that the board has completed most of the review recently, as part of the standard three year review.

AGENDA ITEM 13 **Public information report**

Hatfield said the last issue of *Focus* is in the agenda books. She said the next issue would go out in April. She said that the statistics are also included for their information.

AGENDA ITEM 14 **Formal contested administrative hearing – In the matter of Donald Ralph Parsons, Case 08-076N, consideration and adjudication of the complaint alleging violations of NRS 623.023, NRS 623.330, NRS 623.360, NRS 623.365 and NAC 623.0195**

Ling said the backup information for the case was in the board agenda books. The case was prepared for a formal hearing, but a settlement agreement was entered into late last week.

The Respondent is alleged to have violated NRS 623.360.1(a)(b)(c) by holding himself out as being qualified to practice architecture, and by engaging in the practice of architecture, for three projects located in Nevada without having a certificate of registration issued by the board.

During a routine visit to the Fernley Building Department it was discovered that the respondent worked outside of the contractor's exemption when he submitted a set of construction documents for a tenant improvement project, which despite his attestation to the City of Fernley Building Department, had not been prepared by either himself

or a bona fide employee of his firm, Don Parsons Construction. Further investigation uncovered two additional projects that were submitted by the respondent under the same circumstances.

The respondent was sent a Notice of Charges concerning these projects and a letter of response was received. The respondent's case was discussed with Chief Investigator Ruark and 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 and confession of judgment were negotiated. The settlement agreement incorporated a Guilt Clause, an administrative penalty of \$5,500 and investigative costs in the amount of \$5,100. Staff recommends approval of the settlement agreement.

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM 15 **Items for future agenda**

- Discuss NRS 623.349
- Continued NAC 623 review
- Review of new CIDA standards and possible update of RID Substantially Equivalent application
- Firm name retention policy
- Review of registration/renewal form

AGENDA ITEM 16 **Public comment**

There was no public comment.

Acting Chairman Henry adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Larry Henry, Secretary/Treasurer

Gina Spaulding, Executive Director