

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

October 26, 2010

The quarterly meeting of the NC Code Officials Qualification Board was held at 1:00 PM on Tuesday, October 26, 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:

Dean Barbour	Tracy McPherson
Jeff Curtis	William Rakatansky
Richard Ducker	Victor Shaw
Valoree Eikinas	Bill Thunberg
Mark Hicks	Hiram Williams
Charles Horne	
Hayden Lutterloh, III	

Members absent:

Ronnie Bailey	Kenneth Mullen
Richard Blackburn	Robert Nunez
Tim Bradley	Sherrill Smith
James Kennedy, Jr.	
John Kirkland	

Others in attendance were as follows:

Chris Noles	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
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
Rebecca Williams	Department of Insurance	Raleigh, NC
Bobby Croom	Department of Justice	Raleigh, NC
Brian Goins	Rowan County Inspection Dept.	

Preliminary Matters

Chairman Hayden Lutterloh presided over the meeting and welcomed guests. He asked the Board members to introduce themselves. Mr. Lutterloh asked the Board if there were any conflicts of interest that needed to be made known. Mr. Jeff Curtis recues himself from the investigation report of Godwin vs. New Hanover County. Ms. Horne was the inspector and she is an employee of the Town of Sunset Beach Inspection Department. Mr. Hiram Williams recues himself from the investigation report of Godwin vs. New Hanover County. Mr. Williams knows the home builder.

Item 1: Approval of July 27, 2010 Minutes

Charlie Horne made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2010 Board meeting. Hiram Williams 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. Bill Thunberg seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Fifth Level III Standard Inspection Certificate

One individual received his fifth level III certificate Brian Goins of the Rowan County Inspection Department 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

NEW BOARD MEMBER TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

General Statute 93B-5 was updated in 2009 to require additional training for all Board members at least every two years. The new training includes information on the Administrative Procedures Act, Public Records Law, Open Meetings Law, State Tort Claims Act, and the Defense of State Employees Law. In an effort to accomplish this training all at once, rather than in several separate meetings, the Board's legal council, Bobby Croom, has agreed to prepare a class for early next year. If this is acceptable, the staff suggestion is to time the class to coincide with the April Board meeting. Mr. Lutterloh would like for staff to investigate having the Ethics training at 322 Chapanoke Rd.

UPDATE ON STANDARD COURSE BOARD RULES

The current policies in place regarding standard courses have been drafted in rule form. They are currently being reviewed for format. Additionally, several items to be presented today may necessarily impact those rules. Once any policy changes decided on today are incorporated, staff suggests that both the Education and Research committee and the Policies and Procedures committee schedule meetings to review and revise the draft before it is presented to the full Board. Mr. Lutterloh suggested that the Qualification and Evaluation committee may need to have a committee meeting as well to review the changes.

IFSAC REACCREDITATION

The reaccreditation of the North Carolina Fire Inspector certification by the International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) has been placed on hold, pending input from the Board. There are two central issues which must be addressed:

1. IFSAC requires that fire inspectors be tested to standards presented in NFPA 1031. Current Board policy tests to the NC Fire Prevention Code.
2. IFSAC requires that a portion of the testing include "practicals" which are hands-on type testing requiring an instructor evaluation. Current Board policy does not include any of this type of testing.

3.—

Staff needs direction from the Board about whether to pursue this certification as it represents a significant change from current policies and would result in the fire inspector program being significantly different from the other certifications that the Board administers.

Mr. Lutterloh stated that the Board not pursue the cross certification at this time, but Fire and Rescue can continue to work it like they do Fire Fighter courses. It would not directly reflect our certifications. If Fire and Rescue certifies someone as an inspector they must make sure that they hold a Standard Certification from the Qualification Board. The state is not any safer having IFSAC Certification. Mr. Thunberg made a motion that we maintain the current policy and direct staff to review the IFSAC

requirement to determine if there is a benefit of life and safety for the citizens of North Carolina for inspectors to be trained. Mr. Ducker seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

CODE ADOPTION DELAYS AND SCHEDULE

The Building Code Council has been working on adoption of the new Codes. It now appears that there will be several separate roll-out dates for different volumes. The best estimates available of those dates are:

Code	Initial Roll-Out Date	Mandatory Compliance Date
Building	Sept. 1, 2011	March 1, 2012
Fire Prevention		
Fuel Gas		
Mechanical		
Plumbing		
Electrical	unknown	unknown
Residential	unknown	unknown
Energy	unknown	unknown

