MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING LOUISIANA PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING AND LAND SURVEYING BOARD 9643 BROOKLINE AVENUE, SUITE 121 BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70809-1433 November 19, 2012

At 8:08 a.m. on November 19, 2012, Richard Savoie, P.E., called the meeting to order with the following members present:

Richard L. Savoie, P.E. Chairman
Norma Jean Mattei, Ph.D., P.E. Vice Chairman
Miles B. Williams, P.E. Treasurer
James E. Bowie, Ph.D., P.E. Secretary

M. Ernest Gammon, P.L.S. Ali M. Mustapha, P.E. Theodore H. Thompson, P.E. Kevin E. Crosby, P.E., P.L.S. John W. "Billy" Moore, P.E. John T. Irving, P.E. David L. Patterson, P.L.S.

Also present:

Donna D. Sentell, Executive Director Victoria Hatton, Director of Enforcement Joe H. Harman, P.E., Technical Support Staff Tyson Ducote, Board Investigator Justin Owens, Board Investigator D. Scott Landry, Board Attorney

The invocation was led by Dr. Mattei and the pledge by Mr. Moore.

Public comment time was recognized by Chairman Savoie.

Chairman Savoie recognized and welcomed our newest Board members, Mr. Irving and Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Mustapha requested that the Board meeting agenda be amended to add a discussion concerning the need for applicants with foreign education to obtain credential evaluations.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Mr. Mustapha, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to accept the November 19-20, 2012 proposed Call for Meeting and Board Meeting Agenda, as amended.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Mr. Mustapha, seconded by Dr. Mattei, to approve the Minutes from the September 24, 2012 Board meeting.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Mr. Mustapha, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to schedule the Board's next regular meeting for Tuesday, January 22, 2013 in Lafayette, Louisiana.

The Board's September Task List was reviewed.

Enforcement

<u>Case #2011-73</u> - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which practiced and/or offered to practice land surveying in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$2,000
- 2. Costs of \$352.02
- 3. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal

4. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Dr. Mattei, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Allen, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is R-Squared Global, L.L.C. (formerly known as "Rodney Ray & Associates, LLC")

<u>Case #2012-5</u> - Ms. Hatton reported on a licensed land surveyor who aided or assisted his unlicensed firm in practicing and/or offering to practice land surveying in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$1,000
- 2. Costs of \$345.79
- 3. Online Louisiana Laws & Rules and Professionalism & Ethics Quizzes
- 4. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 5. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Mattei, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Allen, with Mr. Irving, Mr. Moore, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon, Mr. Crosby and Mr. Patterson for and Mr. Mustapha against, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Rodney A. Ray, P.L.S.

Case #2011-117 - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which practiced and/or offered to practice engineering and used the word "engineering" in its name and in conjunction with its business in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$250
- 2. Costs of \$382.05
- 3. Publication without name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- No report to NCEES

After discussion, the Board approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Moore, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Mustapha, with Mr. Irving, Mr. Mustapha, Mr. Moore, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Patterson for and Mr. Crosby against, to approve the signed Consent Order.

<u>Case #2012-25</u> – Ms. Hatton reported on a licensed engineer who aided or assisted his unlicensed firm in practicing and/or offering to practice engineering and using the word "engineering" in its name and in conjunction with its business in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$250
- 2. Costs of \$382.05
- 3. Online Louisiana Laws & Rules and Professionalism & Ethics Quizzes
- 4. Publication without name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- No report to NCEES

After discussion, the Board approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Moore, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Mustapha, with Mr. Irving, Mr. Mustapha, Mr. Moore, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Patterson for and Mr. Crosby against, to approve the signed Consent Order.

Case #2011-87 - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which practiced and/or offered to practice engineering and used the word "engineers" in its name and in conjunction with its business in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$1,250
- Costs of \$390.82
- 3. Online Louisiana Laws & Rules Quiz by Supervising Professional
- 4. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 5. Report to NCEES with name

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

After discussion, the Board approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Thompson, Mr. Savoie and Mr. Allen, with Mr. Irving, Mr. Mustapha, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon, Mr. Crosby and Mr. Patterson for and Mr. Moore against, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is James F. Turner Engineers, LP.

