Indiana Board of Licensure for Professional Geologists

Thursday, March 5, 2026 – Special Session

Board Members Present	Others Present	Visitors Present
Todd Thompson, Chair	DeAnn Reinhart, Licensing Coordinator	Rachel Russell, Keffer Hirschauer
Ginger Davis	Christopher Anderson, Board Counsel	Alan Jones, LPG #2151
John Noel		
Rachel Walker		

Open Session

Call to order and declaration of a quorum at 11:02 a.m.

Introductions of all in attendance.

TT – Informal review requested by Mr. Alan Jones under Indiana Code 25-17.6-3-5 to consider the Board's proposed order of revocation. As this is an informal review, no sworn testimony will be taken and the rules of evidence do not apply. Pursuant to Indiana's open door law, this meeting is being recorded and will be available for at least 90 days following the meeting. Mr. Jones and his counsel will have the opportunity to present any arguments and statements they wish to make and present documents for the Boards consideration. The members of the Board can ask questions at any time and upon conclusion of Mr. Jones' presentation the Board will deliberate and take a vote on how it wishes to proceed. The possible outcomes of the vote are that the Board can adopt the proposed order as is, the Board can adopt the proposed order with modifications, the Board can decline to adopt the proposed order, the Board can decline to act today and schedule another meeting in the future for final action. Mr. Jones, do you have any questions?
AJ – No, I do not.
TT – Have you had the opportunity to review the documents of the complaint that was provided to you?
AJ and RR – Yes.
TT – At this time, I would like to open the meeting up to you and your counsel to make any statements that you would like to the Board.
RR – If you will indulge me so I don't miss anything, there has been a packet submitted to the Board and it contains seven documents. Three of those the Board already knows about because they were provided to us. Number 1 is the proposed complaint, 2 and 3 are Exhibits A & B, which the Board provided which are an indictment and a plea agreement and then documents 4,5, 6 and 7. Number 4 is not for public access and has been marked as such and that talks about the title of the summary of the advisory guideline computation and number 5 is a letter from my client which is dated March 16, 2025 that he submitted to federal court. Number 6 is a letter of support dated December 4, 2024 from Mr. Jones' employer submitted to the federal court. Number 7 is the restitution payment information.

As Mr. Jones has already said, he has been a geologist since 1994. He has been working in that field for many years and he has been professionally licensed for 22. He is passionate about this field. He adds value to the field and to the profession. We are here today to discuss the complaint, the

proportional discipline and not to excuse any wrongdoing. We are going to talk about the underlying issue here. Mr. Jones' federal conviction was financial in nature and involved invoicing tiered to a former employers reimbursement submissions, not a failure of geology judgement or public safety practice. He has accepted responsibility. He is under federal supervision and has completed most of terms of that. He has restitution remaining that will be paid by the end of March. He is currently a productive, long-tenured geologist whose continued licensure to serve the profession and the public.

In proposed complaint, there are 3 counts

1. Federal conviction is narrow and already heavily punished. Exhibits A&B from the Board specifically go to the charges. Mr. Jones agreed to count 3 mail fraud charge. The remaining charges were dismissed. One year probation put in place through the courts in August, 2025. Completed home detention that is no longer required. There were financial obligations which he has almost finished payment on. Document #5 is letter from Mr. Jones in which acknowledges wrongdoing and expresses remorse. Ties the offense to fraudulent invoices and reimbursement practices, not related to geology. Post-offense counseling and guidance and commitment to personal accountability. He explained specific internal controls in place with current employer that he has been with since March 3, 2020. Well supported by the employer by a letter marked as document #6 that was provided to the courts on behalf of Mr. Jones. Employer is aware of everything that is going on.
2. For the practice of geology, Mr. Jones was not acting as a professional geologist when doing the work. Working as a consultant. Licensing discipline exists to protect the public from what the Board perceive as unsafe or unethical professional license and public safety. The conduct here is administrative, not geological in judgement related harm. Needs to be some justification for revocation of his license because there is no geology related conduct. No adverse harm to geology as a whole through that license. Was he working in a professional licensed geologist capacity when the federal offense occurred? The answer is no. There is no allegation within the actual documents from the court stating that he was in the geology practice. The federal court sentence focuses on supervision and restitution and not public safety practice restrictions and he is working and is in the letters he submitted they do have processes where he works and this all stems from signatory issues. Does the conduct involve geology decisions, reports dealing with interpretations, representations? It did not. Is there evidence of risk to public safety from geology practice if he remains licensed? There is not. Based on count #2, we are not seeing an excess from his license as a geologist to what is going on right now with his license.
3. Code of Ethics – 305 IAC 1-3-5B specifically, as evidence that Mr. Jones conducted a violation of the code of ethics. That particular administrative code provision is about when the board may issue a complaint to revoke, suspend or refuse a license. Looking at the documents on the IGWS page summarizing that particular code section, 305 IAC 1-3-5, there is nothing specific linking him to a violation, just a large, looming violation so we would like to know what specifically he has violated in the code of ethics and explain why it is in the context of the practice of geology as well. Don't see that right now with the way the proposed complaint is written. The code of ethics for geologists obviously would talk about things like geology practice but again what happened with this federal crime was not under that practice. Mitigation in this matter, I already went over some things kind of looking at that. He has been licensed for many years. He adds a lot of value to the profession. He has a lot of information. He currently is working and he can talk about the

