

Meeting Minutes

MEETING OF THE NEW MEXICO BOARD OF  
LICENSURE FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS  
AND PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS held at  
9:00 a.m., Friday, April 12, 2024,  
San Juan College, Classroom 1217  
4601 College Boulevard, Farmington, NM 87402  
& Virtual

**Members Present –** Robert Gromatzky, PS, Chair  
Emilie Dohleman, PE, Vice Chair  
Elizabeth McNally, PE  
John Wayne, PS  
Dr. Ahmed Elaksher, PEPS  
Benjamin Aragon, PS  
Karl Tonander, PE

**Members Absent –** Stephen Ney, PE  
Karen Nichols, Public Member  
Maxine McReynolds, Esq., Public Member

**Others Present –** Perry Valdez, BLPEPS, Executive Director  
Crystal Bustamante, BLPEPS, Budget/Finance Manager  
Miranda Gonzales, BLPEPS Administrative Manager  
Ralph Vincent, Project Manager  
Earl Burkholder, PEPS  
Antonio Sanchez, Farmers Electric Co-op  
Michael McCord, Farmers Electric Co-op  
Bobby Kimbro, PE, Lea County Electric Co-op  
Chuck Pinson, Central Valley Electric Co-op  
Charise Swanson, NM Rural Electric Co-op  
Chris Columbus  
Robert Castillo

**1. Convene, Roll Call and Introduction of Audience**

Prior to convening the meeting Mr. Valdez read the meeting script regarding the virtual meeting protocols. Mr. Gromatzky convened the meeting at 9:02 a.m., roll call was taken and a quorum was noted. Audience introductions were made at this time.

**2. Meeting Notification**

Mr. Valdez informed the Board the meeting was noticed on the Board's website and at the Board Office.

3. **Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION** by Ms. Dohleman to approve the agenda as presented, **SECONDED** by Ms. McNally,

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Voting 'Aye':** Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. Dohleman, Ms. McNally, Mr. Wayne, Dr. Elaksher, Mr. Aragon, Mr. Tonander

The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

4. **Approval of Minutes**

a. **Minutes of December 15, 2023**

b. **Minutes of January 12, 2024**

**MOTION** by Ms. McNally to approve the Minutes of December 15, 2023, and January 12, 2024, as presented, **SECONDED** by Mr. Tonander,

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Voting 'Aye':** Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. Dohleman, Ms. McNally, Mr. Wayne, Dr. Elaksher, Mr. Aragon, Mr. Tonander

The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

5. **Requested Public Comment/Correspondence**

a. **Industrial Exemption pursuant to NMSA 61-23-22 and 61-23-27.10 and NMAC 16.39.3.11 G. and 16.39.5.8 G.**

Mr. Valdez presented the Industrial Exemption FAQ which was created from the public's questions and the Board's responses. He complimented Ms. Bustamante and Ms. Gonzales for the work and effort they put into compiling the information. Mr. Valdez said there were two responses highlighted in yellow because he and staff needed more information from the Board for the responses.

Mr. Tonander asked if it was the intent to publish the FAQ list, except for the two in yellow.

Mr. Valdez responded that was the idea. He said if the two questions were not resolved today then the list would be published without those questions and responses.

Mr. Gromatzky stated he needed to edit the response to question number four. The response is tied to the advisory opinion he drafted and based on the feedback from yesterday's PSC meeting, it must be revised.

Ms. Gonzales revised the response to “Set aside for Surveying Board Advisory Opinion”.

Mr. Tonander noted that question number ten seemed to be missing some additional information. He suggested deleting the words “...and the responses will be provided on xxx XX, 2024”.

Mr. Valdez pointed out the first yellow highlighted response for question 16.

Mr. Tonander responded he would research the additional citation and inform the Board staff.

Mr. Gromatzky asked Mr. Valdez if he had received a response from the New Mexico Department of Justice for question number 29.

Mr. Valdez informed the Board members that he had not and would follow up for a response.

Mr. Valdez identified the second yellow highlighted response for question 47. Which was set aside for a Full Board advisory opinion.

**MOTION** by Mr. Tonander to approve the comments by the Board regarding the Industrial Exemption with the amendments made at this meeting, **SECONDED** by Ms. McNally,

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Voting ‘Aye’:** Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. Dohleman, Ms. McNally, Mr. Wayne, Dr. Elaksher, Mr. Aragon, Mr. Tonander

The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

**6. Director’s Report**

**a. Staff Vacancies**

Mr. Valdez reported one staff vacancy, the Executive Assistant position. He informed the Board the position was advertised and there were several candidates who applied for the position. Ms. Bustamante and he vetted some potential candidates for interviews.

