

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, LAND SURVEYORS, AND GEOLOGISTS

Office of the Attorney General
110 West A Street, 13th floor conference room
San Diego, CA 92101
February 12-13, 2014
Beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Wednesday, February 12, 2014

Board Members Present:	Erik Zinn, President; Kathy Jones Irish, Vice President; Natalie Alavi; Asha Brooks; Diane Hamwi; Eric Johnson; Coby King; Ray Satorre; Jerry Silva; Robert Stockton; and Patrick Tami
Board Members Absent:	Philip Quartararo and Dr. Hong Beom Rhee
Board Staff Present:	Ric Moore (Executive Officer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Manager); Celina Calderone (Board Liaison); Jeff Alameida (Budget Analyst); Ray Mathe (Examinations Manager); and Angelique Scott (Legal Counsel).

I. Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Zinn at 9:02 a.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.

During this time Board members and staff introduced themselves.

II. Public Comment

Mr. Joe Silva, a Chemical Engineer, provided his view on the difference between Practice Act and Title Act engineers. He provided examples of accomplishments of the Title Act discipline specifically pertaining chemical engineering during World War II. He requested that the Board consider allowing Chemical Engineers to offer services.

Mr. Art Sutton spoke in support of Joe Silva's request. He suggested that the Board consider a study of professional engineering in California.

IX. Technical Advisory Committees (TACs)

A. Board Assignments to TACs

No report given

B. Appointment of TAC Members

No report given

C. Reports from the TACs

Carl Josephson, former Structural Engineer Board Member, reported that the Structural Engineering TAC met on December 19, 2013. He provided some

background on two items that were reviewed by the SE TAC. One was the proposed legislation by SEAOC, and the second issue was whether the NCEES 16-hour SE exam was appropriate for California. He explained that buildings in California are allowed to be designed by civil engineers with the exception of schools and hospitals. The restrictions to practice structural engineering are not in the Professional Engineers Act. A problem exists when out-of-state engineers look for the restrictions of practice, they are not able to find them because they are contained in other laws; therefore, the out-of-state engineers assume there are no restrictions on the practice of structural engineering by civil engineers. He added that it is also not clear to engineers within the state.

Mr. Josephson pointed out that SEAOC is proposing to bring the language that has the restriction of practice into to the PE Act to help clarify this issue. Originally they hoped to expand the type of structures that could only be designed by structural engineers to those that are referred to as “significant structures,” which is similar to what is currently being done in other states. However, SEAOC has decided to start by placing language in the PE ACT regarding the current structures that must be designed by a structural engineer for better clarity and transparency. Because SEAOC does not yet have written language to present to the legislature, the SE TAC deferred making any recommendations on this proposal until they see the language. The SE TAC is supportive of the concept but will wait until they review the language. Mr. Moore reported that staff has been working with SEAOC and the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee. There have been discussions to determine if the issue should be part of the Board’s Sunset Review. More information will be provided at a future Board meeting as it becomes available. President Zinn suggested that the Board be mindful not to restrict the practice of civil engineering further. Mr. Moore reported that NCEES is considering doing a study as it is becoming controversial and recently sent out a request to determine if a study would be appropriate. Mr. Tami reported that 75% of the states do not license by discipline, and 75% thought it should be status quo; however, over half indicated that it needed to be studied further.

The second issue Mr. Josephson covered with the SE TAC was regarding the NCEES 16-hour SE exam. He explained that California used to write its own SE exam. For years it was referred to as the 16-hour exam, and it was written and graded by SEAOC members. It then transitioned to being developed by the Board with the assistance of psychometricians. It was also referred to as the Western States exam, since other states, such as Washington and Hawaii also helped with the development and administered the exam for their applicants. When the National Structural exam became available, California used 8 hours of the National Structural exam and 8 hours of the California Exam. Candidates had to take and pass the full 16 hours. California then transitioned to the new 16-hour NCEES exam. Ed Huston,

who is from Washington and is the Chair of the NCEES structural engineering exam committee, attended the SE TAC meeting to discuss the exam. The exam leadership is continuing to do a quality control of the exam. Because the exam is written so far in advance, any changes will not occur for another year and a half. There will be another Professional Application and Knowledge (PAK) study in 2015-2016 which will change the language and tenor of the exam. Gregg Brandow, SE TAC Chair, reviewed and provided his impression of the exam. The recommendation to the Board is that the SE TAC continue to monitor the exam to see if it is appropriate for California. There is some concern in the structural engineering community as to whether the exam is covering high seismic areas. The recommendation was to encourage California structural engineers to continue to be involved in the writing and grading of the exam. There was also a discussion whether California should make its item bank available to NCEES, and the SE TAC recommends waiting on that issue.

