COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Board of Registration of Hazardous Waste Site Cleanup Professionals

MINUTES
OF
BOARD MEETING
Held on October 13, 2026
[Approved: November 10, 2026]

Meeting Location: **100 Cambridge Street, Boston, MA and remotely via ZOOM**

Prepared by: Terry Wood

List of Documents Used at the Meeting:
1. Board Meeting Agenda
2. Draft September 15, 2026 Board Meeting Minutes
3. Draft application denial letter
4. ARP Dockets 1, 2, 3 and 4
5. Renewal Dockets 1 and 2

1. **Call to Order:** Diane Baxter called the meeting to order at 12:14 p.m. Present in the room: David Austin and Diane Baxter. Present remotely via ZOOM: Gail Batchelder, Kathy Campbell, Craig Ellis, Dave Gorden, Gregg McBride, Paul McKinlay, Deirdre Menoyo and Jamie Smith.
Board members absent: Kirk Franklin. (Mr. Franklin later joined the meeting as noted below)

Staff members present in person: Matthew Lyne. Staff members present via ZOOM: Chris Borges, Notoshia Dix and Terry Wood.

Members of the public present remotely via ZOOM: Mariellen Morris, LSPA Executive Direcor; Kristi Fitzpatrick, LSPA Assistant Director of Operations & Communications; Medina Korajkic, LSPA Program & Events Coordinator; and Jesse Arroyo.

2. **Announcements:** None.

3. **Agenda:** The Board members agreed to follow the agenda as written.

Mr. Franklin joined the meeting.

4. **Minutes:** The Board members reviewed the draft minutes of the meeting held on September 15, 2026. A motion was made and seconded to approve the draft minutes as written. All Board members in attendance voted to approve the draft minutes as written

by roll call vote.

5. **Old Business**: None

6. **Decisions Regarding Licensing of Applicants:**

A. Draft Denial Letter re: Alexander Dewhirst

Ms. Wood said that the letter states the reason for denial as that the applicant did not establish that he had acquired three years of Relevant Professional Experience within the five years prior to submission of his application. She added that the ARP did note other issues with the application but that Board staff typically lists one reason for denial in the letter to simplify any potential appeal. She said that she asked Mr. Lyne to reach out to the applicant to let him know all the issues the ARP had with the application to assist the applicant should he choose to reapply. A motion was made and seconded to approve the letter as written. The motion passed unanimously by roll-call vote.

B. Application Dockets

New Application Docket Number 1

ARP Members: Craig Ellis, Kirk Franklin, Gregg McBride
Recused Members: Gail Batchelder

ID #	Applicant Name/Company Name	ARP #	REC.
3888	**Carolyn Messer-Ramboll**	**373**	**A**

Mr. Lyne stated that Ms. Messer is a standard track applicant who claimed 10 years of Total Professional Experience and ten years Relevant Professional Experience.
The ARP believed that the first RPE Position listed by the applicant along with the first project qualified for TPE but did not demonstrate RPE. The ARP agreed that the remaining experience met the 5-year minimum requirement for RPE, with the applicant's references confirming the applicant's waste site cleanup decision- making experience.
The ARP recommended Ms. Messer be approved to take the exam.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendation of the ARP. The motion passed by roll-call vote with all Board members in attendance voting in support of the motion with the exception of Ms. Batchelder who was recused and did not vote.

New Application Docket Number 2

ARP Members: Diane Baxter, Kathy Campbell, Jamie Smith

Recused Members: None

ID #	Applicant Name/Company Name	ARP #	REC.
9421	Matthew Simmons-Terra Environmental	374	A

Mr. Lyne stated that Mr. Simmons is an alternate track candidate with a B.S. degree in Environmental Policy who claimed over 21 years of TPE and 14 years of RPE. The ARP believed that Mr. Simmon's application demonstrated at least 7 years of RPE, the amount required for an alternate track candidate. The ARP also noted that Mr. Simmon's application included good project summaries and solid references. The ARP recommended that Mr. Simmons be approved to take the exam.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendation of the ARP. The motion passed by roll-call vote with all Board members in attendance voting in support of the motion.

New Application Docket Number 3

ARP Members: David Austin, Deirdre Menoyo, Paul McKinlay

ID #	Applicant Name/Company Name	ARP #	REC.
4608	Daniel Batchelor	375	A

Mr. Lyne stated that Mr. Batchelor submitted a limited application because he was previously approved to take the exam in 2015. He is a standard track candidate and claimed 17 years of TPE.with all of it being claimed as RPE. The ARP believed that Mr. Batchelor met the requirement for RPE and had at least 3 years of RPE within the past 5 years. The ARP also noted that he had good references that supported his waste site cleanup decision-making experience. The ARP recommended that Mr. Batchelor be approved to take the exam.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendation of the ARP. The motion passed by roll-call vote with all Board members in attendance voting in support of the motion.

New Application Docket Number 4

ARP Members: David Austin, Gail Batchelder, Paul McKinlay

Mr. Johnson is standard track and claimed 25 years of TPE and 18 years of RPE. The ARP believed that the applicant met the minimum requirement for RPE and emphasized his current position at WSP USA where he has served as lead engineer and project manager for 7 years. His references also helped confirm his waste site cleanup decision-making experience and RPE. The ARP **recommended** that Mr. Johnson be approved to take the exam.

ID #	Applicant Name/Company Name	ARP #	REC.
2995	**Cody Johnson- WSP-USA**	**372**	**A**

A motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendation of the ARP. The motion passed by roll-call vote with all Board members in attendance voting in support of the motion.

7. License Renewals

Renewal Docket No. 1
Date: October 13, 2026
Renewal Date: 10/30/2026
New Expiration Date: 10/30/2029
Have completed all requirements for renewal:

	LSP Number	First	Middle	Last
1	4662	Yee		Cho
2	3926	Michael		Bricher
3	3235	Andrew		Pandolph
4	1698	Thomas		Simmons
5	6493	Peter		Dechaves
6	3661	Spence		Smith
7	7713	Brian		Snow

A motion was made and seconded to renew the licenses of the LSPs on Docket #1 for the date indicated. All Board members present voted in favor by roll-call vote.

Renewal Docket No. 2
Date: October 13, 2026
Renewal Date: 7/30/2026
New Expiration Date: 7/30/2026
Have completed all requirements for renewal (after 90-day extension)

	LSP Number	First	Middle	Last
1	7610	Kevin		Kavanaugh
2	6421	Stephen		Graham

A motion was made and seconded to renew the licenses of the LSPs on Docket #2 for the date indicated. All Board members present voted in favor by roll-call vote.

Renewal Status Report.

Mr. Lyne reported that 23 LSPs had a renewal date of 10/30/26. 11 of those LSPs have been approved for renewal and the remaining have until 10/30 to submit their renewals.

8. Other Licensing Related Matters

A. Scheduling of Future Application Review Panels

Mr. Lyne stated that a new ARP is needed for two new applications: Benjamin Downing, #9507 from McPhail Associates and Patricia Jones, #6665 from Tighe & Bond.

Mr. Franklin, Mr. Batchelder, Mr. Ellis, Ms. Menoyo, and Mr. McBride indicated they would be willing to be on an ARP. Mr. Gorden stated he would like to join the ARP as part of his orientation as a new Board member.

B. Inactive Status Report

Ms. Dix reported the Total Number of LSPs on Inactive Status: 2

LSP Number	License Status Date	License Status	Last Name	First Name
8467	April 4, 2025	INACTIVE	Hansel	Kelly
3984	July 1, 2025	INACTIVE	Doherty	James

C. Total Number of Active LSPs = 378

D. Annual Fees Report
Ms. Dix stated there was nothing new to report.

9. Examinations

A. Update re: Exam Procedure Changes

Ms. Wood stated that Mr. Borges anticipates completing the integration of the psychometrician's exam database with the LSP Board's exam database by early next week. Once that integration is complete, Board staff can choose two questions from the unused questions stored in the psychometrician database to substitute for the two questions the exam subcommittee decided to remove from the exam. Board staff will choose two questions concerning the same subject matter that scored similarly in difficulty to the two questions being removed. The integration will also allow Board staff to generate strength/weakness reports for examinees that fail the exam.

Ms. Wood also stated that there has not yet been much movement regarding the Board's decision to allow examinees access to an electronic version of the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) in addition to a paper one. She stated that she has been in contact with MassDEP to come up with options for devices the Board can purchase to load the electronic copies of the MCP and is waiting to hear back.

B. Discussion re: additional exam-related issues raised by the LSPA

Ms. Wood stated that Mariellen Morris, the executive director of the Licensed Site Professional Association (LSPA) had emailed her with some comments and requests regarding the exam that she would like to share with the Board. She stated that Ms. Morris asked by how many questions recent examinees have passed or failed the exam. Ms. Wood stated that this information could be provided. Ms. Morris also asked the criteria the Board used to determine which questions were low-scoring. Ms Wood stated that the Board looked at questions that recent examinees answered correctly at a rate of 37 percent or less. Ms. Morris also wanted to know in which subject matters the low-scoring questions fell. Ms. Wood stated that Board staff could provide this information. Ms. Morris also wanted additional clarification as to why the Board decided not to provide electronic copies of guidance documents to examinees. Ms. Wood stated that the Board decided not to provide electronic copies of guidance documents because there are many listed on the list of sources examinees should review in preparation for the exam and it would be difficult for the Board to track when any of them are updated. Mr. McBride stated that he thought it would be helpful for examinees to have access to electronic versions of the guidance document during the exam. Mr. McKinlay stated that the exam subcommittee discussed the possibility of, sometime in the future, identifying a subset of the most important guidance documents to make available electronically during the exam. Mr. Gorden stated that the LSPA could provide the Board with their ideas about the most important guidance documents to provide electronically to examinees. Ms. Batchelder stated that she believed the questions that derive from guidance documents had been scored based on the fact the examinees would not have access to them during the exam. She said that, if the guidance documents were made available during the test, some questions would need to be rescored. The consensus of the Board members was that the exam committee could continue to consider this issue. Ms. Morris

asked if the LSPA could be provided a summary of the strength/weakness reports that the Board plans to send to examinees who fail the exam or otherwise obtain information regarding how examinees did in terms of subject matter areas. Ms. Wood stated that Board staff could provide the LSPA information regarding the subject matter areas where examinees struggled. Ms. Wood asked whether the Board members had any additional comments they would like to make about Ms. Morris' inquiries. They did not. Ms. Wood stated she would prepare an email to Ms. Morris addressing her questions/comments.

10. Continuing Education Committee Report

Mr. Austin reported that the Committee met earlier in the day and approved seven new courses and re-approved a conference.

13. Other Business

A. Personnel, Budget and Fees: Ms. Wood stated she had no information to report.

B. LSP Board Course: Ms. Wood stated that she has no new information beyond what was reported previously that the LSPA had time in their course schedule in the fall of 2027.

C. Helpful Hints Document re: Applications: Ms. Wood stated that Mr. Smith had provided the following suggested hints to aid people applying for an LSP license:

- Make sure listed TPE and RPE timeframes claimed are clear and consistent across the application. When RPE is being claimed for a portion of a single position make sure it is clear when the RPE time is being claimed within the position description.
- Project descriptions should clearly show waste site cleanup related work involving assessment, remediation, and/or risk characterization
- Include enough projects that project timelines cover the full extent of RPE being claimed
- To the degree feasible, include projects that demonstrate a variety of experience with assessment, remediation, and/or risk characterization (site setting, impacted media, contaminant types, methodologies, etc.)
- Maybe some guidance on project descriptions that are outside of MA/MCP jurisdiction? Describing the RPE decision making as it pertains to the applicable regulatory framework

Ms. Wood stated that she thought the suggestions were useful but added that the suggestion regarding including projects that cover the full extent of time for which the applicant is claiming Relevant Professional Experience exceeds the minimum

requirements set out in the application instructions but we could add qualifying language to Mr. Smith's suggested language to say something like "while not required, including projects that cover the entire timeline will strengthen your application." She added that, since the list of suggestions was short, she would recommend adding them to the existing application instructions rather than creating a new stand-along helpful hints document. The consensus of the Board was that they liked Mr. Smith's suggestions and that it made sense to add them to the existing instructions. Ms. Wood stated that the staff would work to add language to the application instructions.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Austin asked how many people had signed up for the November exam. Ms. Dix stated 21 people were eligible for the exam, not counting the people whose applications were approved today. Of those 21, 14 people have already signed up for the exam, 1 stated she would not be taking the exam this fall and the remaining 6 have not yet responded.

14. **Future Meeting**: The Board will next meet on November 10, 2027.

15. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:47 p.m.