Case #2012-4 - Ms. Hatton reported on a licensed engineer who aided or assisted his unlicensed firm in practicing and/or offering to practice engineering and using the word "engineers" in its name and in conjunction with its business in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$1,250
- Costs of \$377.59
- 3. Online Louisiana Laws & Rules and Professionalism & Ethics Quizzes
- 4. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 5. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Thompson, Mr. Savoie and Mr. Allen, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is James F. Turner II, P.E.

Case #2011-108 - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which used the words "engineer", "engineering" and modifications or derivatives thereof in conjunction with its business in Louisiana without proper licensure. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$1,000
- Costs of \$446.34
- Cease & desist
 Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- No report to NCEES

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Moore, Mr. Mustapha and Mr. Thompson, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Screening Systems International, Inc.

Case #2011-43 - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed individual who practiced and/or offered to practice engineering and used the word "engineer", "engineering" and modifications or derivatives thereof in conjunction with his name and business in Louisiana without proper licensure. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$2,500
- Costs of \$858.84
- Cease & desist
- 4. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 5. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Moore, Dr. Mattei, and Mr. Danzy, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Ron J. McKinley.

Case #2012-22 - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which practiced and/or offered to practice engineering in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$2,500
- Costs of \$543.59
- 3. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 4. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Mustapha, Mr. Williams and Dr. Bowie, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is HRST, Inc.

Case #2011-98 - Ms. Hatton reported on a licensed engineer who (a) prepared, sealed, signed and issued design drawings which contained a number of material deficiencies, (b) prepared, sealed, signed and issued a certificate which contained a false statement and a number of material deficiencies, and (c) prepared and issued a

3

4

5 6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14 15

16

final design drawing which was not sealed/signed/dated. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$3,500
- Costs of \$1,703.78
 Reimburse the homeowner's \$1,500 insurance deductible
- 4. Online Louisiana Laws & Rules and Professionalism & Ethics Quizzes
- 5. Appear before the committee to discuss the particulars of the violations
- 6. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 7. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Crosby, Mr. Thompson, and Dr. Bowie, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Robert D. Lee, P.E.

Case #2012-75 - Ms. Hatton reported on a licensed engineering firm which (a) prepared, sealed, signed and issued design drawings which contained a number of material deficiencies, (b) prepared, sealed, signed, and issued a certificate which contained a false statement and a number of material deficiencies, and (c) prepared and issued a final design drawing which was not sealed/signed/dated. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- Fine of \$3,500
- Costs of \$1,703.78
- Reimburse the homeowner's \$1,500 insurance deductible
- 4. Online Louisiana Laws & Rules and Professionalism & Ethics Quizzes by Supervising Professional
- 5. Appear before the committee to discuss the particulars of the violations
- 6. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 7. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting Mr. Crosby, Mr. Thompson, and Dr. Bowie, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Robert D. Lee Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Mr. Williams exited the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Case #2011-35 - Ms. Hatton reported on a licensed engineering firm which falsely advertised on its website that two professional engineers were associated with the firm despite the fact that they had no association with the firm and have never worked for or with the firm. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$2,500
- Costs of \$488.78
- Online Louisiana Laws & Rules and Professionalism & Ethics Quizzes by Supervising Professional
- 4. Appear before the committee to discuss the particulars of the violations
- 5. Cease and desist
- 6. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- Report to NCEES with name.

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Crosby, Mr. Thompson, and Dr. Bowie, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Robert D. Lee Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Case #2012-29 - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which practiced and/or offered to practice engineering in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- 1. Fine of \$2,500
- Costs of \$498.84
- 3. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal (with the respondent allowed to review the summary prior to publication)
- 4. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Dr. Bowie, Mr. Savoie and Mr. Williams, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Kahuna Ventures LLC.

<u>Case #2012-54</u> - Ms. Hatton reported on an unlicensed firm which practiced and/or offered to practice engineering in Louisiana without proper licensure. The firm subsequently became licensed in Louisiana. The respondent has signed and returned the proposed consent order offered by the Complaint Review Committee. The proposed consent order contained the following sanctions:

- Fine of \$2,500
- Costs of \$360.73
- 3. Publication with name on the Board's website and in the Journal
- 4. Report to NCEES with name

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Complaint Review Committee, consisting of Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie and Mr. Williams, to approve the signed Consent Order. The name of the respondent is Cimation, L.L.C.

Chairman Savoie exited the meeting at 9:35 a.m.

The Board recessed at 9:50 a.m. and resumed at 10:12 a.m. Mr. Moore, Mr. Ducote and Mr. Owens were not present.

Committee Reports

Land Surveying Committee

Mr. Gammon reviewed the letter received from the Terrebonne Parish Consolidated Government and the Terrebonne Levee and Conservation District requesting a change to the Board's Standards of Practice for Boundary Surveys.

After discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Land Surveying Committee to amend Rule 2909(A) as follows:

Route Survey – a survey for determining the route of a proposed pipeline, power line, cable, road or other linear facilities, excluding flood protection levees, in order to acquire a right-of-way, servitude or easement from the property owner being crossed.

The Land Surveying Committee requested that Board staff send the officials in Terrebonne Parish a letter notifying them of the proposed rule change and the rulemaking time frame for it to become final. Due to the rulemaking time frame, the Board instructed the enforcement staff to treat the situation as if the proposed rule change were already in effect (i.e., the Board will not attempt to enforce the current provisions of Rule §2909(A) against any professional land surveyor or licensed land surveying firm who is providing land surveying services relating to a route survey for flood protection levees).

Liaison and Law Review Committee

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Liaison and Law Review Committee to adopt the following Board position statement on compiled land surveying as-built record drawings:

POSITION STATEMENT ON COMPILED LAND SURVEYING AS-BUILT RECORD DRAWINGS

Position:

The Board considers the preparation of compiled land surveying as-built record drawings to be the practice of land surveying. Therefore, the Board requires that these drawings be sealed/signed/dated by a professional land surveyor. Compiled land surveying as-built record drawings must also contain notes identifying the sources of the data and a disclaimer stating whether or not the professional land surveyor who has sealed/signed the drawings has verified the data.

Underlying Laws and Rules:

Compiled land surveying as-built record drawings are often used to document how an existing structure, building site or other development project was constructed.

2

4

5

The laws and rules of the Board do not specifically mention requirements for sealing compiled land surveying as-built record drawings. The Board's laws and rules do, however, address what is considered the "practice of land surveying". In this regard, La. R.S. 37:682(13) states:

- (a) "Practice of land surveying" shall include the measuring of areas, land surfaces, streams, bodies of water, and swamps for correct determination and description, for the establishment, reestablishment, ascertainment, or description of land boundaries, corners, divisions, distances, and directions, the plotting and monumenting of lands and subdivisions thereof, and mapping and topographical work.
- (b) A person shall be construed to practice or offer to practice land surveying who engages in land surveying and who by verbal claim, sign, advertisement, letterhead, card, or in any other way represents himself to be a land surveyor, or who represents himself as able to perform or who does perform any land surveying service or work, or any other service designated by the practitioner which is recognized as land surveying.

The Board's rules further define the "practice of land surveying" in LAC Title 46:LXI§105(A), which states:

Practice of Land Surveying—defined in R.S. 37:682. The board recognizes that there exists a close relationship between land surveying and some areas of engineering, with some activities common to both professions; however, survey work related to property boundaries must be performed under the responsible charge of a professional land surveyor. Presented below are guidelines which shall be used as an aid in determining the types of surveying services which may be rendered by professional land surveyors or professional engineers.

- a. Surveying and mapping functions which require the establishment of relationships to property ownership boundaries are unique to land surveying and must be performed by or under the responsible charge of a professional land surveyor. These functions include:
 - boundary surveys;
 - ii. subdivision surveys and plats;
 - iii. public land surveys.
- b. Surveying and mapping functions not unique to land surveying must be performed by or under the responsible charge of a professional land surveyor whenever they require the establishment of the relationship of property ownership boundaries. Those functions include:
 - i. surveys of servitudes (easements) and rights of way;
 - surveys of leases;
 - iii. topographical surveys;
 - iv. surveys for record;
 - v. layout surveys for construction;
 - vi. hydrographic surveys;
 - vii. mine surveys;
 - viii. mapping.
- c. Surveying and mapping functions which do not require the establishment of the relationship of property ownership boundaries must be performed by or under the responsible charge of either a professional engineer or a professional land surveyor. Such surveying and mapping functions include:
 - surveys of servitudes (easements) and rights of way;
 - ii. surveys of leases;
 - iii. topographical surveys;
 - iv. surveys for record drawing;
 - v. layout surveys for construction;
 - vi. hydrographic surveys;
 - vii. mine surveys;
 - viii. mapping;
 - ix. geodetic surveys;
 - x. cartographic surveys;
 - xi. horizontal and vertical control surveys;
 - xii. quantity and measurement surveys;

xiii. profiles and cross-sections;

xiv. site grading plans.

d. Professional services which require the application of engineering principles and the interpretation of engineering data must be performed by or under the responsible charge of a professional engineer.

The Board's laws and rules also address the use of seals and "responsible charge". La. R.S. 37:682(14) defines "responsible charge" as "the direct control and personal supervision of . . . land surveying service or work"

LAC Title 46:LXI§2503(C) and (D) state:

C. Licensees shall approve and seal only those design documents and surveys which are safe for public health, property, and welfare, which are complete and accurate, which are in conformity with accepted . . . land surveying standards or practice, and which conform to applicable laws and ordinances.

1. Licensees shall comply fully with Chapter 27 (Use of Seals).

- Except as permitted by §2701.A.3.b.ii.(a), licensees shall not seal
 the work of or take the professional responsibility for any documents
 related to . . . land surveying not performed by the licensee or under
 the licensee's responsible charge.
- 3. Licensees may not accept the responsibility for, nor review, revise, sign, or seal drawings when such plans are begun by persons not properly licensed and qualified; or do any other act to enable either such licensees or the project owners, directly or indirectly, to evade the requirements of the licensure law.
- D. Licensees shall submit to a client only that work (plans, specifications, reports, and other documents) prepared by the licensee or by an employee (or subordinate) of the licensee (which is under the licensee's responsible charge); however, licensees, as a third party, may complete, correct, revise, or add to the work of another licensee or other related design professional, if allowed by Louisiana statutes, when engaged to do so by a client, provided:
- the client furnishes the documentation of all such work submitted to him by the previous licensee(s), or their related design professional(s);
- the previous licensees or other related design professionals are notified in writing by the licensee of the engagement referred to herein immediately upon acceptance of the engagement; and
- 3. all work completed, corrected, revised, or added to shall contain a notation describing the work done by the licensee now in responsible charge, shall have the seal and signature of the licensee affixed thereto, the date of execution, and shall become the responsibility of the licensee.

LAC Title 46:LXI§2505(C) and (D) state:

- C. Licensees shall not affix their signatures or seals to any plans or documents dealing with subject matters in which they lack competence, nor to any such plan or document not prepared under their responsible charge. Responsible charge requires a licensee or employee to carry out all client contacts, provide internal and external financial control, oversee employee training, and exercise control and supervision over all job requirements to include research, planning, design, field supervision and work product review. A licensee shall not contract with a non-licensed individual to provide these professional services. Research, such as title searches and soil testing, may be contracted to a non-licensed individual, provided the licensee reviews the work. The . . . professional land surveyor may affix their seal, signature and date to drawings and documents depicting the work of two or more professionals provided that a note under the seal designates the specific subject matter for which each is responsible.
- D. Licensees may accept an assignment outside of their areas of competence to the extent that their services are restricted to those phases of the project in which they are qualified, and to the extent that

they are satisfied that all other phases of such project will be performed or supervised by licensed, qualified associates, consultants, or employees, in which case they may then seal, sign and date the documents for the total project.

LAC Title 46:LXI§2701(A)(3) states, in pertinent part, as follows:

A. The following rules for the use of seals to identify work performed by a . . . professional land surveyor shall be binding on every licensee.

