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DEAN FORBES ISAIS: Good morning, all. My name is Geraldine Forbes Isais and I'm the Dean of the School of Architecture and Planning.

I want to take this opportunity to welcome the Board of Examiners here this morning and thank you for allowing us to host what is always an important dimension of our profession, which is the licensing aspects of our job. So I hope that this is a successful meeting.

I hope and want to encourage you all to take advantage of the fact that we are here. And just in case anyone was wondering, the School of Architecture and Planning this year has about 34 percent more students this year than last. Our enrollment has jumped. So do students want to become architects? Yes, they do.

And we have an incredibly active AIAS Chapter. We have landscape architecture and community and regional planning and historic preservation and regionalism as well.

So the landscape of the school is not just architecture, but it certainly is the professions that help shape our environment and we hope help shape our future.

So if any of you are interested in learning
more about the school, I'm more than happy to meet with
you or, you know, if you're in town and you just want a
tour of the building -- are they going to get a tour of
the building today, Geoff?

MEMBER ADAMS: I think we can do that.

DEAN FORBES ISAIS: If any of you have not
been through the building, you're certainly welcome to
do so. Our fabrications lab that you're hearing that
just stopped is growing and expanding like crazy. Our
digital capacity is likewise across the board. But
also, we just finished a lot of boot camps for students
where they're learning how to hand draw and sketch and
draft.

You know, if you don't know where you came
from, it would be hard to know where you're going. And
that's just something that we're doing on this road. So
I hope you have a very successful meeting, whatever that
means, and feel free to contact me if you'd like to.

Welcome to the school.

THE HEARING OFFICER: This hearing will
please come to order. My name is Ray Vigil. I will be
serving as the hearing officer and be advised by Board
Counsel from the Office of the Attorney General.

The purpose of this hearing is for the
Board to receive public comments on proposed amendments
to the Board's current rules, which are in Title 16,
Chapter 30, Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the New Mexico
Administrative Code.

This hearing is being conducted in
accordance with the provisions of the Architectural Act,
the Uniform Licensing Act, and the State Rules Act. The
hearing is being recorded by Debra Frietze, from Paul
Baca Professional Court Reporters. Anyone interested in
a copy of the transcript should contact the court
reporter directly.

The New Mexico Lobbyist Regulation Act
regulates certain activities before the Board in
rule-making proceedings. The Secretary of State's
Office can be contacted for information and
registration.

Public notice of this hearing was
advertised in the New Mexico Register, the
Albuquerque Journal, and the Board's website. Copies of
the proposed changes have been available on the Board's
website and in the Board's office. Printed copies are
available in today's hearing as well.

Those in here today, please sign the
attendance sheet. It's located at the back of the room,
which will later be entered into the record as an
exhibit.
May we have a roll call of the Board, please?

MS. HOLMES: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair.

[Whereupon, Chairman Vigil and Members Calvani, Adams, Glenn, Oschwald and Bodelson were present. Excused, Vice-Chair Tara Rothwell-Clark.]

THE HEARING OFFICER: This hearing will be conducted in the following manner: Board staff will present pre-filed exhibits. Exhibits admitted into evidence are available for review by the public, but exhibits may not be removed from this room.

After all exhibits are entered, we will proceed in numerical sequence through each proposed rule change. We will only address one rule at a time. After introducing each section of proposed changes, I will open the floor to any comments from the audience.

The Board is not required to follow judicial rules of evidence. However, in the interest of efficiency, I reserve the right to limit any testimony deemed irrelevant, redundant or unduly repetitious.

For the record, would the members of the audience who intend on testifying during the rule hearing please introduce yourselves and state your affiliation?
In order to ensure that the hearing is accurately recorded, only one person at a time shall be allowed to speak. Any person recognized to speak is asked to, one, identify yourself for the reporter each time you address; and two, speak loudly and clearly so the reporter can accurately record your comments.

After a person has offered comment, they will stand for questions from the Board. The audience may also ask questions of anyone offering comments after being recognized by me as the Hearing Officer.

Final board action, including adoption of the rules, will not take place as part of the rule hearing. The Board will discuss the proposed rules during its subsequent board meeting scheduled to convene immediately following this hearing.

Does the Board staff have any exhibits to introduce as evidence?

MS. HOLMES: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. Exhibit 1 is the Legal Notice published in the New Mexico Register, which occurred on June 30th, 2016. It did meet the required minimum of 30 days' advance notice of the rule hearing.

Exhibit 2 is the Legal Notice published in the Albuquerque Journal on July 9th, 10th and 11th, and has so met the minimum requirement.
Exhibit 3 is a list of interested parties and a notice, a memorandum, that was sent to the people on July 8th, 2016.

Exhibit 4 is the proposed amendments to the Boards' Rules, Part 1 of 16.30 NMAC, titled General Provisions.

Exhibit 5 is the proposed amendments to the Board's Rules, Part 2 of 16.30 NMAC, titled Organization and Administration.

Exhibit 6, the proposed amendments to the Board's Rules, Part 3 of 16.30 NMAC, titled Registration and Renewal, Duplicate Certificates, Seal Specifications and Document Identification.

Exhibit 7, the proposed amendments to the Board's Rules, Part 4 of 16.30 NMAC, titled Code of Conduct.

Exhibit 8, proposed amendments to the Board Rules, Part 5 of 16.30 NMAC, titled Enforcement.

The following exhibit, which is Exhibit Number 9, is a public comment received at the Board's office. It was a written comment received from Richard Flores, dated July 14, 2016.

Those are all the exhibits that we have.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Are there any questions from the Board members?
Hearing none, Exhibits Number 1 through 9 are hereby admitted into the record.

[Exhibits 1 through 9 admitted.]

If there are no other preliminary matters, we will proceed with introduction of proposed rules.

Any person wishing to testify or submit evidence with their comments shall do so only after they are recognized by me.

Any document offered to the Board shall be introduced as an exhibit. Board members will be permitted to ask questions before I rule on the admissibility of the exhibit. Upon admission, each exhibit will be marked, numbered and entered into the record.

At this time, each proposed rule change will be introduced by part and section. I will open the floor to members of the audience for testimony and comments on each section of the rule with proposed changes. Members of the Board and members of the audience may ask questions of each individual offering comment during the hearing.

Part 1, 16.30.1, General Provisions. We'll begin with Part 1 of the Rules. There are few changes to Part 1, Section 7, under the definitions.

Would anyone like to comment on the
proposed changes to definitions under Part 1, Section 7?
Okay. No one? If you would like to, please stand and identify yourself for the record.
Seeing none, Board members, are there any questions?
No questions. We're good.
Okay. Moving on, 16.30.2, Organization and Administration.
Next are proposed changes to Part 2, Organization and Administration. These changes primarily clarify administration of the board and delete repetitive language that is already required by and stated in the New Mexico Open Meetings Act. Proposed changes are contained in Section 10, Duties of Officers; Section 11, Committees; Section 12, Meetings; and Section 13, Board Responsibilities.
Would anyone like to comment on Part 2, proposed changes to Sections 10 through 13?
Seeing none, Board members, are there any questions?
Moving forward. Item 16.30.3, Registration and Renewal, Duplicate Certificates, Seal Specifications and Document Identification.
Next are proposed changes to Part 3, Registration and Renewal, Duplicate Certificates, Seal
Specifications and Document Identification. We will go through each section of the proposed changes. Would anyone like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 3, Section 9, Registration through Education, Training and Examination?

Please stand and identify yourself for the record.

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Yes, all of Part 3.

THE HEARING OFFICER: We're speaking to Part 3, Section 9.

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Title 16, Chapter 30, Part 3.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Part 3, Section 9. We're going to do each section at a time.

MS. SHAVER-HOLLOWAY: Oh, each section?

Okay.

THE HEARING OFFICER: So we're at Section 9, which is Registration through Education, Training and Examination.

MS. SHAVER-HOLLOWAY: And I wanted to comment on --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you want to wait on that one?

MS. SHAVER-HOLLOWAY: Yeah. I want to comment on 10.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Would you like to hold your comment for the next item?

MS. SHAVER-HOLLOWAY: Yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Would you please state your name for the record?

MS. SHAVER-HOLLOWAY: My name is Marie Shaver Holloway.

THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. So for members, any questions on Item 9 or Section 9?

I'm seeing none. I'm moving on to the next item. Would anyone like to comment on proposed changes to Part 3, Section 10, Registration through Reciprocity?

Would you please stand and identify yourself for the record?

MR. SATZINGER: My name is James Satzinger, AIA, architect, and I'm representing the AIA New Mexico Chapter as their representative to the New Mexico Board of Examiners for Architects.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Feel free to comment.

