BEFORE THE ARIZONA STATE

BOARD OF TECHNICAL REGISTRATION

In the Matter of:

Paul Nzomo Civil Engineer Registration No. 33446 Case No. P20-036

CONSENT AGREEMENT and ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

Respondent

In the interest of a prompt and judicious resolution of the above-captioned matter before the Arizona State Board of Technical Registration ("Board") and consistent with the public interest, statutory requirements, and the responsibilities of the Board, and pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-101 et seq., and A.A.C. R4-30-120(G), the undersigned party, Paul Nzomo ("Respondent"), holder of Registration No. 33446, and the Board enter into the following Recitals, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Consent Agreement") as a final disposition of this matter.

RECITALS

- 1. Respondent has read and understands this Consent Agreement and has had the opportunity to discuss this Consent Agreement with an attorney, or has waived the opportunity to discuss this Consent Agreement with an attorney.
- 2. Respondent understands that he has a right to a public administrative hearing concerning this case. He further acknowledges that at such formal hearing he could present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. By entering into this Consent Agreement, Respondent knowingly, voluntarily, and irrevocably waives his right to such an administrative hearing, as well as rights of rehearing, review, reconsideration, appeal, judicial review or any other administrative and/or judicial action concerning the matters set forth herein.
 - 3. Respondent affirmatively agrees that this Consent Agreement shall be irrevocable.
 - 4. Respondent understands that this Consent Agreement or any part of the agreement

1

2

المرا تله

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

may be considered in any future disciplinary action by the Board against him.

ř

- 5. The Consent Agreement, any record prepared in this matter, all investigative materials prepared or received by the Board and all related exhibits and materials, are public records (as defined in A.R.S. § 41-158.18) upon acceptance by the Board of this Consent Agreement and may be retained in the Board's files pertaining to this matter.
- 6. Respondent understands this Consent Agreement deals with Board case number P20-036 involving allegations that Respondent engaged in conduct that would subject him to discipline under the Board's statutes and rules. The investigation into these allegations against Respondent shall be concluded upon the Board's adoption of this Consent Agreement.
- 7. Respondent understands that this Consent Agreement does not constitute a dismissal or resolution of any other matters currently pending before the Board, if any, and does not constitute any waiver, express or implied, of the Board's statutory authority or jurisdiction regarding any other pending or future investigation, action or proceeding.
- 8. Respondent also understands that acceptance of this Consent Agreement does not preclude any other agency, subdivision, or officer of this State from instituting any other civil or criminal proceedings with respect to the conduct that is the subject of this Consent Agreement.
- 9. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that, upon signing this Consent Agreement and returning this document to the Board's Executive Director, he may not revoke his acceptance of the Consent Agreement or make any modifications to the document regardless of whether the Consent Agreement has been signed on behalf of the Board. Any modification to this original document is ineffective and void unless mutually agreed by the parties in writing.
- 10. This Consent Agreement is subject to the approval of the Board and is effective only when accepted by the Board and signed on behalf of the Board. If the Board does not accept this Consent Agreement, the Board retains its authority to hold a formal administrative hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-128(E). In the event that the Board does not approve this Consent Agreement, it is withdrawn and shall be of no evidentiary value and shall not be relied upon nor introduced in any action by any party, except that the parties agree that should the Board reject this Consent Agreement and this case proceeds to hearing, Respondent shall assert no claim that

the Board was prejudiced by its review and discussion of this document or any records relating thereto.

- 11. If a court of competent jurisdiction rules that any part of this Consent Agreement is void or otherwise unenforceable, the remainder of the Consent Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.
- 12. Respondent understands that any violation of this Consent Agreement may result in disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of the registration under A.R.S. § 32-150.
- Respondent agrees that the Board will adopt the following Findings of Fact,
 Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of the practice of Professional Engineering in the State of Arizona.
 - 2. Respondent is the holder of Arizona Professional Engineer Registration No. 33446.
- 3. In or around June of 2019, Respondent and client entered into a verbal agreement for Respondent to design a septic system for a property located at 12625 Casa Grande Ave in Mt. Lemon. Arizona.
- 4. On or about November 11, 2019, Respondent's plans were approved by Pima County Department of Environmental Quality.
- 5. In or around November of 2019, the client hired another Engineer to complete the septic system project as Respondent did not provide the client with adequate plans for the project.
- 6. On or about February 10, 2020, the Board received a complaint alleging that Respondent failed to apply the appropriate technical knowledge and skill in his septic system design for a property located at 1265 Casa Grande Ave in Mt. Lemon, Arizona, in August of 2019. It was alleged in the complaint, Respondent's septic system design was completely unnecessary and overly complicated.
- 7. Assessments performed by the Board's Enforcement Advisory Committee identified the following deficiencies:
 - a. Respondent did not demonstrate an understanding of the ADEQ Rules for

-

Site investigation R18-9-A310. Respondent's selection of a vault and haul design supports the allegation that the design was unnecessary. The subsequent engineer's permitted design validates the allegation.

- b. Respondent's permit submittal information and response to these allegations does not establish the basis of the design because they lack fixture unit computation. Respondent's fixture count of 7 results in a design load of 150 gallons per day, however, the subsequent engineer's fixture count of 8 generating a design flow of 300 gallons per day is the minimum for a low-flow toilet (3 fixture units [fu]), lavatory (1 fu), shower (2 fu), and kitchen sink (2 fu) per R18-9-A314(4)(a). Respondent's use of the lower design flow resulted in an undersized vault system of 2000 gallons instead of 3000 per R I 8-9-E314(D)(I). This under-design demonstrates a technical deficiency.
- c. There is no information as to why Respondent specified dual-walled tanks with an integral leak detection system. The allegation that the system design was overly complicated was supported.
- d. The products of design appear to be misjudged for the tank. Appearances are that tank designs for fossil fuels may have been in the choice of tanks as opposed to a standard chamber design using common components readily available and should have been investigated from the beginning.
- e. It likewise appears that a misjudgment of the soil capacity to take the dissolved and processed effluent affected the instruction to dig test holes.
- 8. On July 29, 2020, the Board's Enforcement Advisory Committee ("EAC") convened to review the complaint against Respondent. After reviewing the evidence and interviewing Respondent and the client, the Committee determined that Respondent failed to apply the appropriate technical knowledge and skill in his septic system design. The Committee found that Respondent did not use due care in his evaluation process, misunderstood weathering conditions, and fudged the fixture unit count to get to the size tank that he wanted. The Committee opined that Respondent did not understand the design and rule criteria for the septic system and probably took the easy way out, without considering costs for the client. The

2

4

5

7

1()

ŋ

12

13

14

17 18

16

19 20

21

23

25

26 27

- ³

Committee expressed its concern as to why Respondent did not conduct any percolation tests and only made visual observations while preparing his septic system design. The Committee agreed Respondent showed no basis for the design and demonstrated a lack of engineering skill.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Board has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-101, et seq.
- 2. The conduct alleged in the Findings of Fact constitutes grounds for discipline pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-128(C)(4) as it relates to A.A.C. R4-30-301(6), in that Respondent failed to apply the same technical knowledge and skill that would be applied by other qualified registrants who practice the same profession in the same area and at the same time.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Board issues the following Order:

- 1. LETTER OF REPRIMAND. Respondent is hereby issued a Letter of Reprimand.
- 2. STAYED SUSPENSION AND PROBATION. Respondent's registration as a Profession No. 33446 shall be suspended for twelve (12) months; however, the suspension is stayed for as long as Respondent remains in compliance with this Order. During the stay of suspension, Respondent's registration as a Professional Engineer is placed on probation for twelve (12) months. If Respondent is non-compliant with any terms of this Order during the twelve (12) month stayed suspension and probation period, the stay of the suspension shall be lifted and Respondent's registration as a Professional Engineer shall be automatically suspended without a formal hearing, and remain suspended until Respondent is compliant with all terms of this Order. If Respondent completes all terms of this Order prior to the end of the twelve (12) month stayed suspension and probation period, Respondent may be eligible for early termination of probation.
- 3. RESTITUTION. Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this Consent Agreement, Respondent shall pay restitution to the client, Pedro Zuniga, in the amount of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500.00) for the cost of the Septic System Design project related to case P20-036. Respondent shall provide proof of payment made to the client, such as a

Ì

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

.,

15

16

17

18

[9]

20

21

22

23

24

35

26

27

- 4. PEER REVIEW. Within the twelve (12) month Stayed Suspension and Probation period. Respondent shall submit his next five (5) septic system engineering and design projects for peer review. Respondent shall furnish to the Board, the name of an Arizona registered Professional Engineer ("Peer Reviewer") who agrees to review and report on Respondent's work. The Proposed Peer Reviewer shall have at least five years of actual engagement as a Professional Engineer, with expertise in septic system design, and shall be registered and in good standing with the Board and shall not have received any disciplinary action from the Board within the last three years. Respondent shall submit to the Board a current resume detailing the qualifications of the proposed Peer Reviewer, and an Affidavit and Agreement to Conduct Peer Reviewer signed by the proposed Peer Reviewer, Upon approval by the Board of the Peer Reviewer, Respondent shall ensure that the Peer Reviewer provides a written report to the Board after each peer reviewed project describing any deficiencies in Respondent's practice, and certifying that the peer reviewed project provided to the client by the Respondent is in compliance with Board rules, statutes, and the professional engineering standard of care. The Board will provide the Peer Reviewer with a list of criteria that the Peer Reviewer will utilize to determine that Respondent is knowledgeable in septic system engineering and design. Respondent shall not give final approval on any projects to a client, contractor, any regulatory or review body or any other person until the project has been reviewed and approved by the Peer Reviewer. Respondent shall retain the Peer Reviewer at his own expense.
- 5. REMEDIAL EDUCATION. Within Ninety (90) days of the effective date of this Consent Agreement, Respondent shall provide proof to the Board that he has successfully completed a minimum of Six (6) hours of Board approved education related to septic system engineering and design.
- 6. ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY. Within Twelve (12) months from the effective date of this Consent Agreement, Respondent shall pay an administrative penalty of One Thousand Dollars (\$1000.00) by certified check or money order made payable to the State of

I()

S

Arizona Board of Technical Registration. Respondent shall make quarterly payments of Two Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$250.00).

- 7. COST OF INVESTIGATION. Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this Consent Agreement, Respondent shall pay the cost of investigation of this case to the Board in the amount of Three Hundred Eighty-Nine Dollars (\$389.00) by certified check or money order made payable to the State of Arizona Board of Technical Registration, according to the provisions of A.R.S. § 32-128(H).
- 8. OBEY ALL LAWS. During the probationary period, Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, as well as, all rules governing the practice of Engineering in the State of Arizona. The Board shall consider any violation of this paragraph to be a separate violation of the rules and statutes governing the Arizona Board of Technical Registration. The Board may also consider Respondent's non-compliance with this Order as a separate violation of A.R.S. § 32-150.
- 9. RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION. Respondent and Respondent Firm shall timely renew their Arizona registration as an Engineer and an Engineering Firm, and timely pay all required registration fees.
- 10. EFFECTIVE DATE. The effective date of this Consent Agreement is the date the Respondent and Board sign the Consent Agreement. If the dates are different, the effective date is the later of the two dates.
- COSTS OF COMPLIANCE. Respondent shall pay all costs associated with complying with this Consent Agreement.
- 12. NONCOMPLIANCE. If Respondent violates this Order in any way or fails to fulfill the requirements of this Order, the Board, after giving notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke, suspend or take other disciplinary actions against the registration. The issue at such a hearing will be limited solely to whether this Order has been violated.

////

////

1	ACCEPTED and ORDERED this 22 day of warm by 2020.
2	
3	Jason E. Foose, R.L.S., Chairman
4	Arizona State Board of
5	Technical Registration
6	
7	Consent Agreement and Order, No. P20-036 accepted this 2 day of 507, 2020.
8	
9	Paul Nzomo, Respondent
10	i aui ivzomo, ivespondent
12	ORIGINAL filed this day of
1.3	, 2020, with:
14	
15	Arizona State Board of Technical Registration 1110 W. Washington, Suite 240 Phoenix, AZ 85007
16	
17	COPY of the foregoing mailed via Certified Mail No and
18	No and First Class mail this day of, 2020, to:
19 20	Paul Nzomo 1870 W. Prince Rd
21	Tucson, AZ 85705
22	
23	By:
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	