Mr. Valdez asked the Board members if one or two of them who would want to participate in the interviews, once they are scheduled?

Mr. Gromatzky asked if their participation needed to be in person or if it could be done virtually?

Mr. Valdez answered a virtual option is available for the Board members to participate.

Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. McNally, and Mr. Aragon agreed to participate in the interviews.

**b. Financial Report**

Ms. Bustamante reported that she only included the budget projections for the remainder of the fiscal year. She reported the scholarship fund was budgeted at \$250,000 and \$99,508 was spent, for a remainder of \$150,492 in the fund.

However, she and Ms. Trujillo have begun the process of deducting for the University scholarships, therefore, the remaining approximate amount would be \$53,000 in the fund.

Ms. Dohleman asked if the remaining amount goes away at the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Bustamante answered that the remaining amount would stay in the scholarship fund.

Mr. Aragon asked if the cap for the next fiscal year is at \$250,000?

Mr. Valdez explained the cap is at \$250,000 and any amount remaining would accumulate in the scholarship fund.

Ms. Dohleman asked if there was a possibility the remaining \$53,000 would be allocated for good use before the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. Valdez stated a request from NMSU was received for \$50,000. If the request is approved, it would expend \$50,000 and leave \$3,000 in the fund at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Tonander asked if the amount of \$53,000 was correct subtracting out the \$100,000 for the scholarships.

Ms. Bustamante reviewed the data and corrected the amount to \$50,493.

Ms. McNally asked how the students find out about the scholarships, and where they apply.

Mr. Valdez responded that the Universities are supposed to let the students know. However, based on his and Mr. Tonander's experience during the presentations to the students, the students are unaware of the scholarship. So, he

and Mr. Tonander have been promoting the scholarship and making the students aware of its existence. Mr. Valdez commented that more marketing was necessary to promote the scholarship.

Ms. McNally noted that this is also an issue for NMSPE and their scholarship. NMSPE does as much as possible to make their scholarship known.

Mr. Tonander explained the processes are different with how NMSPE and the Board does the scholarship. NMSPE is involved in the awarding of the scholarship to a student, whereas the Board distributes the money to the university, and they award the scholarship.

Ms. McNally asked if there could be a parallel effort to promote the scholarships.

Mr. Tonander expressed his opinion that it could derail the process the universities follow by flooding them with other applicants.

Mr. Valdez suggested asking the question to the universities of how they promote the scholarship to the students.

Mr. Gromatzky asked if the Board knew if all the funding for the scholarship is being utilized.

Ms. Bustamante answered that NMSU had a small amount of funding leftover, and they found a way to make use of it for the current school year.

Mr. Gromatzky requested that information about the scholarship be placed on the Board's website. He recommended promotion of the scholarship and how someone could go about applying for the scholarship.

Ms. McNally requested the promotion also be placed on the Board's LinkedIn page.

Ms. Bustamante continued with her financial report of the budget. She reported in the personnel services category \$729,300 was budgeted, of that \$498,300 was expensed. The projected balance at the end of the fiscal year would be \$22,000. The contracts category had an adjusted budget of \$962,200. Expensed was \$92,630 with an encumbrance of \$629,500, therefore, a possible projected remaining amount of \$240,000 at the end of the fiscal year. Within the other costs category, a beginning adjusted budget of \$118,900, of this \$50,000 was expensed. There are \$25,300 in tied to purchase orders leaving a remaining amount of \$43,000 projected at the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Bustamante noted that the amount in the contracts that was projected to revert to the fund balance was due to the licensing software project. She informed the Board that it was originally anticipated the project would be completed in Fiscal Year 2024. The remaining \$240,000 will be used in Fiscal Year 2025. Ms. Bustamante said the 2025 operating budget was being finalized.

Mr. Tonander asked if it was anticipated to use more of the amount budgeted.

Ms. Bustamante replied that historically it was budgeted at \$135,000 and \$20,000 of that amount was planned on being used.

**c. License Status Report**

Mr. Valdez gave the following license status report to the Board:

Number of Active Licenses: **10,634** as of April 5, 2024

- **Professional Engineers**
  - Number of active PEs: **10,103**
    - In State: 1,940
    - Out of State: 8,163
- **Professional Surveyors**
  - Number of active PSs: **523**
    - In State: 203
    - Out of State: 320
- **Professional Engineers/Professional Surveyors**
  - Number of active PEPS: **8**
    - In State: 7
    - Out of State: 1

*\*Of the number of engineers and surveyors listed above, these are individuals licensed as both engineers and surveyors with two separate license numbers (dual licensees).*

- Licensees with two numbers: 47\*
  - In State: 24
  - Out of State: 23

**2023 License Renewals**

Number of Licenses in Renewal: **5,425** as of September 12, 2023

Number of Licenses Renewed: **4,941** as of February 29, 2024

Number of Lapsed Licenses: **484** as of March 1, 2024

- **Professional Engineers**
  - Number of expired PEs: **468**
    - In State: 35
    - Out of State: 433
- **Professional Surveyors**
  - Number of expired PSs: **15**
    - In State: 6
    - Out of State: 9

- Professional Engineers/Professional Surveyors

- Number of expired PEPS: 1
  - In State: 0
  - Out of State: 1

7. **Old Business**

There was no old business.

8. **New Business**

a. **Advisory Opinion NCEES CPC Standard**

Mr. Gromatzky introduced the item by informing the Board that the discussion arose in a committee and there was a conversation with NCEES about the CPC Standard and how, allegedly, our PDH requirements do not match that standard. He reminded the Members that the New Mexico PDH requirements are based on the NCEES CPC Standard. The PDH requirement is a biennial amount of 30 hours and at least two hours in engineering or surveying ethics, whereas the NCEES CPC Standard is an annual amount of 15 hours with one hour of ethics every year. It was suggested in the committee that we submit an advisory opinion to demonstrate to NCEES that in New Mexico if a licensee meets the NCEES standard they meet the PDH requirement.

Mr. Tonander said there were a few edits made to the draft advisory opinion at the PEC meeting. He pointed out the second sentence and recommended striking "...are identical...". The reason is because, while attending the Southern Zone meeting, there are going to be some motions at the NCEES Annual Meeting regarding the CPC standard, so the language won't be identical.

Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Tonander if the amended language from the PEC was what he was suggesting?

Mr. Tonander agreed that was the alternative language for the advisory opinion.

**MOTION** by Ms. Dohleman to approve the advisory opinion as amended,  
**SECONDED** by Dr. Elaksher,

**Discussion:** Mr. Aragon requested further discussion on this item. He noted that he is licensed in other states, and they require 30 PDHs every two years. Whether 30 PDHs are earned in one year or another, as long as the total number equals 30. Washington state requires 15 PDHs in one year and 15 the following year. Mr. Aragon expressed his concern that now it will be required to earn 15 PDHs per year.

Mr. Gromatzky responded that this advisory opinion would not change the current requirement. The advisory opinion states that if a licensee met the

NCEES CPC Standard it would meet New Mexico's requirements.

Mr. Tonander added that when the Board is in front of the Legislature, it's noted that we made it clear to our licensees if they are in compliance with what is the national standard they are in compliance in New Mexico.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Voting 'Aye':** Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. Dohleman, Ms. McNally, Mr. Wayne, Dr. Elaksher, Mr. Aragon, Mr. Tonander

The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

**b. Advisory Opinion For the day-to-day right of way easements, are we going to have those surveyed?**

Mr. Gromatzky explained the reason for drafting the advisory opinion was to address the Industrial Exemption questions about easements. It states that professional surveyors are required to complete easements and subdivision plats when in the public right-of-way. It also mentions existing laws and the New Mexico Minimum Standards for Surveying. He noted that one of the past issues that has come up is there are legal descriptions that have been written as centered upon a buried utility with no other location or dimensions provided other than a width. This practice is unacceptable under the current Standards. During the PSC meeting, a comment came from the public about the condition of trying to describe a proposed easement or an un-platted piece of property or a property that was never surveyed. Mr. Gromatzky is taking the draft advisory opinion to include a response to the condition brought up at the PSC meeting.

Ms. Dohleman asked Mr. Gromatzky about pole-line easements, the ones centered upon a buried or overhead utility. Are these easements grandfathered in until such time as the property is re-platted or resurveyed?

Mr. Gromatzky answered 'Yes', and added they will need to be located. He further explained that anybody can draft an easement legal description and record it with the county clerk. The question arises, how do we enforce this when we can't identify who is responsible? Mr. Gromatzky said he didn't have an answer for this.

Mr. Tonander thanked Mr. Gromatzky for the advisory opinion. He suggested adding for the surveyors in the first sentence after "existing boundary" the following language, "and do not result in a new monumentation do not" or something similar. He explained that if any monumentation gets set as a result of an easement, it needs to be set by a professional surveyor.

Mr. Gromatzky said he would take the draft advisory opinion back to include



language for un-plated property and present it again.

**c. NMSU University Support Application – New Request**

*\*\*Dr. Elaksher was placed in the waiting room at 10:03 am\*\**

Mr. Gromatzky asked the Staff if there were any issues with the application regarding completeness or appropriateness, or if there were any issues that would prevent the application from being considered at this meeting?

Mr. Valdez replied there were not.

Mr. Gromatzky informed the Board that the request was discussed at the PSC meeting. He explained the request is from NMSU for their surveying program. The University was previously granted \$50,000 this year, they are now requesting an additional \$50,000, which would consume the remaining amount of the fund. He asked the staff if any other applications were received.

Mr. Valdez responded no other requests were received.

Mr. Wayne asked if there was a limit to how much a university could request per year?

Mr. Tonander answered requests are limited to \$50,000 each but they could come back and request additional funding such as this request.

**MOTION** by Mr. Tonander to approve the NMSU request, **SECONDED** by Ms. McNally,

*\*\*Dr. Elaksher rejoined the meeting at 10:11 am\*\**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Voting ‘Aye’:** Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. Dohleman, Ms. McNally, Mr. Wayne, Mr. Aragon, Mr. Tonander

**Recuse:** Dr. Elaksher and was placed in the waiting room during discussion.

The motion **PASSED**.

**d. FY 25 Meeting Calendar**

Mr. Valdez presented the draft FY25 meeting calendar. He informed the Board that he made sure not to schedule any board meetings on the dates when NMPS and NMSPE are holding their annual meetings.

Ms. McNally asked where the meeting calendar was posted for the public.

Mr. Valdez answered on the Board's website.

Ms. McNally requested it be posted on the Board's LinkedIn page.

**MOTION** by Ms. Dohleman to approve the FY25 meeting calendar as presented,  
**SECONDED** by Ms. McNally,

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Voting 'Aye':** Mr. Gromatzky, Ms. Dohleman, Ms. McNally, Mr. Wayne, Dr. Elaksher, Mr. Aragon, Mr. Tonander

The motion **PASSED** unanimously.

**e. NCEES Annual Meeting Attendance (Chicago, IL – August 14-17, 2024)**

Mr. Valdez introduced the item and asked who would be willing to attend the meeting as a funded delegate.

Ms. Dohleman asked Mr. Tonander to provide information about the Annual Meeting.

Mr. Tonander explained the meeting format would change after this annual meeting. However, the format for the 2024 meeting would be some technical sessions for PDHs on the first day, a plenary session to informally discuss reports and motions, and a welcoming event in the evening. The next day is a business session, zone meetings, and then separate forums for engineers, surveyors, and Member Board Administrators. There are several motions to consider and vote on, the motions would not be published until after the NCEES Western Zone meeting. Everybody has the opportunity to speak on a pro/con basis. There is a law enforcement session on Friday afternoon, and a law enforcement training on Saturday.

Mr. Valdez said he would also contact those Board Members not in attendance at this meeting.

Ms. Dohleman would check her calendar and email Mr. Valdez.

Mr. Elaksher asked if there was a deadline to decide.

Mr. Valdez responded that the deadline is the end of April.

Mr. Aragon and Ms. McNally informed the other members of their experience attending the annual meeting.

**f. NCEES Candidates**

**1) NCEES President-Elect**

- a. Dr. Q., PE (California)
- b. Elizabeth Johnston, PE (Alaska)

**2) NCEES Western zone Vice President Candidate**

- a. Aaron Blaisedell, PS (Washington)

**3) NCEES Western Zone Assistant Vice-President Candidate**

- a. Sean St. Clair, PE (Oregon)
- b. Scott Sayles, PE (Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah)

Mr. Valdez informed the Board the information was provided for their consideration on who the Board would vote for at the Western Zone meeting and Annual meeting.

Mr. Tonander added that the vote is a group vote, one vote for the Board.

The candidate's qualifications were considered individually.

Mr. Gromatzky asked if the Board needs to make a decision at this time.

Mr. Valdez said no, the Board does not.

Mr. Gromatzky directed the staff to place this item on the June meeting agenda.

**9. Committee Reports**

**a. PS Committee**

Mr. Wayne reported that Mr. Glen Thurow attended the meeting. He brought up the statute of repose for surveyors and informed the Board on what he was doing. Mr. Thurow said he would keep the Board apprised as to the progress.

Mr. Wayne said the SPCS 2022 update will be up by mid 2025.

Mr. Wayne stated they approved two applicants for the PS exam, and six applicants for PS endorsement. One case was dismissed, one self-reporting case fulfilled their settlement agreement and was closed. He said there are ten active surveyor cases.

Mr. Wayne concluded that the Committee reviewed seven endorsement applications, six applications were approved for endorsement, and one was not approved.

**b. PE Committee**

Ms. McNally reported there were 10 disciplinary cases on the agenda. Three

were closed because they fulfilled their settlement agreements. The remaining seven were referred for continued action. A settlement agreement, which was prepared by the Administrative Prosecutor, was accepted for one of the cases.

Ms. McNally said there were seven self-reporting cases on the agenda. Four were closed for having fulfilled their pre-NCA settlement agreements. The remainder were acknowledged receipt and no further action taken; one was to keep the Board up to date on the status of certain conditions.

Ms. McNally stated the Committee meeting had to end by 4:30 pm so there were several applications that still require review. A special meeting would be scheduled to finish the agenda.

Mr. Valdez praised Ms. Gonzales and Ms. James for ensuring the disciplinary cases are being investigated on a regular basis. They have been doing a great job with compliance, getting everything taken care of.

Mr. Valdez also thanked and praised the Board staff. They have been working diligently. He gave credit to them for the wonderful work they do.

**c. Executive Committee**

Mr. Gromatzky reported the Committee met to focus and amend the Board's responses to the Industrial Exemption questions. The spreadsheet that was voted on at this meeting was the product of the Committee's work.

**d. Joint Practice Committee**

Mr. Aragon reported there was a meeting in February. The Committee decided to update the Handbook for Building Officials, the last published update was in 2016. He said Mr. Valdez would send the Word document for the Board members to provide their edits. Any comments to provide them to Mr. Valdez, Ms. Dohleman, and himself. The Committee will meet June 20<sup>th</sup> to compile the edits into one version. Mr. Aragon said the Handbook had not been updated in eight years.

Mr. Aragon also mentioned the procurement process by the State was discussed. He said Mr. Michael Bodelson is spearheading this.

Ms. Dohleman added that RFPs were being evaluated on the cost and not the qualifications of the firm.

Mr. Tonander stated several years ago he worked with Construction Programs Bureau with their template RFP and had some success, but it seemed like it reverted. When public entities were selecting projects in engineering and

surveying there was a section that required the license number of a licensee for each of those disciplines. He said having that as well as an affirmative statement that the firm those people are working for have an affidavit on record with the board on who is in responsible charge would be good additions to the standard RFP document. There are some individuals who are not licensed in the State doing work on projects.

**e. Public Information, Exam and Licensure Promotion Committee**

**1) Presentation(s)**

**2) Newsletter**

Ms. McNally informed the Board the Committee met. There may be an opportunity to present to NMPS in 2025 in Las Cruces. An ethics presentation will be provided to the NMPS Rio Grande chapter.

Ms. McNally reported Mr. Thurow discussed the statute of repose for surveyors and was seeking support for this change.

Ms. McNally said Ms. Bustamante is working on the newsletter. She recommended including information about NMSPE and their conference.

Ms. McNally reported that Mr. Valdez and Ms. Gonzales were preparing the honor cords for the graduates who passed the FE and FS exam. She also mentioned an Order of the Engineer ceremony the Board was invited to attend at UNM.

Ms. McNally reported NMSPE is excited to collaborate on outreach efforts, which would be beneficial for both the Board and NMSPE. One idea was to place links to NMSPE and NMPS on the Board's website and connect on LinkedIn.

Mr. Valdez said Ms. Gonzales was producing a pamphlet to include with the honor cords and NMSPE would provide a flyer as well.

Mr. Gromatzky reported on the Western Regional Conference. He mentioned the presentations provided by the Executive Directors of the Boards who were invited to speak.

**f. Legal Enforcement Committee**

Mr. Gromatzky noted the Committee had not met.

**g. Penalties and Fees Committee**

Mr. Wayne noted that upgrades to the fines table were sent to the PEC, and they are waiting for their review and edits. He mentioned the issue they are trying to address regarding repeat offenders.