MR. SATZINGER: Okay. I actually wrote something out, and I'm going to read it to you. This passage is directly about an individual who does not hold an NCARB certificate and is seeking registration through reciprocity as a broadly experienced architect,
must hold a current and valid registration issued by the
licensing authority of another jurisdiction and have had
held such registration in a position of responsibility
for at least five years, -- and this is my insert -- "or
must hold a current and valid registration issued by the
licensing authority of another jurisdiction and have had
held such registration for at least five years and have
been under the supervision of a licensed New Mexico
architect or architects for at least ten years." I'm
finished.

The purpose of this addition was started
probably three and a half years ago when I first came to
a meeting. And that was to try to make it possible for
New Mexico design professionals who have fallen through
the cracks for one reason or another, but have been
working in the state for a number years, for many of the
firms in Albuquerque and Santa Fe, et cetera, all over
the state, who are licensed in another state, but who
have not been sealing drawings in that state of
licensure, but who have been doing professional work at
these firms under the supervision of a licensed
architect.

So it really helps our people here more
than it does people seeking reciprocity from other
states.
MEMBER CALVANI: Mr. Chair?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Calvani?

MEMBER CALVANI: So the way I understand it is you're right. That phrase, if you were in a position of responsibility, would mean that you were stamping plans, et cetera. So what you're saying is to add something that if you weren't in a position of responsibility, then you would be working under a registered architect for ten years, that would be --

MR. SATZINGER: Yes.

MEMBER CALVANI: It's either or? You're either with responsibility or working under a registered architect for ten years?

MR. SATZINGER: Yes, because many of the architects --

MEMBER CALVANI: I understand.

MR. SATZINGER: -- who are registered in another state are not actively working in that state, but they're working here.

MEMBER CALVANI: No, I understand that.

MR. SATZINGER: So this ten-year period, instead of a five-year, is an attempt to say: It needs to be a little tougher, a little lengthier.

MEMBER CALVANI: No, I understand. But what you're saying is either or?
MR. SATZINGER: Yes.

MEMBER ADAMS: Mr. Chair?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes?

MEMBER ADAMS: Jim, just a clarification.

That ten years of working under a New Mexico architect, that means that that person would have had their license for that complete ten-year period?

MR. SATZINGER: I'm not sure about that. But you know, I'm not trying to perfect the language here. I'm just suggesting something for you to start with.

MEMBER ADAMS: To me, that has a --

MR. SATZINGER: Yeah. I mean if that's the case, then they've been licensed in the other state for ten years also.

MEMBER ADAMS: Right.

MR. SATZINGER: This is an attempt at a starting point to try to give these individuals a chance to be registered in their own state.

MEMBER ADAMS: I'm just wondering what your intention was.

MR. SATZINGER: Well, my intention was not -- my intention was that they had been working here for at least ten years. And of course that would be accompanied by letters of recommendation, you know,
proving that from these architects.

In addiction, they have also been licensed
for at least five years as the part above, and so I
think that that could have occurred. You know, the way
I've written it, you could have worked for five years --

MEMBER ADAMS: It's clear now.

MR. SATZINGER: -- taken the ARE, gotten
licensed, and then worked for another five.

You know, I think that -- those are details
that are not really as important as the spirit of the
idea.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Bodelson?

MEMBER BODELSON: Jimmy, if I understand
right, you're just trying to capture the people that
have been in New Mexico for ten years, and we can work
out the language details in terms of how many years
they've been licensed in other states?

MR. SATZINGER: Right. And I picked ten
just so that it was a little more solid than five.

MEMBER BODELSON: Right, and that's pretty
solid.

MR. SATZINGER: Yeah, it's pretty solid.

There are people that are 20 and 25 that I'm aware of.

MEMBER BODELSON: Okay. Do you have any
idea how many people you're talking about, more or less?
MR. SATZINGER: I think 15 to 20, probably.

MEMBER BODELSON: That's a good number.

MR. SATZINGER: Something like, you know, 10 to 15 in Albuquerque and 5 in Santa Fe.

MEMBER BODELSON: Okay. That's about right.

MR. SATZINGER: I'm not sure about Las Cruces.

MEMBER CALVANI: Well, the national law which was just passed, the BA, they talk about that you're licensed for five years. And something we may want to talk about, you're licensed with no disciplinary action in those five years.

So going back to what Mr. Satzinger is saying, maybe you're licensed for five years with no disciplinary action out of that state that you're licensed in. I'm not sure how we word the ten years, whether it's ten years or licensed also with no disciplinary action.

MR. SATZINGER: Well, what I was really trying to do was create a situation where it wasn't easy to achieve this, where this is a really serious way to get licensed. It's not an easy way to get licensed.

MEMBER CALVANI: I understand, But I think the issue is the position of responsibility. If that
phrase wasn't there, you wouldn't have a problem.

MR. SATZINGER: Right. And we all know
that a lot of our fellow architects never stamp any
plans. They don't ever have their own firm.

MEMBER CALVANI: They can't. Yeah, right.

MR. SATZINGER: So to require -- to only
have a way to get through this process by sealing
drawings really leaves a lot of people out.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Jim?

MEMBER OSCHWALD: I just want to point out
that we currently do not have the disciplinary language
in the proposed change that we're talking about, nor do
we have the additional information provided by
Mr. Satzinger.

The folks who are not in responsible charge
are likely to not have any disciplinary action against
them, as we, as a board, cannot bring action against
those individuals. So I think that language is not
necessary.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, just a comment
to that. I think we're talking about if they're
licensed in -- because I think I heard that they could
be licensed in another state. We're still talking about
them being clear of any kind of infractions, which is
from another state, right?
MEMBER OSCHWALD: Right.

THE HEARING OFFICER: They are regulated.

MEMBER OSCHWALD: Then we need to add that in here.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

Member of the public?

MR. LARROQUE: Andre Larroque, President of AIA New Mexico. I would just like to point out that Part E may cover it. "Whereas applicants for registration through reciprocity shall present a Certificate of Good Standing from a jurisdiction in which a current and valid registration is held."

Would that take care of it?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Good point.

Any other comments or questions?

MEMBER CALVANI: Yes, Mr. Chair.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, Mr. Calvani?

MEMBER CALVANI: I understand that this is going into law, and yet NCARB has just passed the BA, which would take the place of this when the BEA goes into effect. Is that correct or not?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, my understanding is those that are unable to achieve NCARB as a venue, that's what this is about.

MEMBER CALVANI: But what they just passed,
the BEA, which was Resolution 2, which we'll talk about from the national meeting, they did pass -- and it's called Revisions of the Alternatives to the Education and Requirements of Certification, and it will be passed.

It will be in effect, and it will be a vehicle for this -- it's almost exactly the same, but NCARB does it, not the New Mexico Board, and it takes the place of the New Mexico Board having to do this. Instead, people in New Mexico would go through NCARB, and if there were methods to achieve an NCARB certificate, then they would come to New Mexico.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Anything from the public?

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Yeah, I'd like to comment on that. My name is Marie Shaver Holloway, AIA. I'm currently the Secretary for AIA New Mexico. I'm a former board member of AIA Albuquerque Chapter. I'm also the former Chair for the Young Architects, which is a program for young architects in AIA.

I'm a graduate of UNM. I graduated in 1986. I've been practicing architecture for 30 years for various firms in the State of New Mexico.

I'm one of Jim's poster children, one of those 15 to 20 people who, for one reason or another,
have fallen through the cracks. Each one of our stories is different.

At the time that I graduated in 1986 with my Bachelor's of Architecture, it was not required to have a Master's degree. Several of my classmates immediately got licensed in the State of New Mexico because they had their internship completed. It took me longer to complete my internship.

I raised a family, kind of forgot about it. Twenty years later, I decided I should get that license that I went to school for. But by that time, the State of New Mexico had changed the rules, and I had to have a Master's degree. So instead, even though I have lived here since 1983, I tested for the State of Colorado. So I have been licensed in the State of Colorado since the fall of 2010.

To answer your question, Robert, I have no desire to become NCARB certified. I don't foresee myself moving out of the state. I don't want to be paying the annual NCARB fees. I would like to be -- it makes sense for me to be licensed in the state where I'm working.

I have no intent in moving to Colorado and stamping drawings in the State of Colorado. So thank you for clarifying this earlier that in Section B, where
it says, "In a position of responsibility," that means
stamping.

So for me, you know, since I've already
been working for 30 years in a very responsible
position, but just not stamping, this is a way for me to
get licensed in the State of New Mexico. And for others
who are even born and raised here who moved out of state
for a while and then they came back for various reasons,
like family, and they find out that because they don't
have that NCARB certificate, they can't get licensed
here.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good.