job he is doing now. In terms of this Board mission, to keep competent geologists, I believe he is more than competent as a geologist and, again, he can speak and in terms of protecting the public, as much as it would be related his geology license which I don't think it is, he is under federal probation until August and has been an exemplary person under those restrictions. He has had no issues. He is following everything by the letter of the law. He acknowledges what has happened here. It has really been weighing on him very heavily and this last thing his license is so important to him and to who his identity is so it is so very important to him. He does have the concrete compliance that is demonstrated. If you look at document #4, it speaks specifically to snapshot of what occurred. It talks about that he did not benefit from anything. The money he is using for restitution is money he has saved since he started working at Jewell grocery store when he was a teenager so he has been saving for retirement for his entire life. For anyone that thinks he benefited from this, that is not what occurred. He did not have any financial gain. He is just paying what he was said to pay back through his own personal money through 401K's he has over time. In terms of what this Board has done strictly, I think the Board Chair has already addressed this, there is nothing within the last 10 years I could find that guides us as to how to handle something of this nature, but I can say and there is an Attorney General here, on other Boards that I am for my clients, revocation is the most extreme. It is for people who did something that, for example, a nurse were to do something to a patient that had an adverse outcome intentionally. Or a nurse steals medication from a patient and diverts the medication and takes it. Even then, I have people on probation for that. So, I would say, it's kind of hard to gauge, but I think based on what I've seen from other Boards, revocation would be an extreme remedy. So, I am assuming that the mission to protect the public, with my client already on probation, following that, that could be used as mitigation to things that are already being done and he has already taken responsibility for this. Looking at the counts, that's where we are at, just giving you that background, my client is amiable to, I mean, as you know, Boards can do everything from nothing to revocation and my client would like to ask to be on a probationary license and he would be willing to have reports from his employer of course as he is working there and they would be willing to do that. Most Boards opt for quarterly reports when they do that. He would be willing to do that. He would also be willing to do any CE's or whatever your industry calls continuing education. Regarding ethics, again, this did not relate to his profession as a geologist but he would be willing to do any kind of ethics or compliance education you may impose on him. That is pretty much where we are at and he is here to answer any questions you may have about the packet, what's occurred in the federal setting, or about anything I said, I can answer your questions as well. We are grateful that you took time to have us here today.

TT – how were you originally employed? How a contractor? How were you not a geologist? You're a licensed professional geologist, they gave you a contract, something to do with remediation. How were not in any way shape or form, not a licensed professional geologist while doing that?
AJ – I was employed with the company as a geologist.
TT – So you were in a geologic mode during part of this environmental remediation?
AJ – Yes.
TT - Did the cleanup actually occur? That was the main one for me because an important thing for us here at the Board is the health and safety of the citizens of Indiana.

AJ – Yes, the remediation systems were installed and operated and reporting to the Indiana Dept. of Environmental Management. Those were the work I did in my capacity.
TT – That sounds like you were employed as a licensed professional geologist.
AJ – Yes
TT – So, you [Ms. Russell] mentioned that he was working as a consultant and was not working as a licensed professional geologist, but he was actually doing the duties of a licensed professional geologist.
AJ – For the work I did for the company.
TT – How were you influenced by your employers?
AJ – This is the excess liability trust fund. The company I worked for – situation where instead of billing the client directly, could bill the client directly but the invoices would be paid through the state. The way the employer set me up was set up as Power of Attorney on behalf of the clients so that my signature would have to be on an affidavit, I believe, that would be submitted with the reimbursement package that was prepared by my company. There was a bookkeeper within the company that prepared that so essentially my name was on the affidavit that went with the billing package that was prepared by the bookkeeper of the company that was submitted to the state for reimbursement.
RW – So, the ELF package was not prepared by you?
AJ – Right, it was prepared by the bookkeeper. I did not sign as a geologist. I signed as a POA on behalf of the owner or our client. So, essentially, clients were paid direct and they would submit the package to the company for reimbursement. They would sign all that documentation, all the invoices they paid for. In this situation, because at that time, we were losing business to consults that were working "for free". We were losing our business to other consulting companies so my employer stepped in and said "well then, this is what we are going to do. I'll take care of all the financing, you get the clients, you sign the contracts with them", which part of that was signing off as the POA on their behalf, and my employer would submit the packages for reimbursement. So, at the end of the day, my signature was used to commit a financial crime and I take ownership of that.
JN – Who was benefitting financially?
AJ – The owner of the company.
JN – So, the ELF reimbursements went to the company?
AJ – Straight to the company and the companies accounts.
JN – Is that owner also paying restitution?
AJ – I cannot comment on current federal investigations. My plea agreement prevents me from disclosing information on other individuals that currently or may be under investigation.
GD – Were you aware the payments were being, were you given documents that you signed, were you overlooking those before they went.
AJ – No, basically, in my case, was certifying that the work was done. So, okay, this quarterly sampling that was done. I am not a bookkeeper. Yes, I have learned a lot from this as far as I wish I would have known. It's essentially like cosigning for a loan and somebody takes off with the car. The banks coming after you whoever cosigned not the person that stole the car.
RW – Were you the main onsite geologist on the reports that were submitted to IDEM. Not the ELF stuff but the remedial marketer.
AJ – Yes.
TT – So, you essentially had two duties – being the geologist onsite but also being the POA?

AJ – Yes, I was the field guide, the geologist and the marketer.
JN – In your employment as a consultant, as a geologist, not necessarily on those projects but on projects in general, as part of project management, had to review invoices and approve invoices for delivery to clients?
AJ – That was an interesting situation. In situations where it wasn't work that was reimbursed work. It was work that we had contracts were I would submit a proposal, here's our scope of work, here's the dollar amount and that's what we billed.
JN – So, in your professional life, you had a role in what those numbers were.
AJ – So, if he had three days worth of drilling but if it's going to go a fourth day, I had to go back to the owner and say there's a change order. They aren't going to pay you. So, that's how I did it in my capacity as the project manager on making sure the owner was aware of what work was being done and if there was going to be an overrun on the work and get that approved before the additional work gets done.
TT – What are your current duties at Pioneer?
AJ – Right now, I am, as a licensed professional geologist, my office right now is in Chicago, so the majority of the work I do is in Illinois and I'm licensed in Illinois and I also do consulting in Indiana. Basically, the division I'm in is called a Phase 2. So what we do, if there is a large company that we've not worked with before but I'm essentially involved in, we actually have a field staff, too, so the work plan is for field staff to put together the projects and basically, I compile the reports and prepare the reports to submit to the state for closure for remediation.
TT – In the letter from Doug Ciserella at Pioneer indicated in his letter that you voluntarily suspended your license so on things you are doing in Indiana right now, you are not signing off as an LPG?
AJ – As of my indictment of May, 2023, I approached my employer and let him know what is going on so we had decided as a company, that the work, I would still be working in that capacity but I was not applying my signature to LPG, other geologists were applying that until I would approach the boards for the states I am licensed in to discuss the situation and have my information. So, yes, since my indictment, I have not been signing off as a geologist.
TT – Do you have LPG's that work under you?
AJ – I have been with the company for 6 years so I'm kind of the low man on the totem pole but there are other geologists in office that we work together on projects.
GD – So, none of the field staff that you provide work plans for, none of those are LPG'
AJ – No, they are not.
TT – I have worked through the questions that I needed to know. Does anyone else have any others?
JN – You didn't benefit financially, but you agreed to make financial monetary restitution back to the ELF Fund.
AJ – Yes, again, as my signature as the POA, that responsibility fell back on me at the end of the day because nobody else would step up to take ownership.
RR – Anyone could submit the reimbursement. I think that is part of what I was trying to say with the LPG. I could do that for that company if I worked there so that was kind of my focus there. Just making sure I wasn't mis-stating myself or overselling that.
AJ – POA does not have to be an LPG, signing on behalf of the owner. The owner declined.
JN – In our industry, the reimbursement fund so theoretically, the reimbursements go to gas stations, the owners? That has not been part of my professional practice over the years so are there consultants and gas stations where the gas station owner is doing the submitting the claims for reimbursement?

AJ – Yes, typically when I first started years ago, that was how it was done. We would do the work, submit the invoices to the client, the client would put together a billing package to submit to the state for reimbursement. But somehow, there's some type of clause in there where the consulting company can sign on behalf of the owner. So, in other words, instead of the owner paying us, the owner goes to the state and the state going back to the owner, it would eliminate that triangle and would eliminate the owner and the payment would go straight to the consulting company, on behalf of the owner. The invoices are not billed to the state of Indiana. The invoices are billed to the client or owner of the gas station. So, I signed as POA for the owner.
JN – I am trying to follow, so the reimbursement goes to the owner – to the gas station and the consulting firm is still billing the gas station as well.
AJ – They are billing the gas station but skipping the gas station as the middleman with the funds going straight to the consulting company. So, it doesn't go the owner. It's not like the state is paying the owner and the owner then writes a check to you, back to the consulting company. It just goes straight to the consulting company.
JN – So, as an owners representative, you are submitting the package and receiving the reimbursement.
AJ – I have learned a lot and the state of Indiana has not changed the signature forms. So, that's my issue and again, that's the issue I have and that's why, with the letter that I have which basically outlining how we do stuff with the consulting company I work for is we have used this as a learning experience so we are not in a situation where one person can take advantage of another. We put more than one signature especially on financial documents, even if requires one signature. I'm involved, the senior project manager is involved and the bookkeeper is involved. All three of us go through this and review the financial information for the company that I work for now so basically, I cannot be taken advantage of.
GD – At no time did you have any kind of inclination or hunch or feeling that these charges maybe look way too high for the work that was being done maybe compared to other jobs you had done?
AJ – Good question and I want to give an answer to you. How is it that a consulting company got a blank check from the state of Indiana? I cannot answer that.
GD – You saw how much the client was being charged. You were putting the money in that you were asking this much and you had been on site doing the work. Did you ever not make that connection that I've seen how much work this entails, how many hours we typically do and that charge going.
AJ – It's interesting is the signature page on the POA does not have a dollar amount on it.
GD – So, when you were billing on behalf of your client to the reimbursement fund, you were never seeing that number?
AJ – The signature page is separate from the page that has the dollar amount so that could be filled in at any time after I signed it.
TT – Not a very sound practice.
JN – Was there somewhere somebody reviewing the invoices?
AJ – In the state or in the company?
JN – In the company.
AJ – It was essentially three people, the owner, owners wife is the bookkeeper, and me were the full-time employees and then the owner would actually hire out part-time help.
RR – I think one thing he hasn't mentioned is how long did you know this person? I think it is relevant.

AJ – I worked for him for 15 years and loved the guy as a brother.
JN – So, I have a question about him and maybe it's not answerable or fair to ask - is he technical? Is he a geologist? So, I'm getting at that idea that a company is doing some remediation work for a retailer and the invoicing part of it – for me, there is a connection between technical scientific knowledge and what the invoice says is being charged so it sounds like, was that on him?
AJ – Yes, he took care of the financials of the company – approving invoices, bills coming in, I didn't do any of that.
JN – Is his background technical, scientific?
AJ – Yes, I believe he was a licensed geologist but he is retired now.
JN – It sounds like there may be a - as part of this bigger activity, that part is unresolved, his part of it or your former companies' part of it?
AJ – Yes.
TT – It's our job right now to go through each of the counts here and discuss them and if we need any additional information from Mr. Jones or his counsel, we can do that.

1. Conviction in the court of law for moral turpitude
   He has been convicted through the court system. However, my opinion is that he is already, through the process of his home detention, his one-year probation, the money he is paying back and the fine he has paid back, I feel that this is already handled by the court system and by the state. I am okay to drop this count but I want the opinions from the rest of you.
   CA – So, drop it or as far as reducing as they work together?
   TT – Yes, they do work together.
   CA – I would be hesitant to completely drop something but as far as the severity of the sanctions.
   RW – Take into account that it is being almost completely finished. I see that point with letters, proof of payment, will be done with probation in August so at 70% finished.
   GD – I agree, the restitution that the courts put in place for mail fraud specifically is being followed and he has almost fully paid. He is also completing service so I agree with the severity of the first count.
   JN – The Board has said the respondent knowingly and with intent to defraud, devised - intended to devise and to participant in the scheme to defraud. My sense is the feeling that that's not true. Sounds like you have shared that you did not have the intent to defraud.
   RW – Under the count though, this is what is in the court record. That's a statement of fact in terms of how the case was resolved. You can't change that statement.
   JN – So, how does the Board resolve something that has been agreed to with what I feel like is maybe a little different story now.
   CA – I think you look at it and it goes to the convictions. He pled guilty to that one count and all the others were dropped and that's pretty common. So, as far as the Boards stance uses its discretion with this is what he pled guilty to but also at the same time, what we are hearing is that there was not that impact. So, I think it really just comes down to how the Board decides what to do. The conviction is what the conviction is and it does provide a basis for discipline from the Board but then you have the respond right here.
   RW – I think that was the buzz point was that it's almost been completed in terms of the penalties imposed so maybe it becomes a less severe point.

GD – I wanted to speak to that and part of my perception is that he is still going through some of that so until the probation has ended and payments have all been made and restitution has been completed that he is still going through those processes to cover his restitution for this guilty plea that he entered into of his own willingness. I still feel there should be something covering that time period while he is on probation while he is paying back during that time period but maybe once that's been covered, that covers the crime that was committed and so that covers that.
TT – To remind the Board that our options here are to revoke his license, suspend his license or put him on probation or censure so those are our options that we have here for each one of these counts.
GD – My recommendation for at least for this count is while he is still going through the process of paying his restitution, that should be an observing period – a similar kind of probation from our standpoint.
CA – You don't necessarily need to make a determination on the same trend for each and every count. You are really looking at it as a whole, which looking at the counts as a whole and at the conduct under the count, what do we think is appropriate.
GD – Since you are bringing that up, can we move to some of the other counts?

2. Gross negligence incompetence in the practice of Geology
TT – That was part of the questions I asked about - was the cleanup actually done because that's where we, as a Board for the health, safety and welfare of citizens of Indiana? In this case it ws done and I assume done well. Geologists…was it done well? Yes. That's what I assumed along the way.
GD – There have been no complaints, no filing of public grievances?
AJ – No, and this was investigated by the Indiana Dept. of Environmental Management so had there been a threat to the safety of the public, they would have been obliged to report this to the Board.
RW – Was the site - gas station closed? And was it in [*not able to transcribe*]?
AJ – Yes, for the site, [*not able to transcribe*] we had closure within 18 months.
JN – This is more just a comment, I find it difficult to separate the financial aspects from the practice of geology. Whether it's consulting, oil and gas, mining, materials. I don't know, just sharing a comment.
RW – I can see that. I have dealt with the ELF side and it would help with an accounting person with this charge and that charge, and it's like I can't get, at least to the way I've been worked with, I can't get out of having that well, this much for this and this is why because we had to do this work and you sort of kind of get buried in that as much as I would prefer not to. Some other companies may operate completely differently. But, yeah, it is hard to separate the costing part unless you are straight-up field and you don't see the budget and are just out there doing that work and don't do the proposals, etc. So, that was one of my questions…what constitutes the practice of geology? The definition?
CA – Performance of service to the public in connection with the geological descriptions, locations, and evaluations of geological materials, liquids, and gases, and the natural processes acting upon them. The term includes geological consulting, investigating, evaluating, designing, and planning.
GD – The designing and planning have very financial aspects.

3. Violation of the Code of Ethics

TT – Violation of IAC 1-5. The Code of Ethics has professional conduct and says that a licensed professional geologist need to abide by the highest standards of honesty, integrity and impartiality in conduct. Under that, there are a number of different sections on it, which is public interest, legal compliance and integrity. Conflicts of interest, obligations to employers and clients and there is also professional courtesy, and it goes on with those kinds of things. Ethics is an interesting topic, very broad associated with it. Integrity, impartiality and conduct are the big three here and in section one with that.

JN – So, did this come to light from your initiative or did it come to light somehow else?

AJ – 3.5 years after I quit the company that I was indited.

RW – Was it because IDEM did the investigation is how it starts?

AJ – I know at that time IDEM had stopped making payments across the board so I don't know how investigations were conducted after. There was a period in about 2020 that was issues with payments to consultants were stopped across the board. I think there was wide-spread fraud throughout but I'm not sure. I just know there were issues so there was a re-vamp of the program, change of the name.

RW – What were some other [*not able to transcribe*].

AJ – That I am not privy to.

JN – So you made the decision to leave the company because you were uncomfortable. You decided in part because you did understand that there was wrong.

AJ – Yes

TT – Something nefarious was going on that you weren't happy with.

AJ – This was kind of that underlying voice that I kind of put in a closet.

JN – But you didn't report it. You didn't go to IDEM.

AJ – I did not, no.

GD – Can we go back to the discussion of you taking the POA come up? What did that discussion look like with your employer?

AJ – So, basically, that was even clients we had were going to leave the consulting company so it was getting me to be the POA like a contractual agreement so instead of having contracts, I would sign off for the clients for the package being submitted for reimbursements. So, going back to your question about contracts - there were no contracts. Your question about how like how I am billing a client and we have a contract with them, and this is the price we agreed, for some reason with their reimbursement I guess there was no contract in other words, you didn't have to go and bid for projects because then the company that I worked for was just going to be billed directly so the client wouldn't have to approve the reimbursement package.

RW – To make sure I get this right, as the client, you had them agree to give POA and you would handle the whole ELF process. In that case you were not giving budgets to the client because they aren't even dealing with it. It's so weird that they were be like you can just do whatever.

AJ – Right, because before we were billing them and they would pay us. Our bookkeeper would take care of all the paperwork. The clients were like if I don't have to pay, I'll just stay with you guys instead of paying a consultant fee and them doing the same thing.

RW- Some clients don't want to have to deal with the ELF process.

JN – Well, at a minimum they are giving your company access to your site. So, was it just a handshake?
AJ – Yes, basically, it was like, fine if you don't have to pay for it, do what you need to do.
JN – So, your firm didn't have anything legal that said we were allowed to go onto the property to install a remediation system?
AJ – I mean, their verbal agreement.
JN – A verbal agreement?
RW – But you had a POA signed for them, right?
AJ – For invoicing.
RW – For ELF invoicing.
JN – I suppose that could extend to POA to allow your company.
AJ – Well no, that wasn't set up that way because the client could fire me at any time. Even if I had the POA, for any reimbursements they already had, they could say you know what, we are going to go with consultant B, you guys are done. It's not like we are going to revoke your POA.
JN – You can't unpower yourself or like look, sorry, I'm your attorney, you can't fire me.
AJ – That's right.
GD – Can someone explain to me how the POA works, just on the basic level?
CA – I asked Todd that. You are giving someone legal authority to act on your behalf for legal matters.
JN – Typically narrowly defined so the POA could act to submit invoices.
CA – I think it could be either way depending on the context and for a lot of times it would set out specifically what it's for within the POA but [*not able to transcribe*]. Usually, you can look at the document itself to see what it details.
GD – So, the discussion was this is the only way are going to save the business, if we take over this role for the clients so they don't have to pay us and so they're hands-off and so that was the basis of the conversation about working this way. I guess my question is, why were you the one they designated to make POA? Was there discussion from your side as to saying why don't you guys do it since you are going to be doing all the billing and everything?
AJ – Had I decided to consult with an attorney on my behalf, the attorney would have said hell no, and trust me, my attorney that represented me, called me everything and stupid and everything else for taking on the responsibility for the owner. No, I should never have been on that as the POA.
GD – And this was just ignorance.
AJ – Just trust.
GD – The other question that was brought up was because of something that we discussed right before that. You mentioned that you left that company because you had an understanding at some point that things were not above water. Is that correct?
AJ – That and the payments stopped coming in to the company.
GD – From ELF?
AJ – So, it was essentially…
GD – You weren't getting paid and…
AJ – And there's something going on.
GD – Somethings going on.
AJ – Yes.

TT – If everyone has their questions done, I think we have reached the point where we as a Board must make some decisions on what we want to do. Currently, the proposed order we have right now is to revoke Mr. Jones' license. Does anybody have any suggestions on something other than that? I would suggest that we actually move him to a probationary stage, given that he is already in a probationary stage with the court system itself and I would suggest that – this is my suggestion – I will throw it out that he stays, you had just renewed your license last year. I would like to keep him under that probationary stage until his next renewal in about 2.5 years (12/31/28). The other thing that we have here is that we are in an ethics issue with what's happened here and I would suggest that under your current licensure, you need to have 12 credit hours per year and under those credit hours, it generally requires one course in ethics. I would recommend that we actually as a Board during the probationary period, increase that to three courses on ethics. That would be my suggestion with that. My other suggestion is I would like to have at least twice a year, a document from your supervisor that would suggest how you are behaving and how things are going with the work and have they have seen any ethical issues that might be along there or any of the others ones that are there. So, those are my three things that I was thinking through here as I reviewed the packet. I had already thought about some of these things before we got here. I appreciate all the comments that you both made for that has helped clear up everything for me on where we are with this. So, that's my suggestion, so I'll leave it up for the rest of you to discuss that as you want. Again, probationary to the end of his next license renewal, increase the ethics courses from one per year to three per year and then twice a year, have a report from his supervisor on how things are going in his job and his performance as a geologist.
GD – This supervisor that supplied this – is this your direct supervisor now?
AJ – No, Doug Ciserella is the owner of the company. My direct supervisor is [*not able to transcribe*], who is also a professional engineer in Illinois and Indiana. My direct supervisor would be under the direction of an Indiana PE.
JN – So, Todd, I think your first one would mean complaint were, based on the counts, we have said that the respondents license should be revoked, we would change that?
TT – Yes, we would reduce that.
JN – We would reduce that to a probationary period.
TT – Yes, a probationary period which includes up to his next renewal of his license and then add the other things on top of that.
JN – On ethics, increase ethics training just for this one LPG?
TT – Just for him during his probationary period. His one cycle.
AJ – I know that the continuing education is 12 credits per year. Would this be in addition to the 12?
TT – Yes, two additional ones on top of the 12 per year, so you would be at 14 per year. Three of those need to be ethics courses and I understand that there's not a lot of ethics courses out there for geologists and we do allow you to take the same ethics course more than once because of that. You are getting into continuing education with that now and there are courses from Texas, Louisiana has courses. We've got it all on our website. During the probationary period, if there are any complaints about your behavior during that probationary period, it would obviously bring you in front of the Board again. With that, we'll address those issues, whatever they might be.
CA – A few other things that I typically include, so if the respondent can notify the Board when criminal probation period is complete and everything is done on that end. Of course, he would need to report any other crimes or if charged with anything else. Just talking about the reinstatement aspect

when that comes, usually, the Board would ask the respondent to petition for reinstatement after that period. That would be the chance for the Board to look and say, okay, has everything been compliant? And if so, done and done. As opposed to an automatic reinstatement, but it's the Boards discretion just exactly on the mechanism for getting back the [*not able to transcribe*].
GD – Yes, I think that's appropriate to review the history and everything at that point.
RW – I agree with probationary licensure and I'm not so sure about the supervisor giving the reports. There is an option for semi-annual compliance affidavits to the Board. I'm not sure if that's something Mr. Jones would submit.
GD – [*not able to transcribe*]
RW – Okay, semi-annual compliance?
TT – Yes, it would be.
CA – Would you prefer from supervisor saying, yes everything is good to go, or something from Mr. Jones?
GD – And I think it was you that said that typically it's a quarterly report?
CA – I think you said quarterly.
RR – I can tell you what other boards – well, it's different. I think with the plumbing commission, maybe they do it twice a year. It seems the boards that have less contact with people seem to have lesser requirements. Just being honest on that. I think the deputy attorney may not say that but the nursing board meets quarterly but they have a very high volume and a very vested interest in the public. So, I think whatever Alan is asked to do, he will do. He prefers semi-annual I'm sure because it's less of a burden but he will do quarterly if he is asked to do them.
AJ – Yes, I'll do quarterly.
RW – I think I would prefer the semi-annual compliance affidavit directly from Mr. Jones and not his supervisor. I agree with the other two items.
TT – Is there any decision on with it being the supervisors report?
GD – Part of my question is whether this is the supervisor to begin with because I thought well, he's already given him a glowing report and recommendation, what's going to stop him from giving another one? But at the same time, I think it is a bit of that oversight from someone else's perspective, someone else's name on the paper so I do like the idea of the supervisor. Maybe we can strike a balance. Maybe it's some sort of compliance from him maybe semi-annual and then on the other end, maybe do an annual supervisors report. That reduces the burden to the employer, which the burden is put on the supervisor but we would still be able to get those updates.
TT – I think just about every one of them works pretty well for us in this situation.
GD – I guess, what is your reason for taking it off the supervisor and putting it on him instead?
RW – Because it comes directly from him and he's confirming directly that he is complying with our requirements. As the education element happens, that the remaining compliance would be all the elements that has to be completed. I think I like it more directly from him than from the supervisor. At the end of the day, he is the one dealing with this and the company has also given a great letter and they are also supporting you, but I think you are also indebted to them, so it's a pretty good idea. So a semi-annual affidavit from [*not able to transcribe*].
TT – So, we are done?
CA – Let me just say that if we are going to do that, let me just clarify for clarity that with the compliance report would entail, what do we want to know?

RW – We need to know that it is in compliance with what we imposed, that the [*not able to transcribe*], the ethics classes are being completed, no additional complaints, that the remaining requirements, like count one have been completed, probation was completed without any issues, repayment is completed. Anything else you can think of?
GD – [*not able to transcribe*]
RW – Anything else you can think of? Beyond that, it's kind of the CEU's and ethics in particular. [*not able to transcribe*] JN - If it sounds like there is still ongoing investigations in a broader way is there any chance that you will – I think what you have done is try to put this all behind you – is there any chance through factors being out of your control, you will be brought back into it?
AJ – No, this is closed with me.
JN – I understand.
AJ – There would be no additional pending charges if that's what you are questioning. There is no criminal investigation against me.
JN – But none of us can control if there will be one in the future. The reason I thought of it is honestly, that's something that, if in the future, again, somehow you are brought back in.
AJ – Right. This, what I think the point is, that there's no additional complaints with the affidavit
RW – Which would include no additional legal charges, criminal [*not able to transcribe*] not just complaints to the Board.
JN – I think that was what was triggering that.
AJ – I'm self-reporting this, so I would be obligated under the rules that if this were to happen, I would have to self-report myself again.
RW – To the Board.
AJ – Yes, and this was not a complaint by someone outside, this was me self-reporting the felony.
JN – So, you brought this to the Board.
AJ – Yes.
JN – So, I guess I was lost on that.
AJ – This was, so I hired counsel and I wanted to be above board and instead of hiding this, I self-reported as required within 90 days of my conviction to report to the Board so I followed the law and that's why we are here today.
GD – Is there a statement that there are no other criminal sharing, no other ethics, no other non-good, I don't know how to say it.
CA – He is otherwise complying with applicable [*not able to transcribe*] rules set forth, which he would need to anyway.
TT – I think we are at that point, I think I need to re-state the motion again, don't I? So, what we are doing is entering a probationary period that would extend through to his next license renewal, semi-annual (twice a year). We do two Board meetings a year. We do one in July and one in January, so if you could provide one to us in July, in the beginning of January and the beginning of July and we would have that available for the Board meeting [*not able to transcribe*]. Then, what we want to do is increase your Ethics courses to two additional courses per year on top of the continuing education you currently need to do, which includes one Ethics course.
GD – And the report, with the conditions we outlined.
TT – Yes, we'll add those conditions in.
AJ – So the first report will be due July 1st of this year.
TT – That would be great, yes.

RR – So, whoever writes the report just to put in there that when he wants to be removed from his probationary period, he must petition the Board to do so. Since it's not automatic.
AJ – So, that would be December, 2028, right? The renewals are every three years? I just renewed in December, 2025,
RR – So, then normally what would happen is the Board would call you in January, I would assume before this Board, to talk about the removal of the probation. A free and clear license with no probation on it.
TT – So, you are, as far as I'm concerned, able to continue practicing as a licensed professional geologist under the probationary period. So, you can put your John Hancock on docs.
AJ – Okay, tell my employer, too.
GD – I will second that motion.
TT – We have had a motion and we have had it seconded so we can now open it up for discussion.
(DR initiated a brief discussion on getting it added to the website)
TT – Any other discussion. All in favor?
All in favor with no nays and no abstaining.
TT – With that, I think we are done. I appreciate both of you coming down here today and speaking in front us. As you know, as a Board, we took a hard line right off the bat. I mean, that's the correct way of doing things and then we can back off away from that. We appreciate your coming down, your honesty with everything that's here. It does appear that you had yourself in a real tough situation and even when you knew that there was something that was kind of nefarious and you didn't like it, I mean, that would have something you should have also probably brought to the Board back then because then we would have been able to handle some of that stuff ahead of what ended up happening.
AJ – I appreciate your taking time to meet with me today.