MINUTES MARYLAND BOARD OF ARCHITECTS

DATE: March 31, 2021

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

- PLACE: 500 N. Calvert Street Room 308 Baltimore, MD 21210
- JOINING IN: Virtual Video Conference – meet.google.com/cmp-vqnj-zic Phone: (US) 1-617-675-4444 (PIN: 288 794 295 7044)
- PRESENT:Paul Edmeades, Chair
Cynthia Shonaiya, Vice Chair
Stephanie Hopkins, Consumer Member
Gary Ey, Consumer Member
Mark Flemming, Architect
Kevin Sneed, Architect
- ABSENT: Douglas Polt, Architect

LABOR OFFICIALS AND STAFF PRESENT:

Kausar Syed, Deputy Commissioner, O & P Licensing Joseph H. Cullingford, Executive Director Carla Marie Zamon, Acting Assistant Executive Director Jessica Praley, Board Counsel Noraida Lozano, Board Administrator Frazier West, Investigator

OTHERS PRESENT:

John Corkill, Architect Holly Aley, ARE Applicant

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Paul Edmeades called the Business meeting of the Maryland Board of Architects to order, virtually, at 11:01 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The members reviewed the minutes of the Business meeting held on February 24, 2021. Motion (I) was made by Mr. Ey, seconded by Ms. Hopkins, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes with corrections.

COMPLAINT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Ey presented the following report on behalf of the Complaint Committee:

02-AR-19 - Closed as of 03/31/21; moving to Central Collections 03-AR-21 - No Change (Referred to PG County prosecutor on 01/07/21) 06-AR-21 - Already sent a letter; a second letter will be sent by registered mail 07-AR-21 - Closed as of 03/31/21; a settlement has been executed 08-AR-21 - A letter was sent to the Respondent as discussed

Motion (II) was made by Ms. Hopkins, seconded by Mr. Sneed, and unanimously carried to accept the Complaint Committee report.

REINSTATEMENT REQUEST

Mr. Cullingford suggested that reinstatements, that require the Board's review, should be forwarded to the Complaint Committee for review before making a recommendation to the Board.. He further explained that reinstatements should only be presented to the Board if there are significant issues with the application. After a brief discussion, Mr. Edmeades agreed with Mr. Cullingford's recommendation of having the complaint committee review reinstatement requests.

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Edmeades inquired whether or not the concept sheet had been submitted to the department. He referred to Ms. Praley to confirm whether a vote is still required to approve the concept sheet. Ms. Praley suggested that the language in the concept sheet still needs approval from the Board before it can be submitted. Mr. Edmeades cited a few corrections as follows:

- 1. On the last paragraph of the first page to replace the word "minimal" with "minimum"
- 2. On the same page and paragraph to replace the last word "Marylanders" to "the public in Maryland"
- 3. On the first box of the second page to replace "Engineers" with "Architects"

Motion (III) was made by Ms. Shonaiya, seconded by Mr. Ey, and unanimously carried to approve the concept sheet with corrections.

APPLICATIONS FOR ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION EXAM (A.R.E.)

Mr. Edmeades presented the following report for the Applications for Architectural Registration Exam (A.R.E).

There were eight (8) applications administratively approved:

Esther Furman Leah Penza Daniel Jones, Jr. Jonathan Harvey Thanh Nguyen Brian Martin Briana Blowe Scott Mann

There were three (3) A.R.E. applications approved by the Board:

Mirasol Hernandez Brian Waesche Lindsay Winstead

APPLICATIONS FOR RECIPROCITY

There were three (3) applications approved by the Board for reciprocity:

Israel Berger Timothy Parsons Jay Stevenson

While discussing an applicant, Ms. Shonaiya referred to Mr. Edmeades to clarify when a candidate should use an ERC form. Mr. Edmeades stated that ERC forms should be used only to document the Educational Equivalency requirement for Maryland excluding the AXP.

Mr. Cullingford inquired whether the Board should list the administratively approved applications in the minutes. Mr. Edmeades and Ms. Shonaiya agreed with Mr. Cullingford to list the administratively approved applications in the minutes.

Motion (IV) was made by Mr. Sneed, and seconded by Mr. Flemming, unanimously carried to approve eleven (11) A.R.E. applications, one (1) A.R.E. application denial, and three (3) reciprocal applications.

OLD BUSINESS

Reciprocity by State

As requested at the last Board Meeting, Ms. Shonaiya followed up with Mr. Cullingford on

the list of the updated substantially equivalent reciprocity. Mr. Cullingford then stated that it will be ready in the Board's next meeting. He will have an updated applicant cover sheet as well.

Mr. Edmeades mentioned not finding the copy of the Reciprocity Matrix. Mr. Cullingford stated that the Reciprocity Matrix will be shared in the Google Drive for the Board to access it.

NEW BUSINESS

NCARB Annual Business Meeting

Mr. Edmeades announced the NCARB Annual Business Meeting which will be held in Los Angeles, June 24 - 27, 2021. He informed the meeting will be in-person and virtual, which the Board may want to consider if planning to attend this event. Mr. Cullingford stated that there may be some travel restrictions. Mr. Edmeades had requested that Mr. Cullingford updates the Board about any changes to the travel restrictions, to which he agreed.

Delegate Appointment

Mr. Cullingford informed the Board they needed to appoint an alternate to Mr. Sneed as a voting delegate for the NCARB Annual Meeting. Since Mr. Sneed is a member of the Credentials Committee, they would be required to check first if he can serve on both by law. It was also noted that a secondary delegate needed to be appointed. After a brief discussion, the Board decided to table this topic to the next scheduled meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

Third Party Inspection Program (TPIP)

Mr. Edmeades stated that correspondence was received regarding Prince George's (PG) County Third Party Inspection Program (TPIP). Mr. Fleming shared his opinion that the architect product has liability issues. The architect has been compelled to sign beyond the standard that should be required of an architect. Mr. Edmeades deferred to Ms. Praley. Ms. Praley stated that she will review the correspondence and report back at the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Corkill shared his opinion, experience, and observation in the past about TPIP being the law of the land for PG county for the past fifteen (15) years. He further explained AIA's stance on TPIP. Mr. Cullingford suggested tabling this topic since Ms. Praley needs to review this matter further. After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to table this topic to the next scheduled meeting.

NAAB Degree for A.R.E

Mr. Corkill announced that the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Baltimore voted to present the resolution urging thirty-five (35) states to consider alternative paths to licensure

and A.R.E. eligibility. He informed that this topic will be presented at the AIA Conference in 2022.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Executive Order

Mr. Cullingford informed the Board about the changes to the Executive Order for deferred license renewal. The department is planning to reimplement mandatory renewals by using a staggered date of renewal for each Board. Licensed architects will be required to renew their licenses beginning on June 15, 2021. This will allow for a 60-day notification window to the affected licensees. Mr. Cullingford noted that the executive order allowed for the deferral of license renewal, adding that the expiration dates will remain the same for all licensees.

Nano Learning

Mr. Cullingford informed there was a letter about Nano Learning sent by AIA requesting the Board's opinion on whether or not they accepted Nano Learning, specifically LUs on HSW but in the increments of .25, .50 and 1.

Mr. Edmeades mentioned that in the CPC regulations, Nano learning was included as a possibility but not precisely defined. Mr. Edmeades stated that he has no problem with Nano learning. Ms. Shonaiya agreed with Mr. Edmeades about Nano Learning.

Ms. Praley recommended to Mr. Cullingford that when he replies to AIA, he has to make it clear that Nano learning is not yet approved and mention that the CPC regulation is still under revision and that the Board is considering Nano learning as part of it. After a brief discussion, Ms. Praley told the Board that she would review and address it at the next scheduled meeting.

New Deputy Commissioner

Mr. Cullingford introduced the new Deputy Commissioner, Ms. Kauser Syed of the Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing. Mr. Syed briefly introduced herself to the members of the Board. The members of the Board welcomed her to the Maryland Board of Architects.

COUNSEL'S REPORT

Ms. Praley advised that there is no need for a Closed Session for the reinstatement application since the applicant signed a Consent Order that requires a hearing before the Board for reinstatement. She further explained that the consent order is mandated.

She informed there were two (2) House Bills (HB 294 and 106), which both were passed by the Senate in January. House Bill (HB 344) about the Open Meetings Act has no change at this time. She will update the Board on the final outcome of all bills at the next meeting, following the session.

ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Maryland Board of Architects has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 28, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.

There being no further business, Motion (IV) was made by Mr. Sneed, seconded by Mr. Ey, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 12:26 p.m.

_____ With Corrections

_____ Without Corrections

Paul Edmeades, Chair

Date: