

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Hampton Inn & Suites
80 Beach Drive N.E.
St. Petersburg, FL 33701**

**May 15, 2007
9:00 a.m.**

General Business Meeting

Call to Order

Roll Call – identify excused absences

Ms. Grigsby, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

Board Members present:

Garrick Gustafson
Eric Kuritzky
Lourdes Solera
Rossana Dolan
Joyce Shore
Neil Hall
Mary Jane Grigsby
Sharon Del Bianco
Roymi Membiela

Board Member absent:

Rick Gonzalez, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Government Analyst
John J. Strickland
Frank Lester Adams
David Hein
Bruce Stanley
Michael Wirtz
Dylan Rivers
Shelley Darepo
Jim Thomison
Thomas Reynolds

Tony Lawhon
Bobbie Lecroy-Lansdown
Stephanie Stiefel
Bill Kobrynich
Robert Shumake
Dan Vierls
Randy Swanson
Sandra Dryden
Carrie Riley
Anthony Thayer
Garvin Bowden
Linda Noble Welch
Pat Johnson
Kim Perry
Kristen Fasloing
Morgan Johnson

Court Reporter: Velina Rogers, Charlton Reporting, 4909 Southfork Drive, Lakeland, FL 33813. Telephone 863.648.0639, Fax 863.648.0659

Disciplinary Cases

Consent Agenda Items - Settlement Stipulation

DBPR vs. John H. Bowley
Case Number 2005-018175
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. Building Management Systems, Inc.
Case Number 2005-026508
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Kenneth D. Camp
Case Number 2005-018623
PCP: Rodriguez and Wirtz

DBPR vs. Michael Culpepper
Case Number 2005-019372
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Kevin Farrell
Case Number 2005-016834
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Jose R. Figuerora
Case Number 2006-027030

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Stanley Hoelle
Case Number 2006-045535
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. William F. Murphy
Case Number 2005-021329
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Deborah Neve
Case Number 2005-038289
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Michael Pierce
Case Number 2005-019249
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. David C. Ports
Case Number 2005-015493
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. David Rey
Case Number 2005-015552
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. Harry E. Weaver
Case Number 2005-016801
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Frank Williams
Case Number 2005-016321
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. John F. Wilson
Case Number 2006-041529
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. George Winne and GRW Architecture, LLC
Case Number 2006-025800
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Ferry Hayes, Allen Designers, Inc. and Walter R. Allen
Case Number 2006-039493

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. Michael S. Garrison and The Garrison Group of Florida, Inc.
Case Numbers 2006-045438 and 2005-049302
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Hall

DBPR vs. Octavio Mejia, Carmen A. Abreu, and Majia & Abreu
Case Numbers 2005-033881 and 2005-033882
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Lina M. Restrepo, Tempo Designs, Inc. and Santiago Tobon
Case Numbers 2006-040857 and 2006-040827
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Ronald G. Trebbi
Case Number 2006-011001
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Consent Agenda Items - Voluntary Relinquishment

DBPR vs. Stephen William Bedell
Case Number 2005-020875

DBPR vs. Michael Carroll
Case Number 2005-019246

DBPR vs. David M. Childs
Case Number 2005-015535

DBPR vs. Douglas Dahlin
Case Number 2005-015993

DBPR vs. Heide A. Doron
Case Number 2005-016910

DBPR vs. Stephane Dupoux
Case Number 2005-020811

DBPR vs. George Hizny
Case Number 2005-016539

DBPR vs. Thomas Testerman
Case Number 2005-021039

DBPR vs. Victor Wilburn
Case Number 2005-021236

Consent Agenda Item Addendum - Settlement Stipulation

DBPR vs. Nelson & Associates Interior Design and Space Planning, Inc.
Case Number 2006-035817
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Motion: Ms. Shore moved to approve the settlement stipulations and voluntary relinquishments as presented on the consent agenda as listed.
Second: Ms. Grigsby seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Application Review

GRW Architecture, LLC

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the application be approve pending receipt of fine.
Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ronald G. Trebbi

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved to approve the application.
Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Nelson - dual application

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve the application.
Second: Ms. Grigsby seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion to for Final Order

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Solana Enterprises, Inc., Valrie Rosen and Gerhard Pelzer
Case Numbers 2006-005025, 2006-005040, and 2006-005031

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the proceedings.

Mr. Bruce Stanley was present to represent the respondent. Mr. Minacci provided the board with a copy of the administrative complaint.

Mr. Minacci commented that the respondent entered into a contract offering architectural services and they are not licensed. On November 2, 2006, a five count administrative complaint was filed. On December 1, 2006, the respondent requested a formal hearing and the case was sent to the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH). On December 20, 2006, Mr. Minacci served the respondent with a request for admissions. The respondent failed to respond and on March 8, 2007, a motion to relinquish jurisdiction was requested and DOAH granted the request March 12, 2007.

Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$25,000 fine plus \$342 costs. He requested that the board grant the motion and enter the fine and costs imposed by the panel.

Mr. Stanley commented that he did not receive the motion to relinquish jurisdiction dated March 8, 2007 until after DOAH granted the request dated March 12, 2007. He commented that they immediately filed a petition to reinstate the petition on March 14, 2007. DOAH replied that jurisdiction was relinquished back to the board, the issues were not disputed and therefore deemed fact. He commented that the respondents were ill, elderly and out of the country but they had responded to the request for admissions.

Mr. Stanley requested that the board return the case back to DOAH for a determination of a recommended order.

Ms. Clark advised the board how to proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Stanley argued that the respondents were ill and that was why they did not respond. He commented that illness was not mentioned previously because DOAH acted before they were aware of the deadline.

Mr. Minacci commented the requests for admissions were served December 20, 2006 and a response was due approximately January 25, 2007. He commented that he wrote the respondent on February 20, 2007 asking for a response, called the respondent on March 8, 2007 with no response, and therefore he filed the motion to relinquish jurisdiction.

Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent did not mention that they did not receive the request in a timely manner or that the respondent was out of the country. Ms. Clark asked Mr. Minacci if there were any grounds for excusable neglect. Mr. Minacci replied in the negative.

Mr. Stanley advised that he requested and received a 20-day extension for discovery from Mr. Smith via e-mail with Mr. Minacci's office on January 19, 2007. Mr. Minacci commented that today was the first that he had heard of that extension or e-mail.

Ms. Membiela asked what constituted illness in a case like this and what documents should the board request to confirm illness. Ms. Clark replied that the board had not reviewed a case like this before and respondent should provide supporting documents regarding the illness.

Mr. Pelzer commented that he had a lung and sweating problem for which he was receiving treatment. He commented that the doctors were trying to diagnosis him and he was not sleeping. He commented that he had a severe problem with the antibiotics prescribed.

Ms. Solera asked if Mr. Pelzer had letters from doctors or prescriptions. Mr. Pelzer replied in the positive.

Mr. Minacci commented that he could not contact the respondent directly because counsel represents him. He commented that today was first time he had heard of the illness. Mr. Minacci commented that there had been no evidence of illness.

Mr. Stanley commented that there was a due process issue and he was requesting that they be given the opportunity for the DOAH judge to make the determination of facts.

Ms. Clark advised the board to determine if there was an issue regarding excusable neglect. Mr. Minacci commented that Mr. Stanley did not advise that he had not received the motion to relinquish jurisdiction timely. He commented that the only reason for not responding to the admissions was illness and all other items mentioned today were new.

Ms. Membiela asked about the other parties mentioned in the case. Mr. Pelzer commented that Ms. Rosen was his girlfriend.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that there was no excusable neglect and the board adopt the findings of fact as alleged in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board adopt the conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Minacci advised that the panel recommended a \$25,000 fine plus \$342 costs.

Mr. Stanley commented that he was not able to argue the facts of the case and requested leniency by the board regarding the fine.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$25,000 fine plus \$342.00 costs.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion.

Ms. Membiela requested that the board consider reducing the fine to \$20,000 plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$20,000 fine plus \$342 costs.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Custom Workroom

Case Number 2006-025244

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the proceeding.

Ms. Shelly R. Derepo was present and was the daughter of Ethel Anger. Mr. Minacci presented that case and advised that the respondent offered interior design services in a newspaper advertisement. He advised that on November 2, 2007, a three count administrative complaint was filed.

Mr. Minacci advised that the administrative complaint was hand served to the respondent on January 13, 2007, which was evidenced by affidavit of service with no response. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus \$135.00 costs. Ms. Derepo, Ethel Angers daughter, commented that her mother could not appear and diagnosed with Alzheimer's so she attended on her behalf.

Ms. Clark commented that Ms. Derepo was not mentioned in the complaint but the case was against a business. She advised only corporate officers or attorneys could represent the company.

Mr. Minacci referred the board to the investigative report, which reflected an advertising case. He commented that if the respondent would have responded within 20 days and agreed to cease offering services the case would have been disposed of by cease and desist. The administrative complaint was filed because she did not respond to the investigation or administrative complaint. He commented that there was no evidence of practice, strictly advertising only.

Ms. Clark advised the board how to proceed.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts alleged in the administrative complaint by failure to respond in a timely manner.

Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to impose a \$500 fine plus \$135 costs.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion.

Ms. Membiela asked if the business was still open. Ms. Derepo replied in the positive but they do not offer interior design services. Mr. Manausa suggested that a cease and desist order be imposed.

The question was called and it passed unanimously.

Motion for Final Order by Hearing not involving disputed issues of Material Fact

DBPR vs. Peter Goldhammer
Case Number 2006-031795

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Mr. Goldhammer was present and represented by Thomas Reynolds.

Mr. Minacci presented that case and advised that the respondent was a licensed architect that signed and sealed plans of an electrical engineer. He commented that the plans reference the 2001 Florida Building Code instead of the 2004 Florida Building Code. He commented that Mr. Hick's, the board's expert, reviewed the drawings and found violations. On November 13, 2006, a two count administrative complaint was filed for failure to exercise responsible supervisory control and negligence. On December 4, 2006, the respondent filed an election of rights and did not dispute the facts alleged in the administrative complaint.

The probable cause panel recommended a reprimand, two years non-reporting probation, and a \$4,000 fine plus costs.

Ms. Clark advised that the facts were established since Mr. Goldhammer did not dispute the facts alleged. Mr. Reynolds provided some background regarding Mr. Goldhammer and advised that he had no previous disciplinary history.

Mr. Reynolds commented that at the time the incident took place in St. Petersburg it was common practice that either the general contractor or architect would take plans to the building department. The building department would make corrections and comments regarding the plans, and the corrected plans were resubmitted to the city.

Mr. Reynolds commented that Barry Flaharty, the general contractor, took Mr. Goldhammer's plans to the building department and the preliminary review referenced 2001 Florida Building Code instead of the 2004 Florida Building Code. He commented that Mr. Flaharty contacted the private provider that reviewed the plans against the 2004 codes.

Mr. Reynolds commented that in haste Mr. Goldhammer signed and sealed the wrong pages on the plans and made a mistake. Mr. Goldhammer corrected the 2001 Florida Building Code reference and made other corrections as required by the building department.

Mr. Reynolds disagreed with the probable cause panel's recommendation of negligence regarding the codes. He commented that Mr. Goldhammer did not plan stamp the plans to pass off someone else's work. He commented that Mr. Goldhammer inadvertently signed and sealed the wrong pages in haste due to the fact that the engineer's title block was included on the plans. Mr. Goldhammer had put a policy in place so this would not happen in the future.

Mr. Reynolds provided a hand out to the board members for review. He reviewed a letter from Mr. Dunn, the complainant that stated miscellaneous building code corrections were minor corrections and it was not something that would merit filing a complaint. The board

determined that the complaint was for the reference to the wrong codes and the respondent signed and sealed the wrong pages of the plans.

Ms. Del Bianco asked what the nature of project was and who drew or provided the electrical plans. Mr. Reynolds replied that the project was a vacant funeral home and the plans were to renovate the bottom floor into retail space and the top into residential space.

Mr. Flaharty was sworn in to provide testimony regarding the case. Mr. Flaharty is a licensed general contractor for 34 years. Mr. Flaharty commented that the Dupont Building was built in 1924 and was listed on the local historic registry. He commented that it allowed for mixed use and condominium on the second floor. He commented that the engineer prepared the plumbing, mechanical, and electrical plans. Mr. Flaharty commented that Mr. Goldhammer in no way presented himself as an electrical engineer.

Ms. Clark commented that the respondent did not dispute the facts, however, the board could determine if those facts constitute a violation of the laws as presented by Mr. Minacci.

Ms. Del Bianco asked who drew the electrical and mechanical engineering plans. Mr. Flaharty commented that he worked with the engineer and building department. He commented that with historical buildings, there is a team effort with the contractor, engineers, building department, etc. and that is the normal process with historical restoration.

Mr. Manausa commented that Mr. Goldhammer signed and sealed the work of the engineer. Mr. Flaharty commented that they were under pressure to get the client in the building. He commented that he pushed Mr. Goldhammer and out of hast he made an error but in no way to attempt to deceive anyone. He commented that all of the drawings were corrected and the building permit drawings were issued on the last corrected drawing.

Mr. Membiela commented that they recognized that they did something wrong. Mr. Reynolds requested that the board find that the facts of the case do not constitute a violation of the law and that the board imposes a more lenient penalty that what the panel recommended.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved to accept the findings of fact as presented in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Membiela seconded the motion.

Mr. Kuritzky commented that he had a problem with a paragraph in Mr. Hick's letter regarding the violation of the rule. He commented that he felt the building department filed the complaint premature. Portions of the discussion were inaudible.

The question was called and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Minacci commented that the panel recommended the minimum penalty. Mr. Reynolds commented the board could impose what they want either minimum or maximum and make their own decision.

Ms. Grigsby asked why the engineers did not sign and seal the drawings. Mr. Flaharty replied that it was hast, everything was accepted, and the engineer signed and sealed the plans.

Ms. Clark commented that the board had the ability to go below the penalty recommended by the panel when the board determined there is mitigating factors.

Mr. Reynolds requested that the board consider the letter submitted by Mr. Dunn and Rule 61G1-12.001, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), regarding negligence. He commented that section four of that provision, states in part, that an architect, firm or business holding a certificate of authorization may not be negligent in the practice of architecture. The term negligence is define by the failure by an architect to exercise due care to conform to acceptable standards of architectural practice in such a manner to be detrimental to a client or to the public. Plans, drawings, specifications, and other related documents prepared by an architect shall have sufficiently high standards to inform the users thereof of the requirements intended to be illustrated or described by them and shall clearly and accurately indicate the design and all essential parts of the work. An architect shall meet the standard of practice, which demonstrates the knowledge and ability to assure the safety and welfare of those clients and engage other professionals which results in production of working documents for use for construction.

Mr. Reynolds commented that there was not harm to the public, no one suffered financial loss, and it was simply a reference to the wrong building code. He commented that the facts do not establish negligence on the part of Mr. Goldhammer. He commented he made a mistake in hast and in no way attempted to mislead anyone or harm the public.

Mr. Kuritzky commented that he understood hast, pressure, etc. but signing and sealing an engineer's drawings are hard to ignore when the engineers information is on the drawings. He commented that hast was not an excuse and yes it was a mistake.

Mr. Goldhammer commented that he did not draw the mechanical or electrical drawings and that the final drawings were corrected before they were submitted for permitting. Mr. Reynolds commented that the engineer's title block was on the drawings and it was apparent that the engineer was involved. The board discussed the fact that signing and sealing documents accepts responsibility for the work performed and submitted for permitting.

Ms. Membiela asked why the engineer was not here. Mr. Reynolds commented that the engineer had a scheduling conflict.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to accept the conclusion of law as presented in the administrative complaint.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to accept the conclusion of law as presented in the administrative complaint for count one (1).

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Dolan moved to dismiss count (2) of the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Reynolds requested that the board consider Rule 61G1-12.004(3), F.A.C., regarding mitigating factors. He commented that this was Mr. Goldhammer's first disciplinary issue. He commented that there was no restitution for client damages because there was none. He commented that Mr. Goldhammer's license was in good professional standing with the public and his peers. He commented that Mr. Goldhammer had completed his continuing education. He commented that Mr. Goldhammer implemented policy so the violation does not happen again. He commented that the economy is bad and any amount of fine would be a hardship.

Mr. Kuritzky offered Rule 61G1-12.001(b), F.A.C., signing, sealing or accepting responsibilities for work not competent to perform as a violation more appropriate to the situation as opposed to Rule 61G1-12.001(c), F.A.C., plan stamping. He commented that for a first offense the penalty was a reprimand and \$1,000 fine.

Mr. Reynolds commented that he felt the violation was more an improper use of a seal. He requested that the board impose no probation and a \$500 fine.

Ms. Membiela asked Mr. Goldhammer how much the fee was for the project. Mr. Goldhammer replied that he could not recall.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved that the board impose a reprimand and a \$2,000 fine plus costs.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Petition to Modify Terms of Final Order

Licensed

DBPR vs. Tasuku Ohazama

Case Number 2001-09506

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Manausa

Mr. Ohazama was present and represented by Garvin Bowden.

Mr. Minacci presented the case and commented that on June 10, 2002 an administrative complaint was filed against Mr. Ohazama for failure to exercise responsible supervisory control, misconduct in the practice of architecture, aiding unlicensed activity, and failure to perform a statutory obligation. A final order was filed June 24, 2003, against Mr. Ohazama

imposing a \$5,000 fine, costs of \$1,313, and the respondent's license was placed on probation for eight years. The terms of the probation required the respondent's plans reviewed every six months and that he perform 100 presentations regarding professional liability. The respondent has paid the fines, costs, and satisfied the plans review, as well as made 75 presentations. Based on his record the respondent requests that his probation and the remaining 25 presentations terminate early.

Mr. Minacci commented that based on his experience with Mr. Ohazama during probation and the presentations, he requested that the board grant motion.

Mr. Ohazama thanked the board to allow him to appear at the meeting. He commented that the past four years had been very difficult and he had worked diligently to complete the terms of the order. He commented that he completed 77 presentations, which took a great effort and commitment to find locations and new audiences. He commented that he hoped it served to help others not to make the mistake he made. He commented that he had given many talks regarding the laws and rules but it would be helpful for Mr. Minacci to come and talk with the students. He commented the burden had been great and he regretted the mistake he made. He thanked the board again for their consideration.

Mr. Bowden commented that Mr. Ohazama paid the fine and costs, completed less than half of the probation, but completed 77 presentations. He commented that he is a professor and practicing architect and found new audiences to give presentations.

Ms. Clark commented that final orders are final. She advised that they could give an order that he had satisfied meeting the terms of the final order and that Mr. Minacci would be relieved from further disciplinary action regarding this case.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved that the board accept Mr. Ohazama's testimony, terminate his probation, relieve him of any remaining presentations, and any further or pending disciplinary action.

Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Catherine Kerr Interiors, Inc.

Case Number 2006-042301

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Kerr was not present but represented by Jim Thomas.

The case was before the board for unlicensed activity for offering interior design services on her web site and this was a second office. A three count administrative complaint was filed and the probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus \$450 costs.

Mr. Minacci advised that the settlement stipulation reflected a \$7,500 fine and costs. He commented that the respondent revised her web site, came into compliance, and her counsel advised her on Chapter 481, Florida Statutes.

Mr. Thomas commented that Ms. Kerr takes the violation seriously and corrected the behavior immediately. Mr. Minacci requested that the board accept the stipulation as presented.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved to accept the settlement stipulation as presented.
Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that they thought they sent a message last time and they are looking at the same offense. Ms. Solera commented that the first time was a \$20,000 offense and that did not deter the respondent. Ms. Dolan commented that the respondent filed bankruptcy and asked if she paid any of the previous offense. Mr. Minacci commented that she did not pay the fine on the first offense. Ms. Dolan commented that she is not licensed, so there was no recourse.

Mr. Minacci commented that she was not represented by counsel the first time and she never corrected the website. He filed a second case after the bankruptcy filing. The respondent obtained an attorney, understands the law regarding interior design and has corrected the web site.

Mr. Thomas commented that she was not performing interior design services. She was not represented by counsel previously and they have remedied the web site.

Mr. Kuritzky asked if the board could impose a payment schedule to increase over a time-period if she does not comply with this order. Ms. Clark commented that when there is a requirement to pay the standard term within a certain time. It is not favored to increase payment amounts if she does not pay.

Ms. Del Bianco asked if there were other factors that caused the bankruptcy. Mr. Minacci replied in the positive. Mr. Thomas commented that the bankruptcy was not filed to avoid paying the first fine. Mr. Minacci agreed.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco who made motion to accept the settlement stipulation.
Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Bobbie LeCroy Lansdown and Bobby Lansdown Design Studio
Case Numbers 2005-041872, 2005-048266 and 2005-048734
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, Bullock, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Lansdown was present and represented by Anthony Lawhon.

Mr. Minacci presented the case. The case was before the board for unlicensed activity. Mr. Minacci commented that the counts were based on the use of the descriptive term architecture and interior design but no services offered. A 10 count administrative complaint was filed for practicing architecture and interior design. The probable cause panel recommended a \$50,000 fine and \$1,092 costs. Mr. Minacci commented that the

settlement stipulation reflected a \$7,500 fine and costs based on the respondent's agreement to come into compliance.

Mr. Minacci advised that the panel's recommendation was based on three projects, which were residential in nature and does not require licensure. The counts were based on the use of the term interior design and architectural in the contracts. If the descriptive terms were not used in the contract, there would not be violations.

Mr. Minacci commented that there were other materials that were civil in nature and the board could not bring charges of negligence or fraud against an unlicensed person. He commented that the respondent relied on advice of counsel when writing the contracts and counsel put the terms in the contract, which should be considered mitigating factors.

Mr. Lawhon commented that Ms. Lansdown followed the advice of an attorney to help her create the contract. She relied on the contract because a lawyer created it for her. She is an allied member of ASID. She immediately stopped using the contracts and reference to the term interior designer or architecture.

Mr. Lawhon commented that Ms. Lansdown was apologetic for the improper use of the terms. He requested that the board take into consideration that others were attempting to use the determination of the board to assist them with civil litigation. He requested that the board consider Mr. Verrick's motivation was pending litigation against Ms. Lansdown. Mr. Lawhon advised that two pending litigations regarding this issue have been resolved.

Mr. Lawhon requested that the board consider the amount of the \$50,000 fine. He requested that the board accept her apology and to accept the settlement stipulation.

Ms. Del Bianco asked if she performed services in common areas. Ms. Lansdown replied in the negative. Ms. Shore commented that ASID offers contracts and referred her to review the newsletters from ASID regarding the use of the title.

The board discussed the qualifications for being a member of ASID or an allied member of ASID. The board discussed Ms. Lansdown's internship under a licensed professional for her to gain the experience to obtain the allied membership with ASID. Once she obtained the allied status, she met with an attorney and the attorney created the contract that uses the descriptive terms.

Dan Verrick thanked the board and advised that he independently filed the complaint with the department. He commented that his earliest correspondence from Ms. Lansdown represented herself as an interior designer including publications, brochures, etc. as well as two (2) agreements. He commented that Ms. Landsdown continually stated that she used a poor choice of words with respect to representing herself. He commented that removed her from a project because of failing to meet time requirements and ceased utilizing her and requested an account for all products purchased. Ms. Landsdown's attorney insists that the monies given to her were for services not products. Mr. Verrick commented that at all times her contract reflected that she was an interior designer. He requested that the board

send a clear message that fraud, deception, and deceit would not be tolerated in the interior design profession.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to accept the stipulation as presented.

Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Anthony Thayer and Handy Helper Residential Design

Case Number 2006-007960

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Mr. Thayer was present and sworn in. Mr. Minacci presented the case and settlement stipulation required appearance. The case was before the board for the unlicensed practice of architecture. However, Mr. Thayer worked with licensed professionals on the projects. Probable cause was found and a two count administrative complaint was filed. The panel recommended a \$10,000 fine and costs.

The settlement stipulation reflected a \$2,500 fine and costs. The stipulation required Mr. Thayer's appearance. The fine was reduced based on the case being for a small residential project and Mr. Minacci met with Mr. Thayer and his attorney. They reviewed Chapter 481, Florida Statutes and Mr. Thayer agreed to comply.

Mr. Thayer commented that he began as a draftsman 20 years ago. He commented that he copied the contract from a previous employer. He commented that he never represented himself as an architect. He explained that he did not know he could not practice the way he was practicing. He commented that he knew he could not use the term architect or architecture but did not realize that he could not offer to draw and then have the plans signed and sealed by an architect or engineer. The city requires that all residential plans be signed and sealed by an architect.

Ms. Clark advised that Mr. Thayer should work directly for the architect or contract with the architect instead of with the owner. The board discussed that certain counties require residential plans be signed and sealed for wind load requirements only.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to accept the settlement stipulation as presented.

Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact

Addendum

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. John J. Strickland

Case Number 2005-038687

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Mr. Strickland was present and represented by Charles Hughes. Mr. Minacci presented that case. The case was before the board for unlicensed architectural services. A two count administrative complaint was filed November 2, 2006. On February 13, 2007, an election of rights form was filed and the facts were not disputed. The panel recommended a \$10,000 fine and costs.

Mr. Hughes commented that they were not disputing the facts or conclusions of law as alleged. He commented that he would like to request a reduced fine instead of the recommended maximum fine. He commented that Mr. Strickland was trying to assist the church as a favor. He commented that Mr. Strickland did not represent himself as an architect. He commented that the church elders knew Mr. Strickland to be a licensed mechanical engineer. The Alachua county building department required Mr. Strickland to place his information on the plans and they issued the permit.

Mr. Strickland never represented himself as a licensed architect and was a retired professional. Mr. Hughes requested that the board consider the circumstances and impose a lower fine than the maximum. Mr. Strickland had a licensed engineer perform the wind load calculations and structural engineer work. The board discussed the penalties and guidelines for unlicensed cases.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to adopt the finding of fact as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to adopt the conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to impose a \$10,000 fine and costs.
The motion died for lack of a second.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to impose a \$5,000 fine and costs.
The motion died for a lack of a second.

Ms. Dolan commented that the building department should have required an architect to sign and seal the drawings. She commented that the department should have enforced the state requirements.

Ms. Dolan commented that Mr. Strickland stated under oath that he was retired and this would never happen again.

Motion: Ms. Dolan moved to imposed \$2,500 fine and costs. based on his oath that he would never do this again and he is retired status.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion.

Mr. Gustafson commented that the fine was still too high and offered \$1,000 fine and costs.

The question was called, the motion passed, with Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Kuritzky opposed.

DBPR vs. David R. Hein and DR Associates Group, LLC

Case Numbers 2006-044424 and 2006-044428

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Mr. Hein was present, sworn in and represented by Frank Adams. The case was before the board based on a three count administrative complaint filed December 27, 2006. On January 23, 2007, an election of rights was filed and the facts were not disputed. The panel recommended a \$15,000 fine and costs.

Mr. Adams commented that the respondent admitted to the facts and the fees were returned to the complainant. He commented that the respondent did not know he needed a certificate of authorization because he had a licensed architect on staff. Mr. Hein apologized for the oversight and a certificate of authorization was on file.

Mr. Clark reminded the board that the panel imposed the maximum penalty for unlicensed case and for them to consider the information presented today when determining the penalty amount.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as presented in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The business had licensed professionals on staff. The company began as an engineering firm and clients inquired about architectural services. Mr. Minacci commented that there was a licensed architect on staff.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose \$10,000 fine and costs.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it failed.

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved to impose a \$5,000 fine and costs.

Second: Ms. Dolan seconded the motion, it passed with Ms. Solera opposed.

Application Review

DR Associates Group, LLC

Mr. Picallo's, the qualifier and responsible supervisor, case was resolved at the February meeting.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve the application pending resolution of today's order.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion for Order Waiving Formal Hearing

Licensed
DBPR vs. E. Dean Bolaris / E. Dean Bolaris, P.A.
Case Numbers 2005-031944 and 2005-027571
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

The respondent requested a continuance and Mr. Minacci requested that the board grant the request.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board grant the request for continuance.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Sandra K. Carroll
Case Number 2005-020639
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed on November 6, 2006, served by personal service on December 14, 2006 as evidence by the affidavit in the board materials. The respondent failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

Mr. Minacci advised that a citation was filed for failure to complete the Florida Building Code core course. The respondent failed to respond to the citation, therefore an administrative complaint was filed. The probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, completion of the required course, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the administrative complaint was properly served on the respondent.
Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Isaac Franco
Case Number 2005-017091
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed on November 6, 2006, served by via certified mail on November 14, 2006 as evidence in the board materials. The respondent failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived his right to be heard for failure to timely respond.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Lisa Halloran

Case Number 2006-041843

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Mr. Minacci provided a settlement stipulation as a handout, which mirrored the panel's recommendation of \$1,500 fine and costs.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board accept the settlement stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Application Review

Sculptors of Space, LLC dba

Sculptors of Space Design Group

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved to approve both applications contingent upon payment of the fine imposed in the above referenced cases within 90 day of the order.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Octavio Lima

Case Number 2005-019545

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed on November 6, 2006, served by personal service on February 17, 2007 as evidenced by the affidavit of serve in the board materials. The respondent failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

Mr. Minacci advised that a citation was filed for failure to complete the Florida Building Code core course. The respondent failed to respond to the citation, therefore an administrative complaint was filed. The probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, completion of the required course, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived his right to be heard for failure to timely respond.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law and set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board impose a \$500 fine.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Randolph Croxton

Case Number 2005-019991

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused. Mr. Minacci provided a settlement stipulation that reflected the panel's recommendation of a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board accept the settlement stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Ramji P. Shah and ARC Design Group

Case Numbers 2005-026802 and 2005-026787

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed on September 18, 2006, served by certified mail on November 20, 2006 as evidenced by the board materials. The respondent has failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

Mr. Minacci commented that the complainant entered into a contract with ARC Design Group to perform architectural services. Mr. Shah is the architect of record for the project but was living in Las Vegas at the time the contract was entered into. The project was transferred to RC Roland and Associates, Inc. to provide architectural services. The businesses are located at different address. Mr. Shah advised that he ceased qualifying RC Roland and Associates, Inc. when he left Tampa in 2001, however he did not notify the department. The plans were prepared with ARC Design Group's title block and the seal of a professional engineer that is not employed by either business.

Probable cause was found to file a three count administrative complaint. The panel recommended an \$11,000 fine and cost.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served on the respondent.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusion of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose an \$11,000 fine and costs.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Reinaldo Vera

Case Number 2005-020039

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed on November 6, 2006, served by personal service on January 27, 2007 as evidenced by the affidavit in the board materials. The respondent has failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

Mr. Minacci advised that a citation was filed for failure to complete the Florida Building Code core course. The respondent failed to respond to the citation, therefore an administrative complaint was filed. The probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, completion of the required course, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Donald Chancey

Case Number 2006-017046

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. An administrative complaint was filed December 27, 2006 and on January 30, 2007 Mr. Chancey requested a hearing before the board which he did not dispute the material facts in the administrative complaint.

Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent contracted to provide architectural services and a three (3) count administrative complaint was for filed. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine and costs.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board to adopt the finding of facts and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$5,000 fine and costs.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Doug Spencer and Doug Spencer Architectural Design, Inc.

Case Number 2005-022371

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The board was before the board for a three count administrative complaint filed on November 2, 2006, which was served by personal service February 12, 2007 evidenced by the affidavit in the agenda materials. No response had been received from the respondent.

Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent was not licensed and was offering architectural services through business. The probable cause panel's recommendation was a \$15,000 fine and costs.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived the right to be heard in the matter by failing to timely respond.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$15,000 fine and costs.

Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion and it passed unanimously

Motion for Final Order by Hearing Not Involving Disputed Issues of Material Fact

Licensed

DBPR vs. Ames Bennett

Case Number 2005-046441

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Ms. Clark presented the case. The case was before the board for a three count administrative complaint filed September 18, 2006, which was served by certified mail on October 18, 2006. Mr. Bennett responded on March 30, 2007 and did not dispute the facts and requested the hearing.

Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent's title block was in violation of the statutes, respondent failed to exercise responsible supervisory control, and aiding unlicensed activity. The probable cause panel recommended 2 years probation, a \$6,000 fine and costs.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board adopt findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Minacci referred the board to Mr. Bennett's letter requesting a reduction in the fine.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a two year reporting probation, a \$1,000 fine and costs.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Juan Carlos David

Case Number 2005-024834

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. Mr. Minacci presented a settlement stipulation that reflected the panel's recommendation of a reprimand, \$1,000 fine and costs.

Motion: Ms. Gustafson moved that the board accept the settlement stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Eyo Faulkner

Case Number 2005-016288

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint November 6, 2006, which was personally served on February 7, 2007. Mr. Faulkner responded February 10, 2007 disputing the facts that he did not take the Florida Building Code core course. The proof provided with the dispute was insufficient evidence that he completed the core course. When the facts are disputed the board must determine if there is a legitimate dispute of facts.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board find that there was no dispute of facts.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Ray Hatfield

Case Number 2005-020019

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed January 16, 2007. Mr. Hatfield responded February 20, 2007 disputing the fact that he did not take the Florida Building Code core course. The proof provided with the dispute was insufficient evidence that he completed the core course. When the facts are disputed the board must determine if there is a legitimate dispute of facts.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board find that there was no dispute of facts.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. William Pace

Case Number 2005-021322

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed November 6, 2006. Mr. Pace responded to the complaint disputing the fact that he did not take the Florida Building Code core course. The proof provided with the dispute was insufficient evidence that he completed the core course. When the facts are disputed the board must determine if there is a legitimate dispute.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board find that there was no dispute of the facts.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Abram Q. Sustaita

Case Number 2005-014226

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed January 16, 2007 for failure to take the Florida Building Code core course. Mr. Sustaita confirmed that he did not take the course and requested to place his license on inactive status. The board reviewed the agenda and an additional handout provided to determine if Mr. Sustaita had a legitimate dispute of the facts.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board find that there was no dispute of the facts.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$500 fine, proof of course completion and suspension until compliance

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. ADG Alpha Design Group and Al Grossi

Case Number 2005-024611

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for a three count administrative complaint filed November 2, 2006. The respondent elected a hearing and did not dispute the facts. The case violations were for practicing architecture when not licensed, using the title architect when not licensed, and for offering services through a business when not licensed. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Clark referred the board to Mr. Grossi's explanation regarding the violations. She advised the board that the panel did not have the additional information for review when they recommended the \$15,000 fine plus costs. Mr. Minacci requested that the board take into consideration that Mr. Grossi responded to the complaint.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board impose a \$7,500 fine plus costs.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Settlement Stipulation

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Kevin D. Atchley Design and Kevin D. Atchley

Case Number 2006-025574

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for a two count administrative complaint for offering architectural services when not licensed and using the title architect when not licensed. The probable cause panel recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflected a \$5,000 fine plus costs. The respondent no longer lives in Florida.

Motion: Ms. Shore moved that the board approve the stipulation as presented.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Paula Caldas and D-Essentials, Inc.

Case Numbers 2006-026226 and 2006-026214

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for a four count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license, using the title architect when not licensed, using the title interior design when not licensed, and practicing through a business without a license. The respondent filed an application for a certificate of authorization. The probable cause panel recommended a \$20,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflected a \$5,000 fine plus costs. Mr. Minacci advised that this was an advertising violation; the respondent corrected their web site, and agreed to come into compliance. Mr. Minacci requested that the board approve the settlement stipulation as presented.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board accept the stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Joseph Miraglia and Miraglia DSGNTec

Case Number 2006-027383

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for a four count administrative complaint for practicing interior design, using the title interior design when not licensed, practicing architecture when not licensed, and practicing through a business without a license. The probable cause panel recommended a \$20,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflected a \$7,500 fine plus costs. Mr. Minacci advised that the violation was for a contract offering interior design services and the respondent agreed to come into compliance. Mr. Minacci requested that the board approve the stipulation as presented.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board approve the stipulation as presented.

Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Margaret O'Rourke

Case Number 2006-014976

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for a three count administrative complaint for practicing architecture, using the title

architect, and practicing through a business without a license. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$5,000 fine plus costs. Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent provided drafting services to a licensed profession and agreed to come into compliance. Mr. Minacci requested that the board approve the stipulation as presented.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board approve the stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. T. Russell DeBose and TR DeBose Architectural Design & Elements

Case Numbers 2005-041790 and 2006-033103

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. Mr. Hall was recused from the case. The case was before the board for a three count administrative complaint for offering architectural services, using the title architect, and practicing through a business without a license. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflected a \$5,000 fine plus costs. Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent provided drafting services to a licensed engineer, he understood the law, paid the fine, and agreed to come into compliance.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board approve the stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Del Bianco seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

New Business

Mr. Rodriguez addressed the board regarding the probable cause panel process. He commented that the panel reviewed and considered all materials provided for all cases. He commented that for a majority of the unlicensed cases the respondent does not respond to the investigation or administrative complaint. He commented that all cases were investigated and all materials were submitted for the panel to review. He commented that the panel finds probable cause when appropriate and they use the fact that the respondent failed to respond as an aggravating matter when assessing the maximum fine. He commented that the panel did not impose the maximum in every case but did impose it in a majority of the cases. He offered to talk with the new board members to provide additional information as to how the panel operated.

Ms. Clark commented that the cases were investigated thoroughly, the probable cause panel reviewed all the materials provided, and considered each case individually. She commented that her comments earlier in the meeting were a reminder to the board that the maximum fine was routinely given for unlicensed cases. She commented that she wanted to remind the board that the panel's recommendation was that a recommendation but it was the board's decision on the penalty and/or fine that is imposed. She commented that not all unlicensed respondents are invited to attend the probable cause panel meeting and in some cases additional information is provided for the board to consider at the meeting.

Old Business

There was no old business.

The meeting recessed 4:17 p.m.

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Hampton Inn & Suites
80 Beach Drive N.E.
St. Petersburg, FL 33701**

**May 16, 2007
9:00 a.m.**

General Business Meeting

Call to Order

Roll Call – identify excused absences

Ms. Grigsby, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

Board Members present:

