NEW MEXICO BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR ARCHITECTS

Minutes of a Special Board Meeting
October 24, 2014
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Synopsis of Meeting Topics:
Opening Business
Policy and Proposals
New Business
Executive Session
Reports

Board Members Present:
Michael Bodelson, Chair
Raymond Vigil, Vice Chair, Architect Member
Geoffrey Adams, Secretary/Treasurer, Educator/Architect Member
Jim Oschwald, Architect Member
Robert Calvani, Architect Member
Sam Valencia, Public Member

Board Members Absent:
Tara Rothwell-Clark, Architect Member

Staff Present:
Wren Propp, Director/CFO
Jackie Holmes, Investigator
Melanie Gonzales, Admin. Services Coordinator

Others Present:
Ron Burstein, AIA NM
Victor Johnson, AIA NM
Allan Baer, AIA SF
John A. Padilla, AIA SF, AIA National
4. Public Comment

Mr. Bodelson noted that a guest would like to speak at today's meeting. Bob Calvani stated that Kevin Sexton is not present yet and upon his arrival he could speak to the Public Comment section. Mr. Sexton arrived at 10:10am.

C. Policy and Proposals

1. Proposed Changes to NM Architectural Act

Section 16-15-4 Section J Powers and Duties of the Board Proposed Change:

J. The board may deny, review, suspend or revoke a registration to practice architecture and may censure, fine, reprimand, and place on probation and stipulation any architect in accordance with the Uniform Licensing Act for any cause stated in the Architectural Act. The board has the authority in accordance with the Uniform Licensing Act to administratively prosecute any unlicensed individual who violates provisions of the Architectural Act.

AND

The board may investigate and initiate a hearing on a complaint against a person who does not have a license, who is not exempt from the Architectural Act and who acts in the capacity of a registered architect within the meaning of the Architectural Act. A valid registration is required for a person to act as a registered architect or to solicit or propose to perform work involving the practice of architecture. If, after the hearing the board determines that based on the evidence the person committed a violation pursuant to the Architectural Act, it shall, in addition to any other sanction, action or remedy issue an order that imposes a civil penalty up to twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) per violation. In determining the amount of the civil penalty it imposes, the board shall consider: (1) the seriousness of the violation; (2) the economic benefit to the violator that was generated by the violator's commission of the violation (3) the violator's history of violations; (4) any other considerations the board deems appropriate.

Mr. Calvani stated that Section J is where the Board is making it clear that they can act and prosecute unlicensed individuals or where an individual violates provisions of the Architectural Act. He mentioned that the Board can initiate a hearing against a person who does not have a license and who is not exempt from the Architectural Act. The Board proposed to take its fines up to a maximum of $25,000.00 per violation with individuals who are unlicensed. This applies to any violation. Allan Baer asked if that meant in this jurisdiction. Mr. Calvani answered yes.
Mr. Bodelson stated that in the past the Board was precluded from providing information to the subject of the inquiry and the nature of the complaint. It has been a restriction and has inhibited clear communication.

Wren Propp stated that according to the language from the Attorney General’s Office the amendment would allow the Board to provide a copy of the complaint to the respondent so they would have more information. Currently, the way the statute is written now, staff will send out a Notice of Alleged Violation that includes all information, except for who has filed a complaint against them. She said that with this, the Board can provide a copy of the complaint in the beginning of any allegations of the violations of the Architectural Act.

Jim Oschwald asked if the Board only distributes names and addresses?

Mr. Calvani said yes and that NCARB will continue to ask the Board for more information.

Mr. Bodelson mentioned that NCARB may continue to ask for that information and the Board may need to discuss this in the future.

Mr. Calvani mentioned that if the intent is to avoid confusion, a Social Security number may be necessary. Mr. Calvani also stated that an address would be adequate.

Ms. Propp stated that NCARB also requested the date of birth.

Mr. Calvani stated that the Board has not moved on the NCARB request and they may continue to request this information.

Mr. Bodelson stated that the Board does not want to give the last four digits of a Social Security number for security reasons.

Other Board members raised concern that if NCARB collects Social Security numbers and date of birth, it could become the target of hackers for identity theft.

Mr. Vigil asked the idea behind the rosters being “distributed or sold?”

Ms. Propp stated that it is common language in a lot of practice statutes in New Mexico. The Board has never sold the roster but it does send it out on a regular basis to individuals that are trying to solicit business from licensed architects. It is in almost every practice act and the roster is now electronic.

Geoffrey Adams asked if NCARB wants more information, does this rule preclude the Board from doing that?

Assistant Attorney General Joshua Granada said that there could be an argument that the language does not preclude the Board from allowing the other information to be disseminated.

**Motion:** Motion to accept the Proposed Changes to Architectural Act Section 16-15-5 as amended

Section D & E

By: Robert Calvani

Second: Jim Oschwald

Board Vote: Passed unanimously
Mr. Bodelson commented that the population of younger professionals who are going to other states for licensure may be planning on getting reciprocity later.
Mr. Adams stated that it is important to identify the two groups. Individuals who had been licensed many years ago and who took the exam when there was a comprehensive design portion to the exam are in one group. He added that he has no objection to the licensure in New Mexico of that group. And if the NCARB’s current BEA/BEFA process is too rigorous, then maybe the Board should address that. He is also concerned with the individuals who complete a Bachelor’s of Architecture degree only and take off for a few years. He mentioned that he is more concerned with that group because the exam has changed and the comprehensive design portion has been deleted. NCARB has pushed NAAB to require NAAB-accredited programs to include a comprehensive design studio course. There is no exam to test that and this issue needed to be addressed, he said.
Mr. Vigil stated there is a lot of concern from Board members in terms of NCARB support. The Board was hoping to balance concerns but it is not a black and white solution. It will need to be flexible. When the Board raises the bar, some will be satisfied and other may not. The Board may not be able to rely on NCARB. It is important to look at New Mexico independently.
Mr. Adams asked if the Board is potentially establishing a broadly experienced architect committee. Mr. Calvani stated that a BEA committee may be a potential solution. It is important to note there may be costs associated with it.
Mr. Oschwald stated that there has been disparity regarding U.S. candidates compared to foreign candidates (BEFA program). The change NCARB has made in relation to Canada allows Canadians to be licensed in the United States after one year of practice. The NCARB BEA proposal matches that agreement. (With the proposed statute change) the Board is adding two additional years of experience onto that one year, a total of three consecutive years in responsible charge. He also commented that in his experience, he has never seen anyone just “meet the bar,” they were well beyond the years of experience required to enter into the BEA program. The Board needs to act on this because the Board cannot rely on NCARB to be the “gate keeper.” It is unfortunate that they were in that situation because the priority of NCARB is to remove hurdles in regards to reciprocity.
Mr. Calvani stated that it will be difficult for some people in New Mexico to show responsible charge if that is dependent on stamping drawings.
Mr. Bodelson commented that the agreement with Canada was based on the fact that the Canadian system was substantially similar in terms of requirements in the United States.
Mr. Oschwitz said NCARB needed an agreement that would work both ways. It was recognized that Canada’s education process was more rigorous.
Mr. Calvani asked if the Board needed to move on this at today’s meeting, in light of the fact that some of the Board members are going to hear what NCARB discusses.
Mr. Bodelson suggested that the Board could either pass, fail to pass, or the Board could table the item. He said that the Board’s intention was to get through proposals and take action on some of them.
Mr. Adams mentioned that it is a timing issue to a certain extent. Worst case scenario is that they adopt it and NCARB will not vote on it for about a year.
Mr. Vigil stated that it may get voted on in June 2015.
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Mr. Calvani stated that the Board was considering to strike G in order to put the verification back on NCARB with the BEA.
Allan Baer stated that he agreed with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Burstein mentioned that if NCARB does not follow through, and if the Board removed G., the Board has taken the path away completely for the people who are registered in other states, but are working in New Mexico, who want to become licensed in New Mexico.
He said he believed that this action could be dangerous, without knowing what NCARB will do.
Mr. Calvani stated that the proposed change was written assuming that the NCARB proposal will go through.
Mr. Bodelson stated that the Board is in a timing dilemma to move forward. With the legislature coming up and this ongoing issue with NCARB, the Board has to make some determination.
Mr. Vigil clarified that the Board is talking about section G as if this is a path that is being utilized currently. The Board has taken the position that they are using this as required by rule and they all agreed that the only way to use G is by going to NCARB. He felt that the discussion was confusing the two issues in terms of what is available to them now and what is not. NCARB is what is available to (potential registrants) now, and that is the way the Board views the rule.
Mr. Burstein stated that G is a valuable tool, where by rule if you do not like a one-year experience requirement, you can enact a three-year experience requirement and you can still create your panel and say that the Board is going to license from other jurisdictions and broadly experienced architects who meet the Board requirements. In addition, he mentioned that the Board does not have to use it.
He does not understand the reason for striking G based on what he has heard here today.
Mr. Baer stated that it is cynical attitude for the Board to take if they have a paragraph like G and some well-intentioned person from another state reads the rule of the Board and assumes that they can come to New Mexico and get their license through rule G. If in fact the Board has decided they are not going to do rule G., it may be unfair.
Mr. Bodelson said the Board recognizes the conflict between the rule and the statute, which is paragraph G. The intent is to basically create the compatibility between rule and statute. The Board does not disagree.
Ms. Propp explained the history behind 61-15-6, as this was an avenue when NCARB had no broadly experienced architect or broadly experienced foreign architect process. And without an NCARB certificate, the way that G was put into practice, was that those who would not qualify for an NCARB certificate, could apply. Section G really is from a different time. She added a comment that this discussion is important because if the Board were to rewrite G to become a more modern circumstance, that would be more preferable. The Board could put back into the rule that people did not have NCARB certificate. The important thing back in history was that you either qualified for an NCARB certificate or you did not. There was no choice and that is what G entailed. It was about the people who had no choice and they were not going to qualify for an NCARB certificate back then. But there were people who were practicing and licensed elsewhere and wanted to practice in New Mexico.
Mr. Johnson mentioned that recognizing the critical criterion was that these people passed the ARE, and they had been examined through other states. It is not that they were just practicing in a
Motion: Motion to table the Proposed Changes to Architectural Act Section 61-15-6 for Registration F through G, until the November 21, 2014 meeting.
By: Jim Oschwald—motion to table 61.15.6 until November 21, 2014 meeting.
Second: Geoffrey Adams
Board Vote: Passed Unanimously

Mr. Bodelson stated that the Board has full intention to engage actively with AIA on all legislative initiatives. This is imperative, and he hoped that the AIA recommends this as well, that having a uniform presentation to legislature is paramount to a successful revision to the statute. The AIA’s help and engagement is appreciated and necessary.

An AIA member asked for a summary of the NCARB meeting to be passed along to AIA.

Ms. Propp said NCARB will keep the information confidential until they are ready to release it. Whatever is public, the Board will release it to the AIA members. AIA lobbyists and representatives are usually at NCARB meetings; perhaps AIA could get updates through this individual.

Section 61-15-6 Requirements for Registration

K. Companies owned by New Mexico currently licensed architects and engineers are exempt from the following:

In the case of practice through a business entity, services or work involving the practice of architecture may be offered through the business entity; provided the registered architect in responsible charge of the activities of the business entity involved in such practice is an employee of the business entity with the authority to bind the entity by contract. Architects may join or form a professional corporation or limited-liability company of registrants and licensees outside of their field of practice or with persons who are not registered or licensed, if control and two-thirds ownership or membership of the Professional Corporation or Limited Liability Company is held by persons registered or licensed in this state pursuant to this chapter. Proof following registration of the Professional Corporation or limited liability Company with the New Mexico secretary of state shall be required. All plans, designs, drawings, specifications or reports that are involved in the practice and issued by or for the business entity Professional Corporation or Limited Liability Company shall bear the seal and signature of a registered architect in responsible charge of the work when issued. The architect in responsible charge of activities of the business entity Professional Corporation or limited liability Company offering architectural services shall provide the board with an affidavit documenting the authority and shall notify the board of a termination of the authority. “Design/build” means a partnership or corporation offering a combination of architectural services together with construction services which may offer to render architectural services only if:

1. an architect registered in this state or otherwise permitted to offer architectural services participates substantially in all material aspects of the offering:
obviously know this; firms owned by engineers know that they are not required to comply. And that is recognizing that there is an innate relationship, architects and engineers practice professions collectively.

Mr. Vigil stated that because of this scenario, what if he/she hires a rocket engineer? It has to be re-worded to accomplish what the proposal is saying.

Mr. Bodelson commented that it’s the ownership, it could be “companies wholly owned by New Mexico architects or engineers.”

Mr. Vigil asked if it addresses the Merricks of the world, or another entity.

Mr. Bodelson says yes it does address the issue.

Mr. Oeschwald said it does not address the issue because the 2/3 ownership might be an issue. URS is a publically held company and publically held companies aren’t necessarily held by architects and engineers. Two-thirds of the ownership may be plumbers or beauticians or whatever.

Mr. Bodelson said that the intent is to acknowledge in terms of relationships between the two professions.

Ms. Propp stated that she has been working on this language. She can go back and find out the parameters of corporations under the Secretary of State’s office. The Board should start off with the boundary regarding professional corporations since the Secretary of State’s office has a definition for companies that are here to do one thing, like practice medicine. Section K. has been an issue for some time. She also stated this is model law that NCARB has worked hard on for design/build. If the Board would like to start the discussion of giving architects, who are practicing in New Mexico, some parameters for practicing under design/build. There is more than what exists now.

Mr. Bodelson stated that he felt this is good language. He suggested that the Board begin to re-craft the exemptions and proceed with the language that the Board already has.

Mr. Sexton stated that by limiting this to professional corporations or limited liability companies, there are entities that do businesses in other legal formations that are excluded. He is not sure that the Board would want to exclude a DBA for example. And as it is currently written, he is not sure this would cover existing firms. For example: it says “architects may join or form,” but what if they are already within a formed entity? He is not sure if this covers existing entities. Another point, it states “proof following registration,” but proof of what? Mr. Sexton said he would assume that the Board means proof of ownership. He suggested adding “proof of ownership.” In addition, he stated another way to address the issue of exemptions is to state “or otherwise permitted by this Act.” He was also concerned about language regarding “all plans, designs, drawings, etc.” Is the Board broadening the requirement for stamping drawings? For example, if he/she is providing, through my entity, drawings related to a residence, which otherwise may not require a stamp, does this now require that the drawings be stamped? He asked if this would enlarge the requirement for stamping plans by that language.

Mr. Bodelson asked if that was prior language, is that correct?

Ms. Propp stated yes it is.

Mr. Bodelson stated that the Board should revisit that.
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public entity. The reason was that these are operated by corporations, but owned by Department of Energy.
Ms. Propp stated that she did not get that email.
Mr. Oschwald stated that he understood the idea of the folks working behind the federal fence but you have the Corps of Engineers who operate boundlessly throughout the state and they have engineers and architects who are not licensed in the state.
Mr. Bodelson added that they perform work on federal installations, correct?
Mr. Vigil stated that not necessarily. They can operate anywhere.
Mr. Bodelson mentioned that there is a problem because the statute applied to architects working at Sandia, Kirtland, etc., and they are not compliance. The arrangement that the entities for the federal installations pursue was not in accordance with the Act. They are all in violation. The Board needs to make an adjustment to accommodate that. They are operating strictly for work within their bounds. He suggested that the Board look at that other language that seemed to be working for the engineers.
Ms. Propp stated that she was not familiar with Engineering Practice Act and she would need to review it.
Mr. Vigil made a motion to table Section 61-15-8
Mr. Bodelson asked if there are comments from the guests.
Mr. Vigil made the motion to re-craft and table Section 61-15-8 Item A2 for the next board meeting.

Motion: Motion to re-craft and table the Proposed Changes to Architectural Act Section 61-15-8 Section A 2 until November 21, 2014 meeting.
By: Mr. Vigil- to re-craft the exemptions and table until November 21, 2014 meeting
Second: Jim Oschwald
Board Vote: Passed Unanimously

Section 61-15-9 Section B Project Exemptions

Tabled by Board February 8, 2013, further discussed at August 1, 2014 Board meeting)

B. A person who is not an architect may prepare building plans and specifications unless the building plans and specifications involve public safety or health but the work shall be done only on:
   (1) single family dwellings not more than two stories in height;
   (2) [multiple dwellings not more than two stories in height contacting not more than four dwelling units of wood frame construction; provided, this paragraph shall be construed to allow a person who is not registered under the Architectural Act to design clusters of up to four dwelling units each to form apartment or condominium complexes where the total exceeds four dwelling units on any lawfully divided lot.]

Mr. Calvani stated that this was brought about to get rid of exemptions for multiple dwellings. The only exemption would be single family dwellings, not more than two stories in height.
2. Discussion of NCARB BEA/BEFA Proposed Changes

Mr. Calvani stated that the Board has already discussed this topic.

Mr. Bodelson opened the floor to discuss any issues the Board covered or other items.
Mr. Sexton stated that he does not have an agenda but he does represent architects and engineers. He added that as a lawyer, he looks at the legal perspective. He stated that he gets concerned about how open and transparent the process is and the exchange of information. In a complaint, he felt there is an opportunity to understand what the complaint is, what evidence is there. If there is a complaint and there is no avenue for discovering what are the details and what is it that they are being accused of, that gets into cloudy situation because you are not sure what you are responding to, other than a summary of allegations.

Mr. Bodelson asked if the changes the Board is suggesting will correct the situation.
Mr. Sexton said yes and if the Board issues fines into $25,000.00, there will be an increase desire to have very specific information and want more due process. When the Board limited the fine to $1000.00, individuals may accept a more expedited process. With larger amounts, he felt the Board would invite more involved process and evidentiary issues.
Mr. Calvani stated that one of the things the Board does is protect the term “architect,” and any term that makes the public think that a person is practicing architecture by using this term. The Board fines people under the statute where it says they are unlicensed and that this Board has jurisdiction to do so.

Mr. Sexton explained that there have been discussions on that. For example, he knew of a person who represents himself as an architectural photographer. Has he violated the mandates of the Board by calling himself an architectural photographer? Someone else may call themselves an architectural engineer, that’s his degree out of Texas. If he calls himself an architectural engineer and he is only licensed as an engineer, has he violated the state statute as representing himself as an architect? The other concern he had was when individuals are properly employed, they have the degree and they are working within an architectural firm and they are not stamping plans, what is the harm in calling yourself an architectural designer, as opposed to someone who is not working in an architectural firm, who may be a builder and calling himself an architectural designer. Those scenarios are different situations.

Mr. Bodelson said the concern is when it is used as a title by implying to the public that an individual is an architect. If it is a used a description of activities, then it is less so.

Mr. Sexton asked for clarity if there is a distinction if it is used as an adjective or a noun.

Mr. Bodelson stated that yes the Board made that distinction.

Mr. Sexton suggested that the easy way to do it is just to say that the only individual, who can use the term architect, whether as an adjective or a noun, is a licensed architect. Then there is no ambiguity.
Mr. Johnson suggested that maybe in Ms. Propp’s spare time she could make contact with internet companies, newspapers, etc., and to state what the definition of architect entails. Notice to the public through those intermediaries is something to consider.