Mr. Moore reported that on the Geology & Geophysics TAC meeting. He advised that the Washington State Geology Board has approached the Board about reciprocity between the two states. There was good dialogue about reciprocity. There were members of the Washington Board that attended the G&G TAC meeting. The experience and education requirements are very similar. The Washington Board understood that anyone that was an engineering geologist in Washington who wanted to be licensed in California would have to pass the California supplemental exam for Professional Geologists first and then provide obtain their license as a Certified Engineering Geologist. They also indicated that Oregon would be interested in reciprocity with California as there is a similar agreement between Washington and Oregon. President Zinn appointed a subcommittee to work with the Washington and Oregon Boards to compare examinations and test plan specifications. Mr. Moore noted that he attended the State Mining and Geology Board's Board meeting. They were very receptive in collaborating with the Board. President Zinn pointed out that the State Mining and Geology Board is under the Department of Conservation.

II. **Public Comment (cont.)**

Ms. Ellie Klausbruckner, Fire Protection Engineer, inquired as to the status of the study required by the PE Act regarding converting Titles Acts to Practice Acts.

X. **Liaison Reports**

A. ASBOG

No Report Given

B. ABET

No Report Given

C. NCEES

1. Nomination of Emeritus Members

VOTE: Mr. Tami and Mr. Satorre moved to recommend Mike Modugno and Carl Josephson be appointed as emeritus members to NCEES.

MOTION: 11-0, Motion carried

D. Technical and Professional Societies

Mr. Moore reported that he and Ms. Arnold attended the Architects Engineers Committee meeting to collaborate and discuss legislative efforts. Mr. Mathe and Mr. Moore spoke at an event in Humboldt to discuss enforcement, monument preservation, and the Joint Professional Practice Committees (JPPC).

Mr. Mathe was asked to be a participant on a panel discussing the Qualifications Based Selection laws and process at Fresno State at which ACEC moderated. Mr. Mathe is attempting to get both ACEC and CLSA to collaborate on communicating with governmental entities the requirements for QBS when contracting for professional services, such as engineering and land surveying

Mr. Moore will be meeting with the Building Standards Commission to discussing working together and possibly hosting a joint TAC meeting at which the BSC Executive Officer and staff could make a presentation.

Ms. Jones Irish asked if it would be possible to share Board staff's speaking engagements calendars with the Board member to assist in outreach. She also inquired if Board members were to participate, if they would be compensated for their travel. Mr. Moore noted that travel has to be reviewed and approved on a case-by-case basis.

III. Executive Officer's Report

A. Legislation

1. Discussion of Legislation for 2014: AB 186; AB 1551

Mr. Alameida reported that AB 186 would authorize a board within DCA to issue a temporary license for 12 months to an applicant who meets certain requirements. It passed the Assembly and is being heard in Senate B, P & ED Committee. Concerns were raised because of the California State exams that require passage prior to issuing a license to the individuals. The Board has offered amendments to the author, and it appears as though there are more amendments from other boards and organizations. The author's staff identified that there is amended language that is not in print but will be provided by February 21, 2014, which is the deadline for new language to be presented.

Mr. Alameida reporting on AB 1551, which would prohibit a person from using a licensed engineer's or land surveyor's documents without the

written consent of the licensee. It would also allow the licensee to withhold consent under certain circumstances.

After much discussion regarding the underlying intent of the proposal; the confusion that would be caused by the wording in the legislation; and concerns with the effect the proposal would have on public agencies, other licensees, and consumers, the following motion was made:

MOTION: Mr. Silva and Mr. Satorre moved to support AB 1551 if amended.

VOTE: 5-5-1, Ms. Jones Irish, Ms. Brooks, Ms. Hamwi, Mr. King, and Mr. Stockton opposed and President Zinn abstained. Motion Failed.

After further discussion as to the Board's role as a consumer protection agency and whether the language as proposed would be enforceable by the Board, the following motion was made:

MOTION: Mr. King and Ms. Jones Irish moved to direct staff to work with Assembly Member Holden's office to change language in AB 1551 so that the Board would have the authority to take disciplinary action against a licensee if they have been found to have violated copyright.

Ms. Eissler requested clarification as to whether the intent of the motion was that the Board would not be taking a formal position on this bill at this time. Following discussion regarding the timing of the legislative session and future Board meetings, Mr. King and Ms. Jones Irish withdrew the prior motion, and the following motion was made:

MOTION: Mr. King and Ms. Hamwi moved that the Board oppose AB1551 unless amended and to work with Assembly Member Holden's office to craft language that will allow the Board to take disciplinary action on any licensee that violates the intellectual property rights of another licensee.

VOTE: 5-5-1, Ms. Jones Irish, Ms. Alavi, Ms. Brooks, Mr. Silva and Mr. Tami opposed and Mr. Satorre abstained. Motion failed.

After a brief discussion of the intent of the Board in taking a position on the bill, the following motion was made:

MOTION: Mr. King and Mr. Stockton moved to support AB1551 only if it is amended to narrow the scope of the proposal to only allow the Board to impose disciplinary action against a

licensee who has been found by a court of law to have violated the intellectual property rights of another licensee.

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

2. Status of Board Legislative Proposals for 2014
 - a. Petitions for Reinstatement – Geologists and Geophysicist Act
 - b. Petroleum Geologists Qualifications
 - c. Remove “eight-hour” term from Section 6759 of the Business and Professions Code

Mr. Alameida reported that all of the proposals have been accepted for inclusion in the Senate B, P, & ED Committee’s omnibus bill.

Mr. Moore explained that the removal of the reference to “eight-hour” exams in Section 6759, which relates to comity applicants, is based on a recommendation from NCEES since the trend is to move away from exams that are a specified time period in length, especially with the conversion to computer-based tests. Mr. Moore noted that the Board has not yet voted on this proposal.

MOTION: Mr. King and Mr. Johnson moved to approve the removal of the “eight-hour” term from Section 6759.

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

B. Strategic Plan

Mr. Alameida provided updates on the various tasks within the Strategic Plan. He explained that the development of a new Strategic Plan will begin this year. The Board will be working together with DCA’s SOLID.

Mr. Moore updated the Board on out-of-state travel approval requests for functions hosted by NCEES and ASBOG. He explained that the Board’s request to attend the NCEES Western Zone meeting was denied; however, we are still awaiting a response on the request to attend the ASBOG exam development meeting. He advised that the next request to be submitted for approval will be for the NCEES Annual Meeting.

Mr. Tami would like to see the inclusion of a BCP to develop exams on the next agenda if our out-of-state travel requests continue to be denied.

Mr. Moore indicated he will work with SOLID to determine what dates they can meet with the Board to begin the Strategic Plan process.

C. Personnel

Mr. Moore reported that two Staff Services Manager I positions are available at the Board and that restructuring among staff is taking place.

D. Administrative Task Force
No Report Given

E. BreEZe Status Update

Mr. Moore provided some background of the BreEZe implementation. Release II is anticipated for fall 2014; and Release III may be implemented by the end of 2015. We are in Release III. The Release I boards had to dedicate more staff and resources for the design, testing, and implementation than first anticipated.

Ms. Eissler explained further that more time is needed to ensure the design is appropriate for each individual board than had been originally anticipated. She added that DCA, the Legislature, and the Governor's administration have all been supportive of authorizing additional resources for the boards to implement BreEZe.

IV. Enforcement

A. Enforcement Statistical Reports

Ms. Eissler provided an update on the enforcement program statistics through January 31, 2014. Enforcement staff is making progress on resolving older cases. Mr. Tami expressed his frustration with the length of time it takes to close cases; he would like a chart that indicates when a case is postmarked to the time it is opened. Ms. Eissler indicated that DCA and the Legislature are aware of the concerns all boards have with the ability of the Office of Administrative Hearings to hear cases in a timely manner, which is a factor in the length of time it takes cases to be resolved. Mr. Tami does not want fault to lie with other agencies. Ms. Eissler advised that the Sunset Review process provides opportunity to present these issues and obtain additional resources if appropriate.