Mr. Tonander said there was one that piqued his interest, ignoring the requests of the Board. It appeared the fine was a relatively minor penalty. He said it appeared that some respondents may be waiting out the two-year statute of limitation by not responding.

Ms. McNally asked if the PSC had a recurring pattern of people not responding to requests for information.

Mr. Wayne answered no.

Mr. Gromatzky stated he had seen several complaints against an individual. He suggested with the document he created, it required peer review, and it would basically add to the cost of the penalty. The document was meant as an ad hoc document.

Mr. Tonander commented that the fines table is a guidance only and not intended to limit board action.

#### **h. NCEES Committee Members**

Mr. Tonander informed the Board that there were approximately 70 plus motions this year for the NCEES Annual Meeting. Many of the motions are from the Bylaws and the Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG) updating language to gender neutral. He noted that the New Mexico motion which became the Western Zone motion, the 10-year career engineer, had previously died and was assigned to a committee. The Engineering Licensure Task Force brought it back with the change of 7-years of experience rather than 10-years. If the motion is successful, it will move to the UPLG, not for any changes, but for consideration to place into the NCEES Model Law.

Mr. Tonander reported on his attendance at the Southern Zone meeting. He noted this was the only Zone which has a law enforcement session outside of the Annual meeting.

Mr. Tonander mentioned the number of scheduled examinations has increased, exceeding projections, both for engineering and surveying.

Mr. Tonander spoke of the Mutual Recognition Agreement with the U.K. and the signing ceremony at the British Consulate in Chicago. Essentially an engineer can apply to be on an international registry maintained by NCEES. The registry is essentially a Model Law engineer, instead of 4-years of experience, 6-years of experience is required, with a British equivalency. Once you're on the international registry, you apply with Great Britain and indicate you are on the registry, you get licensed, and vice-versa to be licensed in those states that have signed on to the Agreement. There are some states that wish to sign the

Agreement but have to make changes to their statutes.

Mr. Valdez asked if the 7-year career motion passes, would the Board need or want to change the Act to match NCEES.

Mr. Tonander responded that it would be up to the Board to decide that. He mentioned that he would not be on the Board at that time, but he would think the Board would want to be uniform with NCEES. Another change in the statutes would be needed to incorporate language to allow for the Mutual Recognition Agreement with the U.K.

Mr. Tonander stated he was interested in speaking to Mr. Thurow about the statute of repose. Texas has a law that states, for engineers, in order to file a case of malpractice or otherwise on an engineer, the complainant needs another Texas licensed professional engineer to indicate they believe there is an engineering flaw. ACEC supported this Texas approach and argued that insurance costs will increase, and the professionals will begin to leave the state for somewhere with lower costs if it was not enacted.

Mr. Gromatzky mentioned the request he received for a Mapping Science exam. It was discussed at the PSC meeting, and it was decided the exam would not meet the New Mexico educational standards.

**i. Project Steering Committee**

**1) Update on Network and Licensing System**

Mr. Vincent informed the Board the licensure system project kicked off. We are developing the project plan and 90% completed. The go-live date was scheduled for November; however, we requested a go-live date for the beginning of October. A three-day session is scheduled for staff. The staff will receive login credentials. The sessions are for staff to configure the system with Accela. The Accela staff will begin the configuration/customization of the base system. Following is the data migration and setup for the payment system. Hopefully, the go-live date will be the end of September or beginning of October.

Mr. Gromatzky added that the Staff is working on getting the PCI compliance part completed. The Board will be responsible for paying for the initial PCI audit, which was not a cost included in the project cost. The project will extend to the next fiscal year.

Mr. Valdez indicated the budget for the project would need to be increased in the new fiscal year to account for the unexpected increase in cost for the Project Manager and IV&V.

Mr. Vincent informed the Board it would be necessary to go back to the Project Certification Committee regarding the changes.  
Ms. Bustamante suggested a special meeting of the Full Board may be needed for a vote to move the necessary funds from the Fund Balance for the project in the new fiscal year.

**10. Next Scheduled Meeting Date:** – June 7, 2024 – Santa Fe/Virtual

**11. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11: 53 a.m.

**Submitted by:**

s/Perry Valdez

Perry Valdez, Executive Director

**Approved by:**

s/Robert Gromatzky

Robert Gromatzky, Chair

June 7, 2024 **Approved Date**