Typically, new test questions would be implemented at the mandatory compliance date for the new Code cycle. The schedule above would require at least three separate roll-out dates for updated test questions. With electronic testing, roll-outs require new computer programming and so incur cost. The current contract allows for 2 updates a year. Adding the Residential and Energy Code updates will likely result in additional money requests from ICC. Staff has spoken with ICC, they have advised us that they are looking into trying to keep cost as minimum. We are notifying the Board that this is the status of the testing, and to note that this is a change. Mr. Lutterloh stated that staff can relay a message from the Board on our concerns regarding the roll-outs.

ENERGY CODE TRAINING

In late August, staff was notified of a grant being offered by the US Department of Energy to be used by the states to improve training and enforcement of energy codes. Based on input at the last couple of Board meetings, we felt certain that the Board would be interested in such an opportunity. Because of the quick turnaround on the application – 30 days from initial posting to the deadline - DOI partnered with the State Energy Office and Mathis Consulting to apply for this grant. Although no official award has been made, we have heard some comments which suggest that North Carolina is in the running to receive up to \$300,000 for this effort.

Adding Energy Code training into the current standard courses will likely require either additional time or innovative teaching techniques like on-line modules for home-study. Likewise, adding it into current testing will require additional questions to be developed which can then either be substituted for some of the questions on other topics or be added to the total number of questions. Either way, staff will require the input and direction of the Board. The question that staff has, is if the questions should go to a committee, or should there be a special committee that the Board would like to have look into this.

Mr. Lutterloh asked how it was going to be worked out with ICC as to instituting testing and courses, and if we could get them to work with us to help lower cost. Ms. Ewens stated that there would be some surveys done, so they could get psychometric evaluations for these topics. The training materials and power points are being updated. ICC does have materials that they would use in developing the North Carolina training materials. The test questions would go to a subject matter expert committee in North Carolina just like any other test question that is developed. It would be an additional cost, and that would be a part of the fee that the grant would cover. Mr. Lutterloh asked if the Energy Code would be a stand alone code, or if it was going to be incorporated with the other codes. Ms. Ewens stated that the questions and training materials would be incorporated into the current Building, Residential, Mechanical, and

Electrical training materials. Ms. Ewens stated that staff is looking for a direction to a committee to help review some of the policy changes that would be required to incorporate the Energy training. Mr. Lutterloh suggested having 2 people from each committee to form an Energy Ad Hoc committee. Mr. Lutterloh asked each of the chairs from each committee to come up with two people to represent their committee. Ms. Ewens suggested having the meeting in January. Mr. Lutterloh stated that staff could go forward with setting up the Energy Committee meeting to take place in January. The Board has some concerns on how the Code Enforcement Officials will be trained on the Energy Code.

Kathy Williams made the following report concerning certification 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 100 individuals have expired this quarter.

JURISDICTIONS WITHOUT INSPECTION COVERAGE

There are 10 jurisdictions that do not have all inspection trades covered by a certified code enforcement official. They are: Grandfather Village, Lake Waccamaw, Roxboro, Seven Devils, Southport, Spindale, St. Helena, Tryon, Wallace, and Watha.

STANDARD AND LIMITED RENEWALS - RENEWAL YEAR 2010

Staff has received approximately 92.8 percent of the standard and limited renewals for renewal year 2010. Second notices were mailed in August, 2010. Staff is continuing to work with code enforcement officials to bring their certifications into active status and to assist those who need to locate possible continuing education opportunities.

STATE EXAM UPGRADE

On September 1, 2010, all 15 state exams were republished by Pearson Vue to incorporate the work performed by the Exam Review Committees who met during the month of April, 2010 and to reinstitute scaled scoring. As described at the last meeting, the Exam Review Committees met with North Carolina Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to review the bank of questions to set cut scores which establish the level of difficulty for each exam question and to review the results of the Occupational Analysis Surveys sent out in March, 2010. This information determined the content of each state exam based on the actual job tasks performed by each inspector. The results of the item analysis committee review became the state exam blueprint.

By using the results of the Occupational Analysis Surveys, the components of each state exam changed. The exam description and outline is located in the North Carolina Exam Information Bulletin which is found at the following website:

<http://www.iccsafe.org/Accreditation/Bulletins/NorthCarolinaBulletin.pdf>. This document outlines the categories covered on the exam and the number of questions per category. Each exam contains three categories of questions: 1) general knowledge, 2) law and administration, and 3) scenario or diagram.

The state exams now reflect the actual work performed in the field and follow the normal psychometric process to establish a valid and reliable set of exams. As defined in the Request for Proposal titled "Professional Testing Organization for Code Enforcement Officials" issued August 27, 2008, all proposal criteria have been met.

STANDARD CERTIFICATE TESTING – July 13, 2010 – October 12, 2010

Examination Summary

155 exams were taken and 21 exams were reviews. The results of the State exams given July 13, 2010 – October 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>% Pass</u>	<u>Reviews</u>
Building Inspector I	11	2	73	53	18.1	3
Building Inspector II	12	6	89	61	50.0	2
Building Inspector III	17	8	87	58	47.1	2
Electrical Inspector I	3	0	49	40	0	0
Electrical Inspector II	9	3	81	56	33.3	3
Electrical Inspector III	9	5	84	33	55.6	1
Fire Inspector I	19	9	100	43	47.4	2
Fire Inspector II	21	11	93	48	52.4	5
Fire Inspector III	12	10	87	62	83.3	0
Mechanical Inspector I	3	2	84	48	66.6	1
Mechanical Inspector II	7	4	79	67	57.1	0
Mechanical Inspector III	8	4	87	48	50.0	1
Plumbing Inspector I	5	4	95	38	80.0	0
Plumbing Inspector II	7	7	92	73	100.0	0
Plumbing Inspector III	12	9	93	59	75.0	1
Totals	155	84				21

Standard Certificates Earned

<u>Area</u>	<u>Active Inspectors</u>	<u>Pre-Qual-ification</u>	<u>Reciprocity</u>
Building	16	0	1
Electrical	7	1	0
Fire	29	2	1
Mechanical	10	0	0
Plumbing	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	82	3	3

Active Inspectors (GS 143-151.13(a)):	82
Pre-Qualification (GS 143-151.13(a)):	3
Exempt from Exam (GS 143-151.13(f)):	0
Reciprocity (G.S. 143-151.14)	<u>3</u>
Total Standard Certificates Issued:	88

Mr. Hiram Williams questioned the low scores, and wanted to know how we change this. Ms. Williams stated that the numbers are too low to give an accurate trend line, and that there would need to be at least 25 people to get a better trend line. Mr. Lutterloh wanted to know if there is an increase in people reviewing their exams. Ms. Williams stated that with the Computer Based Testing that examinees must make a 60-69 to get the option to review the exam. She also stated that when the exams were given in house everyone had the option to review. Mr. Lutterloh stated that the when the examinees paid the examination fee a review was to be included in the fee. Ms. Williams stated that this is how the reliability more intact. Mr. Lutterloh asked if this was something we needed to look at when it is time to redo the contract. Mr. Lutterloh stated that in the original contract the exam and a review were paid separately, but in the final contract it was all included. Ms. Williams stated that we had asked for a valid

examination process. Mr. Williams asked what questions the examinees were able to see. Ms. Williams stated that the examinees are only able to see the question that they missed with the answer they selected. Ms. Williams stated that it is not used as a study tool this is part of the psychometric process. Ms. Williams stated that they can make challenges during the review process. Mr. Ducker asked if the number of pre-qualifications applications down. Ms. Williams stated that it is down due to the industry.

Exam Complaint Summary

The staff has received 10 complaints concerning exams, they occurred between July 28 through October 21, 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 three complaints concerning not receiving test challenge results in a timely matter. Examinees are advised that ICC has 15 working days to process challenges and mail result letters. All issues have been resolved.
2. Wrong Testing Site Information – One individual was told by a proctor that he could not take his calculator into the exam room. He was not successful. Due to the incorrect information given at the testing site, he was given a free examination opportunity.
3. Registration Issues – Three individuals stated they could not register for an exam. The approval date for one individual needed to be changed and he was able to register. One individual was unable to register due the holiday. The uploading of information was delayed due to the holiday. The third individual was unable to register due to incorrect computer information. All issues have been resolved.
4. Registration for wrong exam – One individual registered for the wrong examination. He did not use the exam code provided on his approval letter and also paid a different fee for the wrong test. We were unable to make any correction for this error since he provided the wrong exam code to the operator.
5. On September 1, 2010, all 15 exams were republished. On September 9, 2010 we found that there was an error concerning the law and administration questions on each exam. The error was corrected, but 15 individuals were unsuccessful during this period. Due to the issue with the exams, all 15 individuals were given vouchers to retake exams.

Fifth Level III Standard Inspection Certificate

There is one individual receiving his fifth level III certificate today. He is:

Brian Keith Goins

Rowan County Inspection Department

The number of individuals achieving this level of certification is currently 206.

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

July 28, 2010 - October 12, 2010 there were 42 Continuing Education Courses approved, 5 new Continuing Education Instructors approved for the period. There were 0 New Continuing Education Sponsors approved for the period. There were 86 Continuing Education Courses submitted for credit, 12 were scheduled to begin after July 27, 2010. There were a total of 26 courses approved in multiple trades.

Standard Code Courses – Statistics: July 28, 2010 – October 12, 2010

July 28, 2010 - October 12, 2010 there were 77 Standard courses scheduled for the period. There were 18 in Building, 11 in Electrical, 19 in Fire, 9 in Mechanical, 14 in Plumbing, and 6 in Law and Administration. There were 18 Standard courses canceled for the period. There were 0 that were rescheduled. We have received 35 Standard course grades, and there are 24 that are pending. There are 123 courses scheduled to begin after 10/12/2010.

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/COOB/engineering_cogb_home.asp.

Instructor Certification Workshop

We have scheduled our second Instructor Certification Workshop for FY11. The date of the workshop is Thursday, November 18, 2010 from 8:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. The Application Deadline is Friday, November 5. Several of the Chief Code Consultants from the Engineering Division will be in attendance. Currently, there are 8 participants who have registered for the workshop. Our panel of experienced instructors who will be in attendance

Sponsor Workshop

Our first Sponsor Workshop held on Thursday, September 2, 2010 was a big success, with more than 75 Continuing Education sponsors and instructors in attendance. We have scheduled our second Sponsor Workshop. 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 November 4, 2010 from 8:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. and will be held in the 1st floor classroom at 322 Chapanoke Road. There are 24 participants registered for the workshop.

Continuing Education Website Advertising

The Continuing Education Advertising Website, accessible at the Continuing Education link of the Code Officials Qualification Board is now available for direct access to continuing education course information for all licensees and other interested parties at any time. The website provides inspectors with information regarding upcoming continuing education courses. Currently, the database contains 12 courses with the City of Raleigh; 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 3-digit user name and a password, a Sponsor can access their approved courses and then enter the scheduling information. Although emails requesting sponsors contact our offices for username and password information, as well as encouraging the posting of their upcoming courses, City of Raleigh is currently the only sponsor utilizing the website. Courses in the following are available: 9 Building, 4 Electrical, 8 Fire, and 8 Plumbing. Eight of the aforementioned courses provide dual credit in the areas Building, Fire and Plumbing.

Standard Course Instructor PowerPoint Update

Staff met with ICC representatives, including David Dufresne, Executive Director, Education and Certification, concerning the updating of the standard course power point presentations. Staff was able to preview existing ICC training materials which allowed staff to specify the form and content of the training materials for North Carolina. ICC staff prepared an instructional design timetable for each course and all 16 courses should be completed no later than May 1, 2011. The updated courses will be based on the 2012 code edition to correspond with the upcoming code cycle change. As each area is completed

and approved, the documents will be forwarded to all standard course instructors giving instructors time to prepare for the new code changes and to familiarize themselves with the instructional aid. William Rakatansky and Tim Bradley both participated in this meeting. Ms. Williams asked the Board if they would like to have a draft available. The Board agreed that they would like to have access to it.

Shane Phelps made the following report concerning investigations to the Board.

Investigations Begun – Not Completed

Johnson vs. Duffy
Reynolds vs Edwards/Satterfield
Henage vs Capehart/Carter
Evans vs Walker
Gatlin vs True (2nd)
Austin vs Sciba
Kille vs Canova

Investigations Completed –Basis in Fact

Forbes vs. Vaughn

Investigations Completed –No Basis in Fact

Cochrane vs Marks
Godwin vs Graham/Billings

VOLUNTARY SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

None

CONSENT AGREEMENTS

None

DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS

None

Q-BOARD INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED SUMMARY

Cochrane vs. Mark

The Cochrane complaint charges Kevin Marks of the Nash County Inspection Department with a violation of GS 143-151.17(a)(3) &(6) in that he “has knowingly aided or abetted any person practicing contrary to the provisions of GS Chapter 143, Article 9C, or of the state building code and "has been guilty of willful misconduct, gross negligence, or gross incompetence".

Mr. Cochrane had experienced a lot of moisture problems under his home. His contractor had promised to take care of the issues. The contractor did make a couple of corrections that did not fix Mr. Cochrane’s problems, but then refused to come back out.

Mr. Cochrane’s complaint cited several alleged code violations, but we were only able to verify one of them. He produced pictures from before and after the CO was issued which confirmed the grade at the front of the house was incorrect at the time of the CO. The Inspection Department records had no

indication of an alternate method to drain water away from the house. Other alleged violations had already been corrected at the time of our site visit and no evidence was provided for proof.

Staff concluded the number and type of violations did not rise to gross negligence against Mr. Marks. No evidence was provided that he was aiding or abetting the contractor.

Mr. Lutterloh entertained a motion to accept this as a No Basis in Fact. Mr. Rakatansky motioned Mr. Horne seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the Board.

Forbes vs. Vaughan

Lisa Forbes filed a complaint against Paul Vaughan of the Hertford County Inspection Department for a violation of NCGS 143-151.17(a) (6) in that he "has been guilty of willful misconduct, gross negligence, or gross incompetence".

The Forbes hired a contractor to construct a 440 square foot addition. According to the complaint, they fired the contractor after finding multiple code violations during mid-construction. The Forbes were upset because the Hertford County Inspection Department did not find the violations and issue a stop work order per the complaint. The complaint states they had a home inspection performed that identified "serious issues" on their addition. The Forbes provided an inspection report/list that did not identify who performed the inspection. It was addressed to Buddy Jones, who was the Forbes attorney, and it referenced the Forbes address. According to Lisa Forbes, Buddy Jones hired Harrison Jones, a damage appraisal consultant and owner of Restoration Associates, Inc. in Apex, NC. She indicated that Buddy had used Harrison in many of his construction cases.

The majority of the issues listed in the report were not code violations. Some that were violations would have been inspected during Vaughan's final inspection which was never called for. We could not verify some of the items because they were covered on our site visit, the items were not clear in the pictures, and the inspection report was not by a design professional or qualified inspector/home inspector.

We were able to identify three violations against Vaughan. The most egregious violation was Vaughan performed an inadequate Foundation inspection. Vaughan informed us that the contractor had already backfilled when he performed the Foundation inspection, so he did not see the footing or probe to be sure it was there. The other two violations included inadequate records and an inadequate footing projection which was minor in nature in this case.

Staff concluded that there was Basis-in-fact against Vaughan. Staff is recommending that a letter of caution be issued to Mr. Vaughan. Mr. Thunberg asked what certificates Mr. Vaughan holds. Mr. Phelps stated that at the time of the incident he had a Standard Electrical Level 3, Probationary Building Level 3, Probationary Mechanical Level 3, and Probationary Plumbing Level 3. At the time he did hold Standard Level 2 in Building, Mechanical, and Plumbing. Mr. Vaughan at this time has a Standard Level 3 in Electrical, Building, Mechanical, and Plumbing. Mr. Vaughan at the time is the only person conducting inspections in the department. Mr. Lutterloh asked why in the investigation report there is a request for a hearing, and now a letter of caution is the recommendation. Mr. Phelps stated that Mr. Vaughan agreed to the letter of caution. Mr. Phelps discussed the issue with Mr. Robert Croom; Mr. Croom stated that the Voluntary Settlement Agreement would not apply in this case. Mr. Phelps stated that he has an e-mail from Mr. Vaughan stating that he agrees to waive the hearing, and to be issued a letter of caution. Mr. Lutterloh requested an explanation. Mr. Croom stated that when an investigation is done the first question is whether or not the threshold requirement of gross negligence is met; if you don't have that there is no basis in fact. That is the standard that needs to be done. If the determination is made then it's traditionally been that it qualifies you for a hearing. The process of the Board is that if you make that determination to try to resolve matters by consent with the certificate holder prior to a full hearing. This is where a letter of caution would come from, or a voluntary settlement agreement. Mr. Thunberg motioned for a Letter of Caution to be sent to Mr. Vaughan. Ms. Eikinas seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

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

Godwin vs. New Hanover

A complaint from Armiel Godwin was received alleging the New Hanover County inspection Department may have issued a Certificate of Occupancy for his house although there were suspected problems with his attic. Mr. Godwin became aware of the potential problems through the local newspaper as opposed to observation of problems.

The attic did not comply with residential section 806.4 but was determined to be at least equivalent to the intent of the code. Mr. Dean Barbour motioned to accept the no basis in fact. Mr. Rakatansky seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Item 5: Other Items

Mr. Lutterloh stated that at the last Board Meeting there was a request to not consider the investigation report on Lewis vs. Paramore. Mr. Lewis has a case that is currently in civil court, and it was a recommendation from staff at the last Board Meeting that we withhold a hearing, and or making any decisions on the second complaint on Mr. Paramore. Mr. Lutterloh stated that the information given to the Board today is for informational purposes only. Mr. Lutterloh has been approached by Board members concerning the Board revisiting the second complaint against Mr. Paramore, and not putting it off doing so until the civil case is actually heard. Mr. Lutterloh posed the question to the Board of whether or not the report should be brought up at a future meeting, or if it should wait until the civil case has been heard. Ms. Eikinas asked if Mr. Paramore holds any Certificates. Mr. Lutterloh stated that he does not hold any certificates because he is currently not employed. Mr. Croom stated that the presenting of the report to the Board would be more of a housekeeping matter. Mr. Rakatansky made a motion to schedule to review Mr. Shane Phelps's second report on Lewis vs. Paramore at the next Board meeting January 25, 2011. Mr. Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed. Mr. Lutterloh advised for staff to send out any notifications that need to be sent out.

Adjournment

Bill Thunberg motioned for the meeting to be adjourned. 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

James N Leonti
Anmarie B Wyrick

Building Level II

Brandon W Burgin
Richard B Cummings
Brian H Duhadaway
Kimberly T Sauer
Carl P Temple
William T Wood

Building Level III

Samuel R Beck
Charles R Burton
Beau G Chollett
Morris R Cline
Ryan D Cody
Diane D Meek
Cindy Motsko
Robby M Wilkinson

Electrical Level II

Roland J Davis
Mark W Fortenberry
Jonathan G Stansberry

Electrical Level III

Howard R Beasley
Samuel R Beck
Keenan B Jackson
Victor G Stephenson

Fire Level I

Kenneth J Athing
Matthew A Collins
Christy D Kepley
Christopher N Solomon
Winston C Soward
Robert D Whitfield

Fire Level II

Micah J Bodford
Gregory L Britt
Alejandro Collazo
John G Cruise II
Eddie B Jeffers
Daniel G Price
Robert A Reece
Steven Stroud
Patrick T Sullivan
Joseph B Tanner
Brandon B Weston

Fire Level III

Daniel M Barham
Jeffrey D Bostian
Jon-David Everhart
Thomas J Galdi
Brian K Goins
John E Harrell
Aubrey L Johnson
Aaron C Miller
Carl Pritchett
Eric T Wiseman

Mechanical Level I

Scott M Infinger
Keith O Williams

Mechanical Level II

Richard B Cummings
Eric J Evans
Walter F Johnson Jr,
Walter C Perkinson

Mechanical Level III

John R Haynes
Patrick G Johnson
Robert L Key
Walter W Warren

Plumbing Level I

Alston K Duncan
Daniel D Kelley
Rickey L Walls
Eric T Wiseman

Plumbing Level II
Gregory M Baldwin
Brady M Byrd
Lindsey L. Dellinger
Eric J Evans
Tommy B Helms
Walter C Perkinson
Matthew S Sechler

Plumbing Level III
John G Bullock
Richard B Cummings
Joey R Jenkins
Patrick G Johnson
Robert L Key
James L Locklear
Kenneth L Morrison
David M Prevette
Mark W Tuttle

Pre-Qualification Applicants Meeting the Standard Certification Requirements

The following applicant 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.

Davis Diehl
Travis Glover
Jesse Harris

Electrical III
Fire I
Fire I

Reciprocity Granted to Applicants Meeting the Standard Certification Requirements

The following applicants has met all the education and experience requirements to receive a Standard certificate as a code enforcement official based on certification obtained from an approved reciprocal certification agency.

Kari Lanning
James Auton
Steven Marsh

Building III
Fire I
Fire I

ICC and Florida
Department of Defense
ProBoard