Mr. Moore would like to implement training for experts to ensure that the experts are producing effective reports to assist staff in meeting the 12-month goal for investigations. He also reported that we recognize that there are things we can do in terms of working with the Division of Investigations and the Attorney General's Office, as well as internally.

B. Investigative Timeline Goal

Mr. Moore reported that he, Ms. Eissler, and Ms. Criswell reviewed cases over a year old and provided recommendations and determined the direction of the case. After reviewing approximately eighty cases, Mr. Moore believes twelve months is a reasonable time period for the investigative portion and does not think it is realistic to go further.

Mr. Moore indicated that twelve months would be the maximum amount of time to complete an investigation. Mr. Tami would like to see a maximum time of six months. Mr. King pointed out that investigations take time and due

process must be followed. Ms. Eissler explained that she would have concerns with not giving people sufficient time to respond. She stated that the point of the investigation is not to prove that the subject violated the law but to obtain sufficient evidence to determine whether or not a violation occurred. She indicated there would be concerns if things were done to drastically reduce the time period in which people were given to respond during the investigation; however, from the review of the cases, it is clear that once the information is received, it needs to be dealt with more quickly by the Enforcement Unit staff.

Mr. Moore explained due process and outlined some of the delays that occur during the investigation phase.

Ms. Eissler reported that there was an extreme backlog in issuing citations, scheduling informal conferences, and sending the appeals to the Attorney General's Office, as well as an extreme backlog in referring cases to the AG's Office for formal disciplinary action. These backlogs have now been eliminated, which was the first step in dealing with the overall aging of cases. She explained that the effect of this is that the aging of the final citations and final formal disciplinary actions increases as the older cases move through the process.

Mr. Tami inquired what the average goal is if twelve months is the maximum amount of time. Mr. Moore indicated that the average would be six months and explained that the ones that have aged the most have been very complicated and are not the majority; the average should be below the 6-month timeframe.

Ms. Jones Irish would like a report on the number of cases that have come in to get a sense of the flow. Ms. Alavi requested the aging of open cases based on when they are opened. Ms. Eissler indicated that she would prepare the additional statistics for future Board meetings.

VIII. Administration

A. FY 2013/14 Budget Overview

Mr. Alameida presented the 2013/14 budget. He explained how it is assembled, how revenue is collected, and how expenditures are forecast. He provided examples of how regulatory fees are collected and provided the revenue codes for the Board's application/license fees, renewal fees, and delinquency fees.

Mr. Alameida explained the PELS fund condition for the current fiscal year and the Governor's proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2014-15. He indicated that the current months in reserve for the PELS fund are 6.4 months and 7.2 for the G&G fund. He reported that there is \$7 million in General Fund loans to the administration that are still outstanding. It was indicated that pay \$2.5

million will be paid back this year and another \$500,000 annually until the reimbursement goal is met. The loans were a result of the downturn in the economy; therefore, the administration took loans from boards, bureaus, and departments. He noted that the information is available to the public on the Department of Finance's website.

The estimated expenditures approved by the Governor for Fiscal Year 2013-14 for PELS were \$9.7 million and \$1.37 million for G&G. It is projected that there will be \$8 million in expenditures for PELS and \$1.2 million for G&G. The difference goes into the fund balance.

Mr. Alameida presented charts which outlined the Board's expenditures and revenue. He detailed the budget further and answered questions from the Board members.

B. FY 2014/15 Budget Introduction

Mr. Alameida introduced the budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15 which outlined the amount appropriated in the Governor's proposed budget.

C. Out-of-state Travel Update

No additional report given beyond the information provided during the Strategic Plan discussion.

VII. Consideration of Rulemaking Proposals

A. Proposal to Amend Board Rules 416 and 3060 (16 CCR 416 and 3060) (Substantial Relationship Criteria)

Ms. Eissler explained that the Board has the authority to deny issuing a license or to take disciplinary action against a license if the person has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the profession. She advised that there is a general section in the Business and Professions Code that requires all boards to have regulations that define what is meant by this "substantial relationship."