Mr. Baer stated that the question of intent is important. For example, if someone is at a cocktail party and states he is an architect in some other state, is he in violation of the law? If one follows up with “I am an architect and I want to design your office building,” there is an expression of intent but he felt the criminalization of the pride of statement of what your profession is, is not right. The Board needs to be more specific with intent.

Mr. Baer clarified that in the case of a business card, this is an expression of intent to do business. He found himself cited in 1994, with letterhead that said he was an architect, when he just inquired about how to get licensed in New Mexico. He was offended.

Mr. Padilla supported Mr. Baer’s comment. He knows many of the Board have been in meetings and stated that they have been at national conventions when they are in other jurisdictions and they are probably not licensed yet. He felt that the pride in the profession that they are a part of cannot be limited by not being able to, in a conversation over dinner etc., to say what your profession is. Now if the intent is to solicit work, then that is different and could be in violation. There should be strong clarification as to the intent.

Mr. Bodelson stated that the Board will be meeting in Las Cruces and they had a couple of instances of internet activity and that the Board will discuss that in regards to intent, perception, media. He added that he thought the suggestion is to be very specific in clarifying how the Board will sort it.

Mr. Sexton stated that if the most offensive or most often encountered situation is the terminology, architectural designer, maybe that can be written specifically in to the act to exclude that and add ‘and any other designation that intends to instruct the public that you are an architect’. He emphasized that the phraseology in the current statute is using ‘any designation tending to imply’, that is very subjective and broad statement. ‘Tending to imply’, imply to the public, well the public is not one person. If someone on the Board filters through this or it’s not the public, the Board does not represent a jury of the peers that one would typically find in the public. The Board is a very sophisticated, very specialized group. He felt that the Board’s concerns may be biased. He appreciated the hurdles that should be introduced to try to figure it out but he does not know how the Board gets away with this language, getting away from having to taking it on a case by case basis. He added that he agreed with Ms. Propp in saying, what do I tell the public? He said you would look at the tendency to imply that this person was an architect. The way it is written, it begs for the process.

Ms. Propp said that the organization spends a lot of time on this and they have a fulltime investigator doing just that on a regular basis. She appreciated the fact that the Board cannot tell people not to use the designation AIA if they are not licensed here in New Mexico but she had run into a few people, members of the public, that think that associate AIA means that a person is licensed in New Mexico. And that is not a point of licensure anywhere. She expressed that the public does not know. The Board is working hard to inform the public for their own protection.

Mr. Valencia stated that in his profession, when he goes to Arizona or California and people ask him what he does and he says he is a realtor and hands them his card. That does not imply he is a realtor
Mr. Adams stated that the Examination and Reciprocity committee met on a monthly basis to review the qualification for the applicants for New Mexico architectural registration by Reciprocity and Examination. He moved for Board approval for the recommended applicants for New Mexico registration by Reciprocity as listed in the above report. Mr. Adams read the names of applicants from the Committee Review August 1, 2014.

Mr. Adams noted to add an amendment and motioned to approve the names from the second part, from the Committee Review of September 24, 2014. Mr. Adams read the names of applicants from the Committee Review August 1, 2014.

**Motion:** Motion to approve the amendment to the Recommended Applicants for Registration by Reciprocity.

**By:** Geoffrey Adams

**Second:** Sam Valencia

**Board Vote:** Passed Unanimously

For the second group, Mr. Adams motioned to approve those qualified for registration of the Recommended Examination Applications for the New Mexico Architectural Registration as listed in the above report. Mr. Adams read the names of applicants.

**Motion:** Motion to Approve the Recommended Applicants for Registration by Examination.
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Mr. Vigil motioned to approve the Default of Notice of Contemplated Action in NMBEA 2013_21, NMBEA 2014_10 and NMBEA 2014_12.

Motion: Motion to approve the Default of Notice of Contemplated Action in NMBEA 2013_21, NMBEA 2014_10 and NMBEA 2014_12.
By: Ray Vigil
Second: Jim Oschwald
Board Vote: Passed with Mr. Calvani abstaining.

Ms. Propp stated that the ten days begins on the day of receipt of the certified letter.

b. NMBEA 2015_11 Settlement Agreement

There is no discussion.
Mr. Bodelson asked for a motion to approve NMBEA 2015_11 Settlement Agreement

Motion: Motion to approve NMBEA 2015_11 Settlement Agreement.
By: Geoffrey Adams
Second: Jim Oschwald
Board Vote: Passed Unanimously

c. NMBEA 2015_01 Settlement Agreement

There is no discussion.
Mr. Bodelson asked for a motion to approve NMBEA 2015_01 Settlement Agreement

Motion: Motion to Approve NMBEA 2015_01 Settlement Agreement.
By: Geoffrey Adams
Second: Jim Oschwald
Board Vote: Passed Unanimously

d. NMBEA 2014_18 Settlement Agreement violation/NCA issuance

There is no discussion.
Mr. Bodelson asked for a motion to approve NMBEA 2014_18 Settlement Agreement violation/NCA issuance.

Motion: Motion to Approve NMBEA 2014_18 Settlement Agreement violation/NCA issuance.
By: Geoffrey Adams
Second: Jim Oschwald
Board Vote: Passed Unanimously
also stated that hotel reservations were held on her personal credit card but she needed Board members to contact the hotel and confirm those reservations or she will cancel them. She encouraged Board members to confirm their hotel reservations by that Sunday before the meeting. Everyone will receive mileage.

In addition, Ms. Propp mentioned that she is working on three projects that involve photos. The priority is the Architectural Significant buildings where the Board needs to turn in 6-7 photos to WCARB (Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards). Her list includes: John Gaw Meem’s- Zimmerman Library, the Ranchos de Taos church, the Spaceport, the Spencer Theatre by Predock and the Los Alamos Post Office. If the Board had any other suggestions, email Ms. Propp. Is there anything the Board would throw off? No answer. Palace of the Governors and the NPS building photos were recommended.

Ms. Propp announced that she and Mr. Vigil are attending NCARB’s Member Board Executive/Member Board Chair meeting. They will report back on the issues discussed at that meeting. She also said that she has attended two Council for Purchasing from People with Disabilities in the last two months. There had been a change in staff where Larry Maxwell is now chair and there are new appointees.

At least one council member would like to meet with the Board in regards to concerns with Horizons New Mexico in offering architectural services.

Ms. Propp also announced that she has hired another staff member, Michele Barela.

4. Rules and Regulations Committee
Mr. Bodelson mentioned that they have added Mr. Mr. Vigil as Enforcement Committee member.

5. Joint Practices Committee
Mr. Vigil stated that there were not a large number of issues to discuss at last meeting. The focus was on the QBS upcoming issue related to our industry being aware of the QBS issue because engineers are fully behind that. The Engineering Board spent a lot of time discussing a case on the east side of the state, where a sidewalk project that required ADA accessibility and whether or not an architect or engineer could stamp those plans. They are also going through their statutes, in line for the next legislative session.
Ms. Propp mentioned to Mr. Vigil that she has talked to CID about getting their input to update the Building Officials Handbook and this should be one our goals when the Board becomes the keepers for the Joint Practice Committee.

F. Board Comments/Announcements
Mr. Bodelson stated that if there are any changes to the statute, please send them to Wren.
G. Adjournment
Motion: To adjourn the meeting at 1:42 p.m.
By: Sam Valencia
Second: Geoffrey Adams
Board Vote: Passed Unanimously

Whereupon the regular open meeting of the New Mexico Board of Examiners for Architects adjourned by Chair Bodelson at the approximate hour of 1:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Bodelson, Chair
Geoffrey Adams, Secretary/Treasurer

__/11.21.14__
Date
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Date