MEMBER CALVANI: I understand. I mean I
understand the predicament that the 12 or 20 people are
in. I mean that's evident. I mean I have people in my
firm that are licensed in Texas with a nonaccredited
degree, and that's what this all about.

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Right.

MEMBER CALVANI: So what NCARB has done is
they're try to keep the value of the accredited degree
and yet give a vehicle for you kinds of people to have a
vehicle to become licensed.

And unfortunately, you know, a lot of
people think of an NCARB certificate just for
reciprocity, which you've just said --
MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Right.

MEMBER CALVANI: -- you don't want an NCARB Certificate because you're not going to practice outside of the state.

However, there's more to the NCARB certificate. Obviously, if you had the NCARB certificate, then you would go through this BEA process that's national.

The only deal is that most jurisdictions like New Mexico, who don't want to vet and authorize you and your others, we would rather have the national organization do it because they do it better.

I mean we aren't really -- unfortunately, you know, with what we're going to do here, we're not set up to do this. We're going to have to figure out how to do this. We've done it before, but the BEA process, which was just passed by NCARB, just makes it easier for the jurisdictions to vet people like you.

What happened was that we had the BEA system in place, and it was -- to be honest, it was expensive, it was time consuming, and it wasn't well-utilized.

Now with the BEA system, which really just looks at architectural-related degrees. So if you have an architectural-related degree, it's just a way of
looking at the double the times of IBP, which you could
certainly find those hours and process that.
And then it's for people that just have a
high school diploma, which there are those in California
that have a high school diploma, not an
architectural-related degree. They would, in fact, do a
dossier.
So I understand what you're saying. And
yet as a Board Member and at this jurisdiction, I would
rather not do this and have NCARB do it.

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Well, even though
it's less expensive with the new NCARB process, it's
still expensive.

MEMBER CALVANI: You mean just to get the
certificate?

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Yes.

MEMBER CALVANI: Okay.

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: You know, there's
enough obstacles as it is just to get licensed, and this
is presenting another obstacle. So we're trying to
provide an alternative pathway for people who are
obviously qualified to be licensed by the state that
they're actually working in.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Any comments?

Mr. Satzinger.
MR. SATZINGER: I'm surprised at Mr. Calvani's statements because clearly, in this document, you are saying you are going to deal with broadly-experienced architects.

MEMBER CALVANI: I didn't say that. I'm sorry.

MR. SATZINGER: Well, you were suggesting in your comments that you wanted the NCARB to take care of this, which is different than what this proposal already says --

MEMBER CALVANI: Absolutely.

MR. SATZINGER: -- in the red language. So I'm just wondering why there's a drift back. Because you know, this is something we've been talking about for some time.

MEMBER CALVANI: Let me answer. The drift back is that the BEA was just, you know, passed at the national meeting a few months ago. That's the drift back.

There was nothing in place nationally which -- well, the thing that was in place nationally was unruly and expensive. And now that the new BEA that will take the place of this -- I'm not saying that we're not going to do this.

I guess what I'm saying is that maybe we do
this for a while and take care of, you know, your 12 or 20 people in-house. And then I would hope that we would eventually get rid of this and leave it to the BEA, which is the national deal. I don't know how this works going through there.

THE HEARING OFFICER: One question, as a reminder. So really, the purpose of this hearing is not really to give a lot of dialogue about why or justify where we're at. We're taking comments, and we can have those discussions during our regular board meeting.

MEMBER ADAMS: Sure. I'm probably going to go against what you just said.

I would just say the reason we, at least in my mind, the reason I supported this language and putting it back in was because the NCARB process was so unruly and, you know, draconian in terms of the burden it put on people trying to get through it.

I've always been in support of a streamlined NCARB process and not having the states have to do this kind of stuff, so I was in support of this.

And if NCARB really has fixed it and made it so it's, you know, a more streamlined process, then I would probably switch back my images. But I'm certainly -- as long as NCARB doesn't have that in place yet, I think we have to support this and move forward.
That would be my feeling.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. At this time what I'd like to do before we move forward is I would just like an opportunity for our Counsel to kind of give us a brief overview of our responsibilities and discussions.

MR. DWORAK: Sure. And this isn't something that needs to be on the record because it's not of the substance of this hearing.

[Discussion was held off the record.]