At the August Board meeting, staff was directed to review language from other boards' regulations regarding what they include for substantial relationship and provide a recommendation to add more items to give applicants and licensees a better idea of what is meant by the phrase when it comes to criminal convictions that could affect their ability to obtain or keep a license. It was determined that the language used by the Contractors State License Board was most applicable to our Board. The proposed amendments would add the following language:

- Crimes or acts involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or theft with the intent to substantially benefit oneself or another or to substantially harm another;
- Crimes or acts involving physical violence against persons;

- Crimes or acts that indicate a substantial or repeated disregard for the health, safety, or welfare of the public.

Staff recommends adding this language to Sections 416 and 3060, with additional clean-up of the phrasing so the two sections mirror each other and correctly reflect the language used in statute.

Mr. Tami expressed concerns with the word “substantial.” He felt that it is not clearly defined. He would also like to strike the words “against persons” relating to the physical violence provision.

Mr. King explained how the word “substantial” is typically interpreted by the courts.

MOTION: Mr. King and Mr. Tami moved to strike “against persons” in subdivisions 416(e) and 3060(d).

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

MOTION: Mr. Silva and Mr. Satorre moved to approve the proposal and direct staff to begin the rulemaking process to amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations sections 416 and 3060.

VOTE: 10-1, Mr. Tami opposed
Motion passed.

B. Proposal to Amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 426.10, 426.14 and 426.50 (Qualifying Experience)

Ms. Eissler reported that the staff recommends amending Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 426.10, 426.14, and 426.50 pertaining to the qualification and experience requirements for engineers. The current language is not clear and does not provide a firm date that establishes when qualifying experience begins.

Ms. Brooks left the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

MOTION: Mr. King and Mr. Stockton moved to approve the proposed amendments and direct staff to begin the formal rulemaking process to amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 426.10, 426.14, and 426.50 and clarify all references to qualifying experience regarding structural engineer qualifications.

VOTE: 10-0, Ms. Brooks was not present for the vote.

Ms. Brooks returned to the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

C. Update on Board Rules 475, 476, and 3065 (16 CCR 475, 476, and 3065)
Code of Professional Conduct

Ms. Eissler reported that the proposal to amend the sections has been approved by the Office of Administrative Law, and the amendments will go into effect on April 1, 2014.

D. Adoption of Proposed Amendments to (16 CCR section 3003 (b) and (e))
(Definitions of Engineering Geology and Professional Geophysical Work)

MOTION: President Zinn and Mr. King moved to adopt the proposed changes to Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 3003 (b) and (e) and direct staff to finalize the rulemaking file for submittal to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Office of Administrative Law for review and approval.

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

MOTION: Ms. Jones Irish and Mr. King moved to delegate the authority to the Executive Officer to finalize the rulemaking file.

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

E. Adoption of Proposed Amendments to (16 CCR section 3005) (Retired Status
Fee for Professional Geologists and Geophysicists)

MOTION: President Zinn and Mr. King moved to adopt the proposed changes to Title 16, California Code of Regulations sections 3005 and direct staff to finalize the rulemaking file for submittal to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Office of Administrative Law or review and approval.

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

MOTION: Mr. Stockton and Ms. Hamwi moved to delegate the authority to the Executive Officer to finalize the rulemaking file.

VOTE: 11-0, Motion passed.

XIV. Approval of Consent Items (These items are before the Board for consent and will be approved with a single motion. Any item that a Board member wishes to discuss will be removed from the consent items and considered separately.)

A. Approval of the Minutes of the December 5, 2013, Board Meeting

MOTION: Mr. King and Mr. Satorre moved to approve the minutes.

VOTE: 9-0-2, Motion passed; Ms. Brooks and Ms. Alavi abstained.

The Board recessed at 4:53 p.m.

Thursday, February 13, 2014

Board Members Present:	Erik Zinn, President; Natalie Alavi; Asha Brooks; Diane Hamwi; Eric Johnson; Coby King; Ray Satorre; Jerry Silva; Robert Stockton; and Patrick Tami
Board Members Absent:	Kathy Jones Irish, Vice President; Philip Quartararo, and Dr. Hong Beom Rhee
Board Staff Present:	Ric Moore (Executive Officer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Manager); Celina Calderone (Board Liaison); Ray Mathe (Examinations Manager); and Angelique Scott (Legal Counsel).

I. Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Zinn at 9:03 a.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.

XVI. Hearing on the Petition for Reinstatement of Revoked License of Levi Rodriquez

The Board conducted the hearing on the Petition for Reinstatement of Revoked License of Levi Rodriquez.

XVII. Closed Session – Administrative Adjudication [Pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(3)] This Closed Session was held immediately following the hearing.

XI. Closed Session – Personnel Matters, Examination Procedures and Results, Administrative Adjudication, and Pending Litigation (As Needed) [Pursuant to Government Code sections 11126(a) and (b), 11126(c)(1), 11126(c)(3), 11126(e)(1), and 11126(e)(2)(B)(i)]

A. Civil Litigation

1. Dennis William McCreary vs. Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, Sierra County Superior Court Case No. 7361
2. Thomas Lutge v. Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, Department of Consumer Affairs, Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2012-80001329-CU-WM-GDS
3. Ruvn Grutman v. Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BS145675
4. Ruvn Grutman v. Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BS145796
5. Sassan Salehipour v. Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BS146185

XII. Open Session to Announce the Results of Closed Session

Ms. Eissler reported that during Closed Session, the Board directed the Administrative Law Judge to prepare the decision on the Petition for Reinstatement; the Board took action on four stipulations, one default decision,

and two proposed decisions; the Board discussed examination procedures and results; and the Board discussed litigation as noticed.

V. Exams/Licensing

A. Update on Fall 2013 Exams

Mr. Mathe presented the examination statistics. He indicated there were eight candidates who took the professional geophysicist examination; however, due to an insufficient number of Subject Matter Experts willing to attend the cut-score meeting, it had to be rescheduled for a later date. Mr. Mathe noted that there are only 174 Professional Geophysicists, and it is difficult to obtain sufficient participation to set the cut-score. Mr. Moore explained the examination is dependent on the recruitment of existing licensees to help with writing and reviewing items and determining the cut-score. Mr. Mathe noted that the overall no-show rate for all of the fall exams was 11%.

B. 2014 Exam Development Schedule

Mr. Mathe reviewed the examination schedule for 2014 and encouraged Board members to attend. Mr. Moore cautioned that there cannot be more than two Board members in attendance at a time as it would constitute a Board meeting.

C. Spring 2014 Exams

Mr. Mathe noted that eligibility lists will be sent to vendor for state examinations in the next few weeks.

D. Proposal to Post Sample CBT Questions for State Exams on the Board's Website

MOTION: Mr. Tami and Mr. Satorre moved to retire exam questions and make them available to candidates as soon as feasible.

VOTE: 10-0, Motion passed.

E. Approval of New Test Plan Specifications for the CSE, CEG, and CHG Exams

MOTION: Mr. Tami and President Zinn moved to adopt all three test plans.

VOTE: 10-0, Motion passed.

Mr. Johnson left the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

XV. Other Items Not Requiring Board Action

Mr. Moore reported that there were 226 certificates of recognition issued to Professional Engineers and 372 to Professional Geologists. He added that the Board continues to receive letters of appreciation from the licensees.

VI. Approval of Delinquent Reinstatements

No report given.

XIII. President's Report/Board Member Activities

Mr. Tami reported he attended the NCEES Advisory Committee on Council Activities meeting, the NCEES PS exam development meeting, and the Mobility Task Force meeting.

XV. Other Items Not Requiring Board Action (Cont.)

Ms. Eissler reported that there will be a petition hearing at the next Board meeting. Mr. King indicated that he will be unavailable on April 11, and Mr. Tami will not be available on April 10 and 11. Mr. Moore advised that he would poll the Board members regarding their availability.

XVIII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

PUBLIC PRESENT

Julius Reyes, PEGC

Carl Josephson

Joe R. Silva

Art Sutton

Bob DeWitt, ACEC

Don Woolley, Rick Engineering Company

Elley Klausbruckner, Klausbruckner & Associates

Adrian Contreras, AGO

Mehrdad Nabizadeh, PEGC