

**OREGON STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS
FOR
ENGINEERING AND LAND SURVEYING**

DRAFT

Minutes of Meeting
May 13, 2003

CALL TO ORDER

President Albright called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Conference Room of the OSBEELS Office, 728 Hawthorne Ave., N.E., Salem, Oregon.

Members Present:

Stuart Albright
Charles Crump
Steve Dyrnes
Charles Hester
Susanna Laszlo
Dan Linscheid
Bob Neathamer
Ron Stuntzner
Dave Taylor
Bob Walker

(Joel Smith was excused, but indicated he could be reached via telephone if needed for voting.)

Visitors Present:

Lloyd Tolbert, PLS, Chair-elect of PLSO
Fran Coxen
Sharon Coxen
Phil Drain
Joe Drain
Thomas Fowler
Eric Peterson
Gerry Clark

Others Present:

Kathi Dahlin, Assistant Attorney General
Brian Halfman, OSBEELS Investigative Assistant
Ed Graham, OSBEELS Executive Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were corrections and clarifications needed on the minutes of March 11, 2003 as follows: on page 4, correct the spelling from “ahs” to “has”; page 5, include the typical letter and make two paragraphs out of the third paragraph between “...work.” and “Laszlo...”; on page 7, clarify the first paragraph so as not to infer approval concerning the use of the title “traffic engineer.”

It was moved and seconded (Dyrnes/Taylor) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 11, 2003, as amended. The motion passed unanimously. It was moved and seconded (Laszlo/Neathamer) to approve the minutes of the special meetings on April 7 and April 10, 2003. This motion passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Neathamer requested that the Board go into executive session immediately after approval of the agenda. Walker announced that the American Council of Engineering Companies of Oregon (ACEC-Oregon) would like to address the Board concerning rule proposals after the hearing in the afternoon. Hester requested a discussion of future meeting dates under Item 13, D. Stuntzner requested the addition of Items 11 – G: re-application process, H: structural exam changes, and I: NCEES testing proposal. The agenda was accepted with the preceding additions.

At this point, President Albright took the Board into executive session as provided in ORS 192.660 (1)(h) to consult with legal counsel. Upon returning to regular session, President Albright announced that no action was taken and no decisions were made during executive session.

PUBLIC INPUT

Fran Coxen addressed the Board concerning the complaint that he brought against Bob Bagett (#2236). He described himself as a victim of the Clearwater Land Exchange and indicated the land was not conveyed on the basis of original corners. He was also concerned that the adjoining were not necessarily allowed to “bid” on the property that was exchanged, then subsequently offered for sale. Coxen contends the reviewer used by the Board may be biased. In conclusion, the Coxen’s do not believe the Board investigated the complaint thoroughly and asked the Board to investigate and consider the available evidence even further.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY’S REPORT

Function:

Examination/Registration – The April examinations are over and test materials have been returned for scoring. Staff is getting ready for the October examinations as we speak. I want to let you all know how pleased I was to see so many OSBEELS Members participating at the examination sites. My thanks to Albright, Crump, Dyrnes, Laszlo, Linscheid, Neathamer, Stuntzner, and Taylor.

Committee Activities – Law Enforcement, Examination and Qualifications, and Professional Practices Committee each met during the interim. The External Communications Committee Chair continues to watch for legislation that might impact the agency or the professions.

Administrative Activities – Annual renewal activity for June is underway. Staff will be mailing 5855 courtesy reminders during the middle of May: 2,760 regular renewals; 1,047 reminders at the 6-month level; and 2,048 late reminders at the 2-4 year level.

Staffing:

Those of you who attended the examinations in Eugene have already met the new person at the front desk. Shantelle Alayon is a welcome addition to the OSBEELS staff. Brian attended the National Certified Investigator Training session presented by the Council on Licensure, Examination and Registration in Sacramento, California and will be invited to report on that event.

Challenges:

Continuity is the issue to be dealt with for the present. Indoctrination of a new Executive Secretary will be the first order of business, hopefully in the very near future. I will be asking the Board if there's any interest in a contract to assist with these tasks during the remainder of this year. I am interested in such a contract if the Board is so inclined.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Albright complimented staff on the work they accomplished on the examinations in Eugene. He noted that the program was well organized and cleanly executed. He also noted that the examinations in Japan also went well.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Hester distributed a report showing the checking account holding \$241,564, the sweep account holding \$205,580, and the payroll account holding \$168 for a total of \$447,312. Hester reported that both revenue and expenditures are greater than planned and discussed those areas that exhibited the greatest deviation. In conclusion, it appears we are better off than we thought. Bar and Pie Charts showing revenue and expenses were also distributed. In the future, graphs will be used to better illustrate these figures.

Hester did express concern over the lack of timely audits on the part of the Secretary of State. He is working on the problem and explained that the semi-independent boards are not considered high risk enough to warrant a special audit.

Another matter of concern to the Finance Committee is signature authority. Until a new Executive Secretary is appointed, a second signature will be needed to conduct regular board business. It was moved and seconded (Neathamer/Taylor) to designate Crump as the second signature with Linscheid as a backup. The motion passed unanimously.

The proposed budget was also discussed. There was an error in the dollar amount shown for Administrative Expenses. The figure was corrected by Graham prior to the hearing. The budget will be considered for adoption this afternoon.

On the matter of meeting attendance, if you are interested in attending a meeting related to OSBEELS activities, send an electronic (e-mail) message to President Albright explaining what meeting you wish to attend and why. President Albright will advise delegates when they have been selected to represent OSBEELS at a meeting or conference.

LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

Law Enforcement Committee Chair Neathamer reported that the committee reviewed 30 cases on May 1, 2003. There are 14 cases on the consent calendar, 3 cases requiring Board action, 3 cases requiring further investigation, and 9 cases for which a Notice of Intent is being prepared. There were 8 other issues reviewed; 2 new cases were to be opened and 1 case was referred to a Board member for review.

The committee also reviewed 10 stipulated agreements. Cases 2131 and 2179: the respondents were granted an extension until the end of 2003 to complete stipulated coursework. Cases 2205 and 2221: the Board will proceed with collection of the civil penalty. Case 2154: a Notice of Intent to revoke will be drafted for failure to comply with the stipulations in the agreement.

There was a brief discussion concerning the maximum amount the Board can assess in a civil penalty. The current amount is \$1,000 per incident. It was suggested that this amount be increased to \$5,000 per incident. This matter was referred to the Rules and Regulations Committee for future action through legislation.

The Board also addressed the question of who would sign official documents such as Notices of Intent after the retirement of Ed Graham if no replacement were to be found before he leaves office. It was moved and seconded (Laszlo/Dyrnes) that Board member Bob Neathamer sign Notices of Intent after Ed Graham leaves office. The motion passed with one (Walker) opposed.

A lengthy Case Status Report was held until members had an opportunity to review it. Cases requiring Board action were addressed next.

Case 2209/2227: The respondent was issued an NOI to assess a \$2,000 civil penalty. No hearing was requested, only a letter stating that the penalties were too high. It was moved and seconded (Neathamer/Dyrnes) to issue a Final Order upon Default to assess the \$2,000 civil penalty. The motion was passed.

Case 2212: Dahlin expressed concerns that there were some issues with this case that may hinder progress at this point in time. It was recommended that the case be sent back to the Law Enforcement Committee for further consideration. It was moved and seconded (Linscheid/Dyrnes) to return the case to the Law Enforcement Committee. The motion was passed.

Case 2250: The respondent was scheduled for an informal conference during the May 1, 2003 committee meeting. He did not make it to the conference, so scheduling a hearing was suggested. The Board agreed that it was not necessary for a Board vote, but approved scheduling a hearing. Staff was also directed to send a letter to the respondent describing the difference between an informal conference and a hearing and ask which venue he would prefer.

Regarding the Consent Calendar: Walker asked that Case 1029 be removed from the consent calendar. Linscheid requested that Case 2236 be removed from the consent calendar. It was moved and seconded (Neatham/Laszlo) to approve the amended consent calendar. The motion was passed.

Case 1029: Walker recalled that the Board had grounds to take action in this case. It should not be closed simply due to the fact that it was an old case. It was moved and seconded (Hester/Linscheid) that the case be referred to the Joint Committee for review and course of action. There was a friendly amendment (Walker) to refer this matter within 30 days. The motion passed with the amendment.

Case 2236: The complainants in this case were allowed to make a presentation during the public comment portion of the Board meeting. This input was discussed along with the peer review report submitted by Romey Ware. Linscheid was concerned by the fact that no on-site review of the area in question had taken place. It was moved and seconded (Linscheid/Dyrnes) that the case be referred back to the Law Enforcement Committee for further review and an on-site inspection. The motion was passed.

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES COMMITTEE

The Professional Practices Committee met on Friday, May 2, 2003 and discussed the following items.

1. Guest Discussion with Ravi Mahajan, State Buildings Code Division

Mahajan, from the State Buildings Codes division, joined us for an informal meeting to discuss several items.

- a) Fire system design: Mr. Kelson came into the meeting via telephone and discussed the concern about not enough enforcement of the NFPA codes by local officials. Mr. Mahajan indicated that the State Building Code division is focused on the structural design of the building. There are no specific plan review requirements set with respect to plumbing, electrical and other discipline codes. What is clear is that a licensed engineer is required for buildings greater than 4000 sf and an interior height of 20 ft. The building codes division also refers to the Architect or Engineer of record, who is responsible for reviewing and coordinating all submittal items for compatibility with the design of the building. Said differently, the State Building Code division interprets UBC to say that the Project Engineer/Architect will assume responsibility for all the trade and disciplines not registered.

The Committee identified some questions. Do professionals understand they have personal liability for those trades not represented by stamp? The Building Code officials assume the project engineer/architect take the overall project liability. The Committee is concerned for the health, life, and safety of the public. There may be a disconnect

between philosophy and practice. For example, does the engineer stamping the project really check the fire sprinkler system for compatibility for design? Does he/she understand the hydraulics and the water availability to the building? How should this be enforced? The State Building Code Division would appreciate guidance from the board on this issue.

b) Plan reviews and the difference between comments and making actual revisions to plans

We discussed some of the examples the board has received as concerns with respect to plan reviewers putting unsolicited design comments, to the extent of covering the PE stamp, on review drawings. Mr. Mahajan indicated that practice is to work with the PE and if there is a change that is required, in order to expedite the process, the plan reviewer will often make the comment/plan change on the drawing with the PE's approval. The committee didn't see that as a problem as long as the discussion was documented on the plan. However, the concerns coming to the Professional Practices committee involved unsolicited design comments. Mr. Mahajan indicated he would like to see those plans and Mr. Graham indicated he would forward the documents for Mr. Mahajan's review.

c) Significant Structures

Note: The following was discussed for interpretation. The questions were asked by members of the Board and the answers were provided by Mr. Mahajan. Neither the questions nor the answers are intended as "official interpretations" at this time.

Q: How does the Building Codes division interpret tanks as an essential facility?

A: A tank is considered an essential facility when it caters to a facility that must remain in operation after an earthquake or tsunami.

Q: ORS 455.447 states that an "essential facility" means ..."(g) Structures and equipment in government communication centers or other facilities required for emergency response. " Interpretation of this could mean that a bridge could be placed under this item only when it provides access to a specific site of an essential facility. (Such as if a key government communications building is built and the only way to get to it was via a bridge.) Otherwise, a bridge is not an essential facility just because emergency response vehicles (police and fire) drive over it. Is this true?

A: The goal of this regulation is to only regulate the building, and not all of the supporting infrastructure, such as roads and bridges to access the building. A bridge is not typically considered an essential facility.

Q: Are the UBC tables (Table 16L & 16M) the approved features by the Department of Consumer and Business Service as referred to in ORS 672.129?

A: Yes

Q: Is the Department of Consumer and Business Service going to change the irregularities?

A: No.

We thanked Mr. Mahajan for his time and agreed that it would be beneficial to have further conversations with his team of plan examiners of other trades and the board. The Committee Chair will follow up on this.

2) Mr. Bill Bowne of Wallis Engineering Via Email Dated March 5, 2003

Q: Should the City require their inspection to be done under the supervision of a registered engineer?

A: ORS 672.060 3 (b) indicates there is an exemption when the work of the person does not include final designs or decisions.

Q: Does the inspector have the authority to make design changes in the field?

A: No, not without the engineer's approval.

The role of the inspector is to assure compliance with the design within the jurisdictions set parameters. Graham will send a letter to Mr. Bowne regarding his questions.

3) Mr. Glenn Davis, City of Salem Letter Dated April 14, 2003

Q ORS 671.010 (5) allows the practice of architecture to include appurtenances to a building. Does the design of detention and onsite storm water systems fall into this category so that architects can design these too?

A: *806-010-0125 Definitions "The term, "appurtenances," mentioned in the definition of the Practice of Architecture in ORS 671.010(5), refers to those systems, equipment and/or elements, whether interior or exterior, that are necessary to the overall function of a building."*

OAR 806-010-0125 defines appurtenances that are necessary to the function of a building. Storm water systems addressing site runoff is not considered part of the functioning building. The practice of architecture does not include calculations of allowable release rate, orifice size and required storage volume of a detention system. Graham will send a letter to Mr. Davis conveying this information.

4) Information Policy Review (From Feb 1999 newsletter)

At the last board meeting we were given a copy of the Feb 1999 newsletter to review and comment whether we should capture some of this in the rules. Due to time constraints, the committee decided to hold this for the next meeting.

5) J. Bozievich Ethical Question

Mr. Bozievich asked about whether he would be failing as a "faithful agent or trustee" to be an expert witness against a former client. The professional practices committee responded to him with a series of questions for him to consider, as the committee did not have sufficient information to answer yes or no.

6) Micheal Long/Cathy Nelson Emails dated April 22, 2003, April 30, 2003 Dual Stamping

Ms. Nelson and Mr. Long would like to discuss this issue with the PP committee. The topic was tabled and not discussed at the meeting. The Chair will call Ms. Nelson and Mr. Long to see if they can attend the next scheduled committee meeting.

7) Russ Lawrence, PE Email dated April 25, 2003 Permitting

Mr. Lawrence asked about agencies such as the Division of State Lands (DSL) providing permitting to projects that may require engineering stamping and how to assure protection of public safety. Can OSBEELS ensure the regulatory agencies, such as DSL, responsible for issuing permits for work, assure the required work to be performed is under the direction of a qualified Professional engineer.

This question is similar to the issue with State Buildings Codes Division. The Chair will contact DSL and ask them to join us to discuss this issue. The Chair will also invite Mr. Lawrence to join us as well.

8) James Han Via Email to Dave Taylor April 20, 2003

Mr. Han was unclear as to the limitations of his ability to stamp a design. Mr. Dave Taylor directed him to OAR 820-010-620 and discussed stamping of final documents.

At 1:00 p.m. President Albright opened the public hearing to consider the Board's budget and read into the record the conduct of the hearing. Graham read into the minutes the details from the Notice published in the Secretary of State's Bulletin on April 1, 2003 along with the statement of need, documents relied upon, and fiscal impact statement. The Board proposes the amount of \$1,644,576 as the limit for payment of expenses during the 2003 – 2005 biennium. There were no persons present either in favor of or opposed to the proposed budget. The hearing was closed at 1:07 p.m.

President Albright continued with the regular meeting and welcomed the guests from ACEC Oregon.

Thomas Fowler and Eric Peterson, members of ACEC-Oregon, were invited to address the Board. Peterson submitted a position paper on the matter of electronic signatures and digital document files. A copy of that paper is retained in the Board office as a part of these minutes. Peterson encouraged the Rules and Regulations Committee to set out stamping applications, but he did not favor electronic signatures at this time. Hester noted that the Federal Government is heading toward electronic documents under Public Law 106.107. Fowler presented a letter from the President of ACEC Oregon, Michael Unger, opposing allowing digital signatures until the risk is reduced through the development of new technology to safeguard the public and the profession from misuse. This letter is also retained in the Board office and made a part of these minutes. Fowler also noted that education of clients was also important in this interim.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Crump distributed a list of bills currently before the legislature and went over the highlights of each. Due to the time remaining in this session, it would appear that few of the bills will survive to become law. The list included: Senate Bills 611, 714, 867, and 893, plus House Bills 2205, 2341, 2512, 2706, and 3022. Crump also noted two bills (HB 2637 and HB 2893 that were being tracked by DAS and related to state agencies. HB 2893 was discussed to some extent and will be watched closely.

These bills may be viewed through the state web site www.Oregon.gov. A copy of Committee Chair Crump's report is retained in the Board office and made a part of these minutes.

RULES AND REGULATIONS COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Walker distributed an updated list of Committee activities. He also distributed a letter from ODOT Technical Services Manager/Chief Engineer, Cathy Nelson concerning OAR 820-010-0622 and -0623 and relating to stamping issues. The letter included a request for interpretations from OSBEELS. Laszlo will pursue this request with Nelson through the Professional Practices Committee.

On the matter of electronic signatures and digital files: Walker requested direction from the Board as to how the Committee should proceed. It was the consensus of the members that the comfort level may not yet exist regarding security issues surrounding the use of electronic signatures and digital files. The Board did take notice of the fact that the Federal Government may have a "standard" in place by the end of this fiscal year. Linscheid noted that the County Surveyors opposed the reference to the "incomplete documents" language in the proposed rule. According to Linscheid, County Surveyors can only receive documents that are complete and intended for filing. Walker will see that this matter is addressed by the Committee. At this point, it was moved and seconded (Laszlo/Linscheid) to table any action on the proposed electronic signature rule for now. The motion passed unanimously.

Dahlin pointed out that some of the language concerning wet ink signatures and "preliminary" documents in the proposed rule is already in the policy manual. This language makes no reference to electronic signatures. It was moved and seconded (Laszlo/Dyrnes) to move the policy language into the rules. The motion passed unanimously. The matter is referred to Rules and Regulations.

There was a brief discussion concerning the schedule for rule consideration and adoption. According to the discussion, draft rules will be presented to the Board in July with a hearing to follow in September. The rules, if accepted, could be adopted following the hearing in September or could be held over to a second hearing and adopted in November. Rules adopted in September or November would become effective either upon filing or at a date specific. An effective date of January 1 in the next year was suggested.

The last matter to be considered under Rules and Regulations is the budget. It was moved and seconded (Walker/Laszlo) to adopt the budget as proposed. The motion passed unanimously. On advice of the Assistant Attorney General, it was moved and seconded (Walker/Laszlo) to amend OAR 820-010-0325 to reflect the new OSBEELS operating budget for the 2003 – 2005 biennium. This motion also passed unanimously.

Assistant Attorney General Dahlin introduced a question under client/attorney privilege regarding cases in appeal brought by Gilbertson. The Board was asked if it would consider an offer to settle. It was moved and seconded (Linscheid/Laszlo) to go into executive session to discuss this matter with the Assistant Attorney General. The motion passed unanimously.

President Albright announced that the Board would now meet in executive session as provided in ORS 192.660 (1)(h) to consult with legal counsel. Upon returning to the record, President Albright announced that no final decisions and no actions were taken during executive session. When asked by the Assistant Attorney General, how she should respond, it was the consensus of the members that the Board was not able to accept a proposal at this time. Dahlin will draft a response.

EXAMINATION AND QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

Comity Applications – Committee Chair Stuntzner directed the members’ attention to the list of applicants seeking registration by comity. It was moved and seconded (Stuntzner/Linscheid) to approve the list of 73 applicants as presented. The motion passed unanimously. There was one additional comity applicant not on the original list. It was moved and seconded (Stuntzner/Linscheid) to approve applicant Simon for registration as a PE in Oregon. The motion passed unanimously.

There were a number of additional items for consideration by the Board that were routine in nature. Chair Stuntzner included these items on a consent calendar as a means of dealing with such matters more quickly in the future. From that calendar, it was moved and seconded (Stuntzner/Dyrnes) to allow active practice for Mercer and extend the time to makeup the lacking PDH requirements over a one-year period. The motion passed unanimously. Macalanda will be allowed to go inactive as requested. The other matters did not require Board action.

Included in the meeting packets was a report from Crump and Linscheid on the examinations administered in Tokyo. Both were pleased with the process, but included five suggestions to improve it even more. Those suggestions will be discussed by the E&Q Committee for implementation at subsequent examinations. A copy of the report is retained in the Board Office as a part of these minutes.

Examination sites are becoming a problem. OSBEELS was bumped from the Oregon State Fair Grounds at the last minute and staff was required to find alternate space in a very short time. The difficulty lies in the number of candidates and the space required for each in order to comply with NCEES testing standards. For example, there were 320 candidates sitting for the April 2003 FE examination and had to be split into two separate locations in Eugene. Staff was not able to find a single location large enough in such a short time. The question: should OSBEELS continue to use one central location or use a number of smaller sites around the state? After additional discussion, it was moved and seconded (Linscheid/Dyrnes) to avoid multiple sites. The motion passed unanimously. It was noted that Newport has been scheduled for the October examinations. The consensus was to seek a facility more centrally located and stay in the valley area, but to hold the Newport site as an alternative.

The Certified Water Right Examiner test was also on the agenda and Gerry Clark from the Department of Water Resources was present to discuss the matter. It appeared that the time had come to consider an Interagency Agreement between OSBEELS and DWR regarding the development and administration of the CWRE test. Clark suggested members of OSBEELS meet with Dwight French to develop an agreement.

Geotech by prior practice application forms have been completed and are ready for review by the Board. It was suggested that additional references and information concerning the specific rules be included on the application form and in the application packet. The packet will include the “Guidelines” that are referred to in the rules. Staff was instructed to proceed with the application packet as amended during this meeting.

Candidates taking examinations more than three times was discussed by the Committee. It was suggested that the rule relating to retakes be expanded and some guidelines be developed to assist in the assessment of additional actions as a condition of reapplication. The matter will be studied further and referred to Rules and Regulations.

The format of the Structural II examination is changing. At this time, candidates are allowed to pass the 8-hour test in 4-hour segments. After October 2003, candidates must pass the entire 8-hour test. In addition, candidates must select either bridge problems or building problems for the entire 8 hours. This may be a greater issue, since the structural license will allow holders to provide services on “significant structures”, but may have acquired the license by answering only bridge problems. Walker and Graham will address the problem and draft a letter to NCEES. It may be necessary to introduce an additional “state specific” portion to the structural series to cover the significant structures matter.

Committee Chair Stuntzner referred to the NCEES bulletin concerning the option available to the member jurisdictions regarding the administration of NCEES examinations. Presently, Oregon has a contract with NCEES, but NCEES is promoting it’s own subsidiary group to provide exam administration to member jurisdictions for a fee. This bulletin will be discussed at the Western Zone Meeting in Montana later this week. Taylor will report on that portion of the meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Linscheid reported that the Executive Secretary Search Committee interviewed one more candidate, but is still searching. After considerable discussion, it was moved and seconded (Taylor/Neathamer) to adopt a temporary rule deleting the requirement for licensure and proceed with additional recruitment. The motion passed unanimously. Recruitment will open May 16 and continue through June 27 to give unlicensed individuals an opportunity to apply.

Other administrative functions were also addressed. Until a new Executive Secretary can be appointed, both the Law Enforcement Committee Chair and the President may authorize Attorney General services. (Secretary’s Note: Earlier in the meeting, it was decided that Crump and, if necessary, Linscheid would have signature authority in this interim period.)

Summary of Action Items

The members went over the 12 action items from the March 11 meeting, most of which had been completed. The document should serve as a reminder of tasks or assignments to be completed.

NEW BUSINESS

Executive Secretary Activities

Included in the packets was a draft “scope of work” exhibit that would be a part of a personal service contract with Graham for interim administrative activities. It was moved and seconded (Neathamer/Taylor) to proceed with the development of a contract between OSBEELS and Graham. The motion passed unanimously. Walker noted that there was a “not to exceed” space with no dollar amount entered and suggested the figure be \$10,000. There were no objections to this figure. The contract document will be forwarded to the AG for final review and subsequently returned to President Albright for signature.

Meeting Delegates

Members interested in attending the NCEES Annual Meeting in Baltimore are instructed to contact President Albright this week so arrangements can be initiated by staff in a timely manner.

Election of Officers

Laszlo reported that the Nominations Committee met and is submitting Albright for the office of President and Neathamer for the office of Vice President. There was a call for nominations from the floor. Hearing none, it was moved and seconded (Stuntzner/Dyrnes) the nominations be closed. The motion passed unanimously, thus Albright and Neathamer, running unopposed, were elected as noted.

NEXT MEETING

July 15, 2003 in the OSBEELS Office.

Future Board Meetings in 2003:

July 15

September 9

November 11 (Veterans Day)

Future Committee Meetings in 2003:

June 12 & 13

August 14 - 15 (conflicts w/NCEES event)

October 9 - 10 (24 & 25 are test dates)

December 11 - 12

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.