3. Seal Responsibility

- a. The application of the licensee's seal, signature, and date shall constitute certification that the work thereon was done by the licensee or under his/her responsible charge....
 - b. Responsible Charge
- i. Plans, specifications, drawings, reports or other documents will be deemed to have been prepared under the responsible charge of a licensee only when:
- (a). the client or any public or governmental agency requesting preparation of such plans, specifications, drawings, reports or other documents makes the request directly to the licensee or the licensee's employee as long as the employee works in the licensee's place(s) of business;
- (b). the licensee supervises the initial preparation of the plans, specifications, drawings, reports or other documents and has continued input into their preparation prior to their completion;
- (c). the licensee reviews the final plans, specifications, drawings, reports or other documents; and
- (d). the licensee has the authority to, and does make any necessary and appropriate changes to the final plans, specifications, drawings, reports or other documents:
- (i). if the plans, specifications, drawings, reports, or other such documents are prepared outside the licensee's office, the licensee shall maintain all evidence of the licensee's responsible charge including correspondence, time records, check prints, telephone logs, site visit logs, research done for project, calculations, changes, and all written agreements with any persons preparing the documents outside of the licensee's office accepting professional responsibility for such work;
- (ii). a licensee failing to maintain written documentation of the items set forth above, when such are applicable, shall be considered to be in violation of R.S. 37:698(A)(6), and the licensee shall be subject to the disciplinary action procedure as set forth in the licensure law.
- ii. No licensee shall affix his/her seal or signature to reports, plats, sketches, working drawings, specifications, design calculations, or other . . . land surveying documents developed by others not under his/her responsible charge and not subject to the authority of that licensee, except:
- iii. No licensee shall affix his/her seal, signature or date to documents having titles or identities excluding the licensee's name unless:
- (a). such documents were indeed developed by the licensee under the licensee's responsible charge;
- (b) the licensee shall exercise full authority to determine his/her development; and
 - (c). except as set forth in §2701.A.3.b.i.(a).

LAC Title 46:LXI§2701(A)(4)(a) states, in pertinent part, as follows:

4. Seal Use

a. Completed Work

ii. The licensee shall affix his/her seal, sign his/her name, and place the effective date on all land surveying documents that have been issued by the licensee to a client or any public or governmental agency as completed work. For purposes of this §2701.A.4.a.ii, effective date is defined as the date the licensee certifies that the land surveying document represents his/her work.

iii. Drawings and Plats

- (a). In the case of multiple sealings, the first sheet or title page shall be sealed, signed and dated by the licensee or licensees in responsible charge. In addition, each sheet shall be sealed, signed and dated by the licensee or licensees responsible for each sheet.
- iv. Specifications, Reports, Design Calculations and Information
- (a). In the case of specifications or reports of multiple pages, the first sheet or title page of each document shall be sealed, signed and dated by the licensee or licensees in responsible charge. Subsequent revisions shall be dated and initialed by the licensee in responsible charge whose seal, signature and date appears on the first sheet or title page.

The Board discussed incorporating the following language from the Board position statement on compiled land surveying as-built record drawings into the Board's rules:

The Board considers the preparation of compiled land surveying as-built record drawings to be the practice of land surveying. Therefore, the Board requires that these drawings be sealed/signed/dated by a professional land surveyor. Compiled land surveying as-built record drawings must also contain notes identifying the sources of the data and a disclaimer stating whether or not the professional land surveyor who has sealed/signed the drawings has verified the data.

Chairman Savoie charged the Liaison and Law Review Committee with recommending the appropriate language to incorporate the Board's position statement on compiled land surveying as-built record drawings into the Board's rules.

Chairman Savoie also charged the Liaison and Law Review Committee with recommending the appropriate language to incorporate the Board's position statement on compiled engineering as-built record drawings into the Board's rules.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Liaison and Law Review Committee to amend Rule 903(A) and enact Rule 1901(B) as follows:

§903. Professional Engineer Licensure

A. The requirements for licensure as a professional engineer under the alternatives provided in the licensure law are as follows:

A.1. ..

- 2. the applicant for licensure as a professional engineer shall be an individual who holds a valid license to engage in the practice of engineering issued to him/her by proper authority of a state, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, based on requirements that do not conflict with the provisions of the licensure law, and which were of a standard not lower than that specified in the applicable licensure law in effect in Louisiana at the time such license was issued, who is of good character and reputation, who has submitted an application for licensure in accordance with the requirements of R.S. 37:694, and if the state, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, in which he/she is licensed will accept the licenses issued by the board on a comity basis, and who was duly licensed as a professional engineer by the board; or
- 3. effective until December 31, 2015, the applicant for licensure as a professional engineer shall be an individual who holds a bachelor of science degree in naval architecture and marine engineering, or in an equivalent board-approved curriculum, from an accredited engineering curriculum of four years or more approved by the board as being of satisfactory standing, who is of good character and reputation, who has a verifiable record of twenty years or more of progressive engineering experience in naval architecture and marine engineering on engineering projects of a level and scope satisfactory to the board, who was recommended for licensure by five personal references, three of whom are professional engineers who have personal knowledge of the applicant's engineering experience and character and ability, who has

1 2

submitted an application for licensure in accordance with the requirements of R.S. 37:694, and who was duly licensed as a professional engineer by the board; or

- 4. effective until December 31, 2015, the applicant for licensure as a professional engineer shall be an individual who holds a master of science degree in naval architecture and marine engineering, or in an equivalent board-approved curriculum, or two bachelor of science degrees in related engineering curricula, from an accredited engineering curriculum approved by the board as being of satisfactory standing, who is of good character and reputation, who has a verifiable record of fifteen years or more of progressive engineering experience in naval architecture and marine engineering on engineering projects of a level and scope satisfactory to the board, who was recommended for licensure by five personal references, three of whom are professional engineers who have personal knowledge of the applicant's engineering experience and character and ability, who has submitted an application for licensure in accordance with the requirements of R.S. 37:694, and who was duly licensed as a professional engineer by the board; or
- 5. effective until December 31, 2015, the applicant for licensure as a professional engineer shall be an individual who holds a doctor of philosophy degree in naval architecture and marine engineering, or in an equivalent board-approved curriculum, from an accredited engineering curriculum approved by the board as being of satisfactory standing, who is of good character and reputation, who has a verifiable record of ten years or more of progressive engineering experience in naval architecture and marine engineering on engineering projects of a level and scope satisfactory to the board, who was recommended for licensure by five personal references, three of whom are professional engineers who have personal knowledge of the applicant's engineering experience and character and ability, who has submitted an application for licensure in accordance with the requirements of R.S. 37:694, and who was duly licensed as a professional engineer by the board; or
- 6. effective until December 31, 2015, the applicant for licensure as a professional engineer shall be an individual who has demonstrated long-standing experience in naval architecture and marine engineering, who is of good character and reputation, who has a verifiable record of thirty years or more of progressive engineering experience in naval architecture and marine engineering on engineering projects of a level and scope satisfactory to the board, who was recommended for licensure by five personal references, three of whom are professional engineers who have personal knowledge of the applicant's engineering experience and character and ability, who has submitted an application for licensure in accordance with the requirements of R.S. 37:694, and who was duly licensed as a professional engineer by the board.

§1901. Disciplines

B. Each individual licensed under R.S. 37:693(B)(5) and §903.A.3 through 6 shall be listed by the board as a professional engineer in the discipline of naval architecture/marine engineering.

COT. 1. 1. 1.

Mr. Williams returned to meeting at 11:05 a.m.

The Liaison and Law Review Committee made a motion to amend Rules 903, 905 and 909 and to enact Rule 911 relating to the new law on military-trained applicants and military spouses.

The Board disapproved the motion made by Mr. Mustapha, seconded by Mr. Crosby, with Mr. Mustapha for and Mr. Irving, Mr. Moore, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon, Mr. Crosby and Mr. Patterson against, to table the previous Liaison and Law Review Committee motion.

The Board recessed at 11:55 a.m. and resumed at 12:45 p.m.

The Board approved the motion made by Mr. Mustapha, seconded by Mr. Williams, with Mr. Mustapha Mr. Irving, Mr. Moore, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon and Mr. Crosby for and Mr. Thompson against, to table the previous Liaison and Law Review Committee motion until the May 2013 Board meeting.

Chairman Savoie charged the Liaison and Law Review Committee with recommending the appropriate rule changes to (a) require applicants for the Fundamentals of Engineering and Fundamentals of Surveying examinations to apply directly to NCEES and (b) remove the Fundamentals of Engineering and Fundamentals of Surveying examinations from Rule 1315(B) and (C).

At 1:30 p.m., the following representatives from LSPS, ACEC/L, LES and the Ad Hoc Committee on Licensure Requirements for Professional Engineers entered the meeting: Ms. Ronda Courville, Executive Director of LSPS; Mr. Dan Mobley, Executive Director of ACEC/L; Ms. Brenda Gajan, Executive Director of LES; Mr. Alan Kraus, P.E.; Mr. Jason Thornhill, P.E. and Ken McManis, Ph.D., P.E., P.L.S. Mr. Thornhill was the spokesman for the committee and presented a report of the committee's work.

The Board recessed at 2:30 p.m. and resumed at 2:55 p.m. Ms. Courville, Mr. Mobley, Ms. Gajan, Mr. Kraus, Mr. Thornhill, and Dr. McManis were not present.

Chairman Savoie appointed the following individuals to a new ad hoc committee to review individual engineering curriculum courses in connection with determining whether such courses can be used to satisfy the educational requirements for PLS licensure: Mr. Tim Allen; Dr. McManis; Mr. Gammon; Mr. Mustapha and Dr. Bowie.

Continuing Professional Development Committee

The Board unanimously approved a motion made by the Continuing Professional Development Committee to authorize the concept of allowing one PDH for each hour of thesis credit for professors advising M.S. and Ph.D. students (up to a maximum of ten PDHs per renewal period).

After discussion, Chairman Savoie charged the Liaison and Law Review Committee with recommending the appropriate rule changes to allow CPD credit for college professors who serve as thesis directors for M.S. and Ph.D. engineering students.

Mr. Landry and Mr. Moore exited the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Applications

New Applications

The Board disapproved the motion made by Mr. Mustapha, seconded by Dr. Mattei, with Mr. Mustapha, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Mattei and Mr. Crosby for and Mr. Gammon, Mr. Williams, Dr. Bowie, Mr. Patterson and Mr. Irving against, to approve the application of Mr. Joseph Banach for licensure as a professional engineer by comity.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Dr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. Gammon, to approve the application of Mr. Joseph <u>Banach</u> for licensure as a professional engineer by comity based on Act 276 of the 2012 Legislative Session regarding military-trained applicants.

Committee Reports (continued)

Finance Committee

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by the Finance Committee to accept the proposed 2013-14 budget as presented.

The Board approved the motion made by Mr. Patterson, seconded by Mr. Thompson, with Mr. Irving, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Mattei, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon, Mr. Crosby, Dr. Bowie and Mr. Patterson for and Mr. Mustapha against, to conduct Lexis/Nexis criminal background checks on all applicants who divulge a criminal violation and random Lexis/Nexis criminal background checks on 10% of all other applicants.

Old/New Business

Mr. Crosby, Mr. Thompson, Dr. Bowie and Ms. Hatton exited the meeting at 5:10 p.m. and returned at 5:50 p.m.

The Board approved the motion made by Mr. Gammon, seconded by Mr. Crosby, with Mr. Crosby, Mr. Williams, Mr. Gammon, Mr. Irving, Dr. Mattei and Dr. Bowie for and Mr. Mustapha and Mr. Thompson against, to have the Education/Accreditation Committee review the Board's current policy for applicants with foreign education needing a credential evaluation.

Chairman Savoie charged the Enforcement Ad Hoc Committee with developing a policy for Board review concerning the following issues for applicants who have prior felony convictions:

- How long after a person has completed his/her sentence must they wait to apply to the Board for licensure/certification?
- Are there any particular felony convictions that would preclude someone from ever becoming a licensee/intern? If so, does the Board want to list these and is it legally permissible to list these?

Committee Reports (continued)

Nominations and Awards Committee

Chairman Savoie presented the following list of nominations for election of Board officers for 2013-14:

Miles B. Williams, P.E. - 6 months as Chairman/6 months as Vice Chairman James E. Bowie, Ph.D., P.E. - 6 months as Vice Chairman/6 months as Chairman M. Ernest Gammon, P.L.S. - Treasurer Theodore H. Thompson, P.E. - Secretary

Closing Business

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Dr. Mattei, seconded by Mr. Gammon, to approve all committee recommendations and actions.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Dr. Mattei, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to acknowledge and confirm all licenses and certificates issued by the Board.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Dr. Mattei, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to approve all Board expenses.

The Board unanimously approved the motion made by Dr. Mattei, seconded by Mr. Crosby, to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m. on Monday, November 19, 2012.

Richard L. Savoie, P.E.

Chairman

James E. Bowie, Ph.D., P.E. Secretary