THE HEARING OFFICER: Moving ahead, Any further questions?

Yes.

MEMBER GLENN: For my purposes, how much is a -- what's the cost of obtaining an NCARB certification?

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Currently, I don't know the new rules.

MEMBER GLENN: You said it was expensive. I'm just trying to get an idea.

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Well, I know what it cost Jim.

MR. SATZINGER: About a year and a half.

MEMBER GLENN: In terms of dollars, though, what are we talking about?
MR. SATZINGER: About $5,000 maybe.

MEMBER CALVANI: For what?

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: 5,000 in fees and a year and a half of his time.

MEMBER CALVANI: To do the BEA?

MR. SATZINGER: Yeah, the old one.

MEMBER CALVANI: But that's the old one.

That's gone.

MR. SATZINGER: Yes.

MEMBER CALVANI: So that's not answering your question.

What is it to just have an NCARB certificate? I think it's like $1,000.

MEMBER ADAMS: To get it, and then it's $200 a year --

MS. SHAVER HOLLOWAY: Annual maintenance in perpetuity.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Any further comments or questions to Section 10?

Seeing none, I'll move forward to -- would anyone like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 3, Section 11, Registration Renewal?

Seeing none, would anyone like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 3, Section 12 or 13, Exploration of a Certificate and Renewal of an Expired
Certificate?

Would anyway like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 3, Section 15, Architect Emeritus?

Seeing none, we're moving on. Would anyone like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 3, Sections 16 or 17, Duplicate Certificate and Display of Certificate of Registration?

Would anyone like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 3, Sections 18 or 19, Individual Seal and Document Identification and Change of Address?

None? Unless there are any other comments, we'll move on to the next part.

Okay, 16.30.4, Code of Conduct. Next are proposed changes to Part 4, Code of Conduct. There's only one change proposed under Section 10.

Would anyone like to comment on the proposed changes to Part 4, Section 10, Full Disclosure?

Next are proposed changes to Part 5, Enforcement. The proposed changes clarify the Board's enforcement process. This is 16.30.5.

Would anyway like to comment on Part 5, Section 8, Complaints?

Would anyway like to comment on Part 5,
Section 9, Settlement Agreements?

Would anyone like to comment on Part 5, Section 11, Violations?

Would anyone like to comment on -- actually, that's it. That concludes all the proposed changes to the Board Rules.

Okay, moving on --

MR. DWORAK: One question.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, sir?

MR. DWORAK: One of the witnesses had, I believe you, sir. I'm sorry, I forgot your name.

MR. SATZINGER: Jim.

MR. DWORAK: Jim, I know that you had a document you were reading from. You're welcome to introduce that as an exhibit if it was some language --

MR. SATZINGER: Yes.

MR. DWORAK: -- so the Board doesn't have to memorize that. So if you'd like to introduce that, the Chair can --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Absolutely. I would like to recognize -- actually, if you could --

MR. SATZINGER: I have a copy for each of you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Did you identify the difference between what was proposed and what --
MR. SATZINGER: I have, in italics, the additional language, in a larger font.

MR. DWORAK: And Mr. Chair, just to clarify, that would be introduced as Exhibit Number 10.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay, thank you.

And the text of that -- I'm not going to read it. So please let it be known we're entering changes by Mr. Satzinger as Exhibit Number 10 into the record, what are modifications and/or additional text to Section 16.30.3.10, Registration through Reciprocity.

[Exhibit 10 admitted.]

THE HEARING OFFICER: Has everyone present signed the attendance sheet in the back? No? Could I please have everyone sign, take this time to go ahead and get everybody signed in?

Once I get everybody's signatures, we're going to go ahead and enter that and admit that as an exhibit, Number 11.

I just want to make sure everyone has had an opportunity then to sign the sign-in sheet.

So if there are no questions from the Board, I'd like to admit this sheet as Exhibit Number 11.

[Exhibit 11 admitted.]

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. The comments
submitted and testimony heard during this rule hearing will be reviewed by the Board and considered during a separate meeting that will begin after we conclude this hearing. The Board will vote on the proposed rules during its meeting.

I'd like to thank the Board members and everyone else present for their participation today.

Let the record show that this hearing was adjourned at 10:48 a.m., And this concludes our hearing for today.

[The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.]

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Mr. Raymond Vigil, Chair

[Signature]

Mr. Geoffrey Adams, Secretary/Treasurer
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