

**MINUTES OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA CODE OFFICIALS QUALIFICATION BOARD**

July 27, 2010

The quarterly meeting of the NC Code Officials Qualification Board was held at 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, July 27, 2010 at the Board's office at 322 Chapanoke Road in Raleigh, NC.

The following members of the NC Code Officials Qualification Board were present:

Ronnie Bailey	James Kennedy, Jr.	Victor Shaw
Dean Barbour	John Kirkland	Sherrill Smith
Richard Blackburn	Hayden Lutterloh, III	Bill Thunberg
Tim Bradley	Tracy McPherson	Hiram Williams
Jeff Curtis	Kenneth Mullen	
Charles Horne	William Rakatansky	

Members absent:

Richard Ducker
Valoree Eikinas
Mark Hicks
Robert Nunez

Others in attendance were as follows:

Samantha Ewens	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Kathy Williams	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Shane Phelps	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Celestine Phill	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Suzanne Taylor	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Sarah van Doornewaard	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Bobby Croom	Department of Justice	Raleigh, NC
Thomas Markham	Department of Justice	Raleigh, NC
Jeffrey L. Britt	Robeson County Inspection	Lumberton, NC
Amy Clifton	Johnston County Inspection	Smithfield, NC
Anaira Knight		Smithfield, NC
Nader Fahami	Charlotte Fire Inspection Dept.	Charlotte, NC
Jack Paramore		Burgaw, NC
Mike Blackmon	Dunn Inspection Dept.	Dunn, NC
Steven King	Dunn Inspection Dept.	Dunn, NC
Austin King		Benson, NC
Hazel King		Benson, NC
Melissa Tew		Benson, NC
Sarah Tew		Benson, NC
Jonathan Leonard	Charlotte Fire Inspection Dept.	Charlotte, NC

Preliminary Matters

Chairman Hayden Lutterloh presided over the meeting and welcomed guests. After a call to order, Lutterloh introduced new board member Dean Barbour, Director of Inspections Johnston County. Lutterloh asked the Board members to introduce themselves. Lutterloh asked staff to send Deborah Simpson a Certificate of Appreciation and letter from the Board expressing our appreciation for her service to our Board as a member, and most recently as Vice Chair. Lutterloh asked the Board if there were any conflicts of interest that needed to be made known. Tracy McPherson excused herself from the Board vote on the Bullard Voluntary Settlement Agreement.

Item 1: Approval of April 27, 2010 Minutes

Charles Horne made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2010 Board meeting. William Rakatansky seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Item 2: Approval of New Standard Certificate Applicants

William Rakatansky made a motion that the Board grant Standard Inspection Certificates to those applicants who have met the Board's education, experience, and examination requirements. The applicants are listed in an attachment to the minutes. Ronnie Bailey seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Fifth Level III Standard Inspection Certificate

Two individuals received their fifth level III certificate. They were Steven R. King of the City of Dunn Inspection Department, and Amy L. Clifton of the Johnston County Inspection Department. They were greeted, and congratulated by each Board member.

Item 3: Committee Reports:

- a) Executive Committee: The committee had not met and had no report.
- b) Policies and Procedures Committee: The committee had not met and had no report.
- c) Education and Research Committee: The committee had not met and had no report.
- d) Qualification and Evaluation Committee: The committee had not met and had no report.

Item 4: Staff Reports

Samantha Ewens made the following Director's report

BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Dean Barbour has been appointed to the position vacated by Deborah Simpson. Mr. Barbour is currently the director of the inspections department for Johnston County. His oath was administered earlier this morning. All positions on the Board are currently filled.

UPDATING BOARD RULES FOR STANDARD COURSE INSTRUCTORS

The process has been started for updating and/or creating these rules as discussed at the last Board meeting. Because a fair number of procedures have been developed by staff out of necessity over the years, our plan is to get those procedures in a written format along with any suggestions we have for improvements. Staff can then present that outline to the Education committee for review before proceeding. Lutterloh asked how long it would be before it would be ready for the Education committee would be able to review it. Ms. Ewens stated that she anticipates that by the next board meeting there should be something to report, and hopefully we should be able to meet with the committee before then.

SCALING OF TEST SCORES

We have reviewed this issue multiple times. The process has been completed. ICC staff led members of our subject matter experts (SMEs) committees. They have reevaluated cut scores, developed new questions, and that information is available and ready for the update on September 1, 2010. We will notify anyone that is signing up to take a test that scaling will be part of the process. Staff will also send out a letter to jurisdictions so that they may notify their staff of the changes. An update will also be included in the next DOI engineering newsletter. Lutterloh suggested that this information is given at the Council of Code Officials Meeting.

UPCOMING COUNCIL OF CODE OFFICIALS MEETING

Staff will be presenting a one-hour talk at next weeks COCO meeting, to be held in Wilmington. This meeting is held only every four years, and it is a great opportunity to reach out to the Code enforcement community at large. Based on the Board's recommendations from the last meeting, a central topic of that talk will be not only the procedural changes accompanying the move to electronic testing but also the services that are provided as part of the associated contract. We hope to foster a better understanding that the testing fee is used to develop training materials as well.

INVESTIGATIVE REPORT DELAY REQUEST

We have had a request to delay a final Board decision on the investigation into Mr. Jack Paramore, which had been prepared for presentation today. Robert Croom would like to discuss this with the Board.

Mr. Croom explained that Mr. Lewis and his attorney are requesting that the Board not take any action today on the complaint that was filed by Mr. Lewis regarding Mr. Jack Paramore. Mr. Lewis filed a complaint against Mr. Jack Paramore in September 2009. In light of the recently filed lawsuit, and the potential for the discovery of additional information Staff is recommending that the Board not take any action on the report today until the conclusion of the lawsuit. Mr. Croom stated that although our investigation is complete at this point based on the evidence we have we do not know whether this lawsuit may produce new evidence. It might be wise in this particular instance to hold off for today any action on this report. This report was initially delayed from the last Board meeting until this meeting to give Mr. Lewis an opportunity to attend the meeting. Mr. Thunberg asked if Mr. Lewis failed to provide evidence that is in his possession would that impact our investigation. Mr. Croom stated that he did not know if this was the case. He believes at this time that we have reviewed and considered all of the information that Mr. Lewis has provided to us as part of the current report. Mr. Thunberg asked what Mr. Paramore's position was on this, and if he has any objections to the hearing being postponed. Mr. Croom stated that he did not know if Mr. Paramore had any objections. Mr. Croom also stated again that staff is recommending that the Board not take any action. Mr. Croom noted that at this time the Board does have a copy of the investigation report, and the conclusion is that there is No Basis in Fact to the charges. There is no delay in Board action or any sort of hearing on this matter, staff is requesting not to take any action today. Mr. Croom does not feel that this request is unreasonable.

Mr. Lutterloh stated that Mr. Paramore has made the attempt to be here, and he would like Mr. Paramore to state what his understanding is to the Board of the situation without giving any evidence because this is not a hearing. Mr. Tim Bradley cautioned against making any arguments because the Board has not taken any action, and it could be detrimental for Mr. Paramore in the future to make statements on record. Mr. Lutterloh gave Mr. Paramore information regarding public meetings being recorded. Mr. Lutterloh thanked Mr. Paramore on behalf of the Board for attending today and stated that it would be best that he did not make any statements at this time. Mr. Paramore stated that Mr. Lewis's statements are absolutely false. Mr. Lutterloh cautioned Mr. Paramore.

Mr. Thunberg made a motion to accept staffs request to delay the final Board decision on the investigation to a future date. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Mr. Lutterloh requested a vote by the Board. The majority accepted the motion; there was one dissenting vote. The motion was passed.

Mr. Bradley suggested that the Board go on record that there has been no disciplinary action taken against Mr. Paramore by the Board, and that staff should notify both parties by Certified letter of that status. Mr. Lutterloh expanded and wanted staff to prepare a letter directly to Mr. Paramore copied to Mr. Lewis or to whomever the Secretary thinks it needs to go to, the letter needs to come from the Secretary. The letter needs to state that there is no action pending before this Board, and that there has been no action taken against Mr. Paramore in any pending or current allegations. The last allegations that were brought before the Board were determined to have no basis in fact, and the Board voted and accepted that there was no

basis in fact to any previous complaint that was made against Mr. Paramore. Hiram Williams motioned to accept this request. Mr. Rakatansky seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Mr. Shaw asked if this issue would need to be brought up in the future. Mr. Croom advised that the Board would need to go through normal procedures when Mr. Phelps presents his reports to the Board as part as the normal course of business, and that would be the reason to bring this case back up. Mr. Croom clarified that there were two complaints filed against Mr. Paramore.

Mr. Paramore asked since he has been through this twice, and there was no basis in fact why he could not expedite it today. He asked why he must be held in suspension, if a person is so unanchored that if given extended time he comes back with the same information. Mr. Thunberg called a Point of Order stating the Board has acted on this matter, and delayed it to a later date. Mr. Lutterloh stated that we have no action here today before this Board for us to pass on. There was no hearing scheduled today, and that is why this Board is not taking an action on that type of complaint. Mr. Paramore asked if the initial investigation is complete. Mr. Lutterloh stated that he cannot advise that. The initial first complaint is complete and that there is no basis in fact and the Board already voted on that. On the information that was just heard there is additional information, and we have not had that information brought before the Board. Mr. Croom clarified that the second investigation is complete based on the information we have now, we are requesting that the Board not take any action on this report today because of the filing of the lawsuit, just in case there is any additional evidence. Mr. Lutterloh stated he wants to make sure all parties are properly represented. Mr. Bradley stated that he assumes that since there were no actions taken by the Board that Mr. Paramore's certificates are active and valid. Mr. Croom stated that they would be active and valid if he were employed as a Code Enforcement Official. Mr. Bradley asked if there would be anything prohibiting him if an employer asks from gaining his certificates. Mr. Croom stated that if he wanted to resume Code Enforcement and he were employed that there is nothing prohibiting this, because of the result of the second investigation. If this were to occur we would need to bring the matter up in front of the Board to clean the issue up. Just because there is an investigation does not mean it impacts a person's certificate. Mr. Paramore stated that one of the questions that is asked is if there is a complaint against you. Mr. Croom stated if that situation arises we will put this investigation back up on the agenda. Mr. Paramore stated that he has not violated his commitment to this council or the North Carolina Building Code. Mr. Lutterloh stated that question is not before the Board at this time. Mr. Lutterloh dismissed Mr. Paramore

Kathy Williams made the following report concerning qualification section to the Board.

EXPIRED PROBATIONARY CERTIFICATES

Probationary certificates are valid for a period of two years. Notices of expiration are sent to each inspector and his or her City or County Manager. The probationary certificates for 110 individuals have expired this quarter.

JURISDICTIONS OUT OF COMPLIANCE

There are no jurisdictions out of compliance as this time.

STANDARD AND LIMITED RENEWALS

The Limited and Standard renewals ended June 30. Staff has received approximately 86 percent of the standard and limited renewals for renewal year 2010. Second notices will be going out the first week of August, 2010. 440 suspension letters have been mailed to those individuals who did not complete the required six hours of continuing education necessary to renew certificates. A copy of the letter goes to the Director of Inspections and the City or County Manager. As each individual completes the required continuing education, the certificate will be activated and renewed and the card will be forwarded to the individual in their jurisdiction.

Mr. Rakatansky questioned the amount of suspensions. He wanted to know if it was because of downsizing. Ms. Williams said that there have been many layoffs, and are downsizing because they are experiencing slow downs.

COURSE REVIEW COMMITTEES

The Building Exam Review Committee met April 29 – 30, 2010. The committee consisted of approximately 8-10 code enforcement officials (CEOs) from across the state that have a standard certificate in the required trade. ICC staff directed the committees. The committee was divided into two groups. One group reviewed questions to set cut scores which establish the level of difficulty for each exam question. The second group reviewed the results of the item analysis survey sent out last year. This information determined the content of the exam based on the actual job tasks performed by each inspector. The results of the item analysis became the exam blueprint. Once each group completed their set activity, the committee regrouped and spent the remaining time writing new exam items to add to the item bank as outlined by the exam blueprint. The committee reached its goal and performed a great deal of work during the two-day time period. We will begin with the scaling in September.

IFSAC RE-ACCREDITATION UPDATE

Staff is preparing for an IFSAC re-accreditation visit in November, 2010. Staff will participate in a mock audit with the Fire and Rescue Division in September, 2010 to make any final adjustments if necessary. A team of IFSAC representatives will perform a field audit for Fire Inspector I, II, and III. IFSAC currently provides accreditation to entities that certify the competency of and issue certificates to individuals who pass examinations based on the National Fire Protection Association fire service professional qualifications and other standards approved by IFSAC members. This accreditation status is recognized nationally and internationally.

STANDARD CERTIFICATE TESTING – April 20, 2010 – July 12, 2010

Examination Summary

122 exams were taken and 19 exams were reviews. Mr. Rakatansky asked about the column with percent passing. Mr. Lutterloh requested that this column return to the reports. The results of the State exams given April 20, 2010 – July 12, 2010 are summarized below:

<u>Area/Level</u>	<u>Number Taking</u>	<u>Number Passing</u>	<u>High Score</u>	<u>Low Score</u>	<u>Reviews</u>
Building Inspector I	10	2	77	45	2
Building Inspector II	11	9	93	51	2
Building Inspector III	17	6	91	59	1
Electrical Inspector I	7	2	77	54	1
Electrical Inspector II	11	8	78	61	3
Electrical Inspector III	4	3	79	62	0
Fire Inspector I	19	10	86	43	2
Fire Inspector II	11	4	80	58	4
Fire Inspector III	9	9	87	73	0
Mechanical Inspector I	2	0	65	65	1
Mechanical Inspector II	8	6	79	55	2
Mechanical Inspector III	6	6	71	73	0
Plumbing Inspector I	2	1	81	61	0
Plumbing Inspector II	13	11	85	67	1
Plumbing Inspector III	2	2	85	77	0
Totals	122	79			19

Standard Certificates Earned

<u>Area</u>	<u>Active Inspectors</u>	<u>Pre-Qualification</u>
Building	16	1
Electrical	13	0
Fire	21	2
Mechanical	12	0
Plumbing	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	75	4

Active Inspectors (GS 143-151.13(a)):	75
Pre-Qualification (GS 143-151.13(a)):	4
Exempt from Exam (GS 143-151.13(f)):	0
Reciprocity (G.S. 143-151.14)	<u>0</u>
Total Standard Certificates Issued:	79

***Note:** Applicants are no longer seated one exam cycle prior to the expiration of their probationary certificate. Individuals are able to take exams upon their own schedule. If an applicant does not pass the exam, the CEO is eligible to retake the exam in as little as 2 months. This provides the applicant with two opportunities to pass the state exam before the certificate expires.

Exam Complaint Summary

The staff received 11 complaints concerning exams since April 28, 2010. Some complaints were simply comments that did not involve or require any type of action. A summary of complaints is below:

1. Test Challenge Results - We received five complaints concerning not receiving test challenge results in a timely matter. During the month of April, the primary staff responsible for this activity was at our offices conducting the exam review committee activities. During this time, the normal timeframe of 1 to 2 weeks to receive feedback on an exam challenge became 3 to 4 weeks. This issue has been resolved.
2. Clock Issue – Two individuals contacted our office regarding clock issues. One individual believed he had received 2 ½ hours instead of 3 ½ hours. ICC conducted a time audit of his computer time and found that he had received 3 ½ hours. The other clock issue resulted from a review. The clock only registered 30 minutes, instead of the correct time. This individual was rescheduled for another free exam review.

Mr. Rakatansky asked how this could occur. Ms. Williams stated it was a computer glitch.

3. Registration Issues – Two individuals stated they could not register for an exam. We found that both individuals had used the wrong phone number for registration. The situation was corrected.
4. Scoring issue – One individual believed his score result was incorrect due to information he was given at the site. Staff requested the examinee’s paperwork and graded his exam by hand. The score reported by ICC was correct. The individual was notified.

5. Check-In Process – One individual contacted the office regarding the check-in procedure. He did not like the fact that he could not take in his personal items, such as keys, wallet and watch. Staff explained the reason for not being able to bring such items into a testing center and the issue was resolved.

Mr. Lutterloh asked why we are receiving so many complaints at this time, when we did not have so many issues when staff gave the exams. Ms. Williams stated we did have complaints when we gave the exams in the past, but we always handled them in house. Mr. Lutterloh asked if we are better off having a third party giving the exams. We are having more concerns and issues. Ms. Williams stated that there are some positives. There is more flexibility and convenience. You receive your results right away. These exams are more cost effective for some jurisdictions. Mr. Barbour shared his recent views on taking the exam, he stated that his screen went blank, and the proctors came over right away. He loved getting the score right away. Mr. Barbour stated that the jurisdictions that are further do save money, but he feels that there should be another option if they could not afford it. Mr. Lutterloh stated when the time comes there will be some re-evaluation of the testing procedure.

Fifth Level III Standard Inspection Certificate

There are two individuals receiving their fifth level III certificates today. They are:

Amy L. Clifton
Steven R. King

Johnston County Inspection Department
City of Dunn Inspection Department

The number of individuals achieving this level of certification is currently 205. Ms. Williams noted that not all are active. This is the number that have ever achieved this level.

Celestine Phill made the following report concerning Continuing Education to the Board.

There were 132 Continuing Education courses that were approved for the period. There were 10 instructors that were approved. There were 3 sponsors that were approved. There were 227 Continuing Education courses that were submitted for the period, and there were 14 courses scheduled after July 27, 2010, 26 courses were approved in multiple trades. There were a total of 69 Standard code courses scheduled for the period. There were 26 courses that were canceled, zero rescheduled and 22 for which grades have been received. Grades are pending for 21 courses. There are 94 courses that are approved that will be held after July 27, 2010.

The course notices were published in the Council of Code Officials newsletter, which is available online at the NC Department of Insurance website at www.nc.doi.com/OSFM/Engineering/COQB/engineering_coqb_home.asp.

NCDOI Website Updates

The Standard Code Course listing has a new look. In an effort to make the viewing of available courses more eye appealing to those inspectors looking to attend Standard Code courses, as well as a tool for community colleges to utilize in the planning and scheduling of upcoming courses, we have moved to a calendar-view format. The new format will allow community colleges to view the various Standard Code courses offered within the different regions and assist them in scheduling courses so that they are not competing with other community colleges within the same region. The first calendar was posted on the website on July 16, 2010.

Sponsor Workshop

We have scheduled our first Sponsor Workshop. In an effort to provide more in-depth training for existing and newly approved Sponsors, we have implemented a training workshop that each Sponsor will be requested to attend. The purpose of the workshop is to ensure that sponsors are familiar with the

Board Rules regarding Continuing Education and comfortable with the Sponsor, Instructor and Course Approval process, as well as become proficient in the submission of end-of-course documentation. Hopefully this will reduce errors in the reporting of continuing education credit. Also, the workshop will provide each sponsor with information regarding the new website process for advertising upcoming Continuing Education courses. The date of the workshop is Thursday September 2, 2010 from 8:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. and will be held in the 1st floor classroom at 322 Chapanoke Road. We are hoping to hold 4-5 other workshops so all sponsors can attend. Additional dates will be forthcoming.

Continuing Education Website Advertising

In order to provide inspectors with information regarding upcoming continuing education options, we have been working the Department of Insurance Information Technology Division to develop a way for Sponsors to advertise upcoming courses and locations. We have developed an interactive process whereby using a 5-digit user name and a password, a Sponsor can access their approved courses and then enter the scheduling information. This database will be available on the department's website and will allow for direct access to continuing education course information for all licensees and other interested parties at any time.

Standard Course Instructor PowerPoint Update

Based on comments from instructors who filled out the instructor evaluation form and from instructors who have talked with staff, the PowerPoint presentations are too long, wordy and need more visual aids. Utilizing these comments, the Staff tried to form a committee of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for each technical trade who has used the instructor PowerPoint presentations in their standard courses to identify the necessary changes in the different Chapters. We tried to set up a conference call, but there were too many conflicts. We contacted SMEs to look at certain Chapters and then they could take the PowerPoint chapters and revise them. We started getting reports that the PowerPoint's were too long. The PowerPoint chapters do have some diagrams, but not a lot. It is a lot of regurgitation of code. They were very hard to use, and why did they need this information when they could just look at their code book. Staff decided to contact International Code Council (ICC) and see if they could make changes. They have agreed to take back the PowerPoint's and make changes. Once this initial revision is complete, the North Carolina subject matter experts (instructors) will review to make sure all necessary information has been included. Using this approach will give the SMEs a better basis to conduct a review of the presentations in a more time efficient manner.

Mr. Bradley stated that the PowerPoint slides that were given to us by ICC were not to our standards. Mr. Bradley stated he will contact the President of ICC to get this issue resolved, and get the PowerPoint presentation to Office of State Fire Marshall's (OSFM) standards.

Mr. Hiram Williams asked about the Energy Code, and whether or not we would be having education regarding the Energy Code and if we have ICC develop that, or if we are having someone in-house developing it. Mr. Bradley stated that staff does welcome the suggestion to have ICC or in-house staff develop a course. Ms. Ewens stated that there is a million dollar contract that has been awarded by the Department of Energy to train Code Enforcement Officials across the state in the Energy Code. Part of that RFP is to develop the class, and get the class approved through staff, and then take the class around the state to a certain number of locations for ease of training. The governor has instituted a goal of 90% energy compliance with the Energy Code by 2012. Staff has been talking to them about getting that course through our Continuing Education approved. The Green Building Code will be much more difficult to implement into the current structure that we have. The question would arise is whether we need to add another Certification.

INVESTIGATIONS AND HEARINGS

INVESTIGATIONS

Investigations Begun – Not Completed

Johnson vs. Duffy
Forbes vs. Vaughn
Reynolds vs. Edwards/Satterfield
Cochrane vs. Marks
Henage vs. Capehart/Carter
Evans vs. Walker
Gatlin vs. True (2nd)

Investigations Completed –Basis in Fact

Cain vs. Thompson/Coxe

Ms. Taylor presented the information regarding Cain vs. Thompson/Coxe. Ms. Taylor believes that there is enough information to justify a hearing. Mr. Bradley motioned to take it to a hearing. Mr. Blackburn seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Investigations Completed –No Basis in Fact

Benton vs. City of Raleigh

Mr. Lutterloh opened the floor for a motion to accept Mr. Phelps's report of No Basis in Fact. Mr. Rakatansky motioned Mr. Shaw seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the Board.

Lewis vs. Paramore (2nd)

VOLUNTARY SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

Scott Bullard – Whispering Pines

Mr. Phelps presented the information regarding Mr. Scott Bullard. The Voluntary Settlement Agreement that Mr. Phelps brought before the Board is for Mr. Bullard to attend and pass a Fire Level 1 Standard Course, as well as a Law and Administration course. Mr. Bradley motioned to reject the Voluntary Settlement Agreement, and to submit a counter modified Voluntary Settlement Agreement to suspend Mr. Bullard's Fire Level 2 Probationary Certificate until he has completed and passed the Fire Level 1 course, and the Law and Administration Course and proper documentation is provided. If Mr. Bullard agrees to the Voluntary Settlement agreement it would not need to be brought before the Board again. Mr. Shaw seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the Board.

CONSENT AGREEMENTS

None

DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS

Phelps vs. Coxe

Mr. Phelps discussed the ongoing criminal case regarding Leonard Gerald Thompson. There was a continuance in the last court case. We will be going back on August 18, 2010.

Suzanne Taylor made the following report concerning the Verification Process to the Board.

Surveys

Ms. Taylor stated that staff sent out surveys to all of the counties, and we have received all of them back. We then sent out surveys to all of the cities within counties who do their own inspections without county help, and we are still working on getting them back. Out of the 100 counties there are 20 that say they are up to date. The rest are questionable. Ms. Taylor stated that she will go over the ones that she has questions on. Ms. Taylor will be contacting each county individually to ask questions on what their issues are.

Item 5: Other Items

Item A: Review of Exam

Ms. Williams stated that Mr. Nader Fahami is here today, and he is a Fire Plans examiner with the City of Charlotte. On October 31, 2009 Mr. Nader Fahami took a paper/pencil examination in Charlotte for Fire Level III and he did not pass the exam. The review was scheduled for December 12, 2009; Mr. Fahami did not attend the exam review. He chose to later challenge three exam questions; he submitted his challenges to ICC for review. He was informed that his challenges were denied. Mr. Fahami is asking for staff to review the challenges he submitted. For this presentation he has been informed that the exam content is confidential he will not be able to address any specific exam questions.

Mr. Fahami strongly believes that there was an error in the test. He stated that this is not the first time that he has had problems. When he took an exam in Raleigh with staff he would come for the review, when he challenged the question he received the point for it, and therefore passed the exam. Now that ICC has taken over, they do not give the correct answer or a reference so there is no way to defend your answer. Mr. Fahami decided not to go to the review because it would not be a fair review, but he did submit questions he wanted to challenge from memory. Mr. Fahami wants another opportunity to reconsider and evaluate his challenges. Ms. Williams stated that if someone reviews their exam the information that they receive is the question that they answered incorrectly, and their answer to that question. It is done this way in order to minimize the exposure of the question. Secondly, the review is not a study session; it is there so you can see what you missed. Mr. Rakatansky asked Ms. Williams if this is ICC's policy or if this is in our contract with ICC. Ms. Williams stated that it is ICC's policy. Mr. Rakatansky asked Ms. Williams if people were properly notified of the changes. Ms. Williams stated that she could not remember the content of the information that was sent out. Mr. Thunberg stated that the Education Committee discussed this, and it was sent out. Mr. Rakatansky asked if we could resurrect the information was sent out. Ms. Williams stated that Mr. Fahami was aware of how the review was conducted. Mr. Fahami disagreed; he stated he was not aware of how the review was done. Mr. Fahami stated he would like to see the question and the answer to tell him where he was wrong.

Mr. Rakatansky made a motion to let Mr. Fahami see the test questions that he missed with the answers that he gave which were indicated as being incorrect. Ms. McPherson asked Mr. Lutterloh if this would set a precedent for any time someone misses a review that they will have an alternate for a review. Mr. Lutterloh stated it would set a precedent. The Board opposed the motion. The Board's ruling was to allow Mr. Fahami's score to remain unchanged.

Item 6: Committee Assignments:

Mr. Lutterloh named Mr. Curtis to the Qualifications and Evaluation Committee, and Mr. Barbour to the Policies and Procedures Committee. Mr. Lutterloh wanted a follow up at the next meeting and make sure if Mr. Kirkland was on the Education and Research Committee because if we do we may need to move someone around.

Item 7: Election of Officers:

Hiram Williams made a nomination for Hayden Lutterloh to continue to serve as the Chairman of the NC Code Officials Qualification Board. Sherrill Smith seconded the motion. Victor Shaw requested for the nominations to be closed, the motion was approved. Mr. Hayden Lutterloh will continue to serve as Chairman of the NC Code Officials Qualification Board. James Kennedy, Jr. made a nomination for Tracy McPherson to serve as Vice Chair. Mr. Ronnie Bailey made a nomination for William Rakatansky to serve as Vice Chair. Ms. McPherson requested to remove herself from consideration. Sherrill Smith seconded the motion to accept and close the nominations for Mr. William Rakatansky to be Vice Chair, the motion was approved. Sherrill Smith made a motion to nominate Tim Bradley to serve as Secretary. Victor Shaw seconded the motion to accept and to close the nominations for Tim Bradley to serve as the Secretary to the NC Code Officials Qualification Board. The nominations were approved.

Item 8: Election of Committee Chairmen:

Hiram Williams made a motion for William Rakatansky to continue as Chairman of the Education and Research Committee. Mr. Thunberg seconded the motion, the nomination was approved. Sherrill Smith made a motion for Richard Ducker to continue as Chairman of the Policies and Procedures Committee. The motion was approved. William Rakatansky nominated Sherrill Smith as Chairperson of the Qualifications and Evaluation Committee. Sherrill Smith nominated Bill Thunberg as Chairperson of the Qualifications and Evaluation Committee. Mr. Lutterloh called for vote by hand. Sherrill Smith received 5 votes. Mr. Bill Thunberg received 8 votes. Bill Thunberg has been nominated as Chairperson of the Qualifications and Evaluation Committee.

Adjournment

Hayden Lutterloh requested a motion for the meeting to be adjourned. Mr. Rakatansky seconded the motion. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Hayden Lutterloh.

Respectfully submitted,



Tim Bradley
Secretary
NC Code Officials Qualification Board

NEW STANDARD INSPECTION CERTIFICATE APPLICANTS

Active City, County, and State Code Enforcement Officials

The following inspectors have met the certification requirements of GS 143-151.13(a). These applicants are active inspectors in city, county, or State inspection departments. Their certificates will become valid as of today.

Building Level I

Joseph S Canipe
Junior F Davis

Building Level II

Gregory M Baldwin
Michael A Cook
John D Eakins
Justin Floyd
Lamar E Heath
John T Jones
John B Kelly
David E Stouidt

Building Level III

Robert K Cox
David P Honeycutt
Steven R King
Paul P Piazza
Raymond Robinson
Reginald W Satterfield

Electrical Level I

James L Jackson
William Norris

Electrical Level II

Ray W Bennett
Brady M Byrd
Richard B Cummings
John T Jones
David W Lowman
Walter C Perkinson
Keynan Phillips
David E Stouidt

Electrical Level III

Amy L Clifton
Patrick G Johnson
Kenneth L Morrison

Fire Level I

Jody A Bell
Avelino M Fernandez
Michael T Furr
Charles M Jenkins
Jeffrey E Olund
John E Royal
Michael J Tatum, Jr.
Allen W Wilson

Fire Level II

Michael A, Cook
Todd M Lynch
Stephen J Rodr
Larry R Woodard

Fire Level III

Albert B Barnett
Steven R King
Thomas M Moore
Kevin W Owenby
Michael K Rigoli
Joshua E Smith
James D Stipe
David S Ward
William E Winchester

Mechanical Level II

Michael A Cook
John D Eakins
John B Kelly
Jonathan G Stansberry
Eddie W Taylor
Laura B Wilson

Mechanical Level III

Michael J Caudle
Adrian Certain
James C Collins
Michael L Emig
Mark E Griffin
Steven R King

Plumbing Level II

Kevin E Caison
Michael A Cook
John D Eakins
Eddie L Garner
Anne F Graham
James R Jones
John B Kelly
David W Lowman
Keynan Phillips
Russell L Smyre
Jonathan G Stansberry

Plumbing Level III

Jeffrey S Goodman
Mark E Griffin

Pre-Qualification Applicants Meeting the Standard Certification Requirements

The following applicants have met all the requirements to receive their Standard certificates except being employed by a city, county, or State inspection department and being assigned the responsibility of enforcing the State Building Code. Their certificates will be issued when they are so employed.

Matthew C Marbois	Building I
Seth Durham	Fire I
Matthew M Swindell	Fire I
Matthew M Swindell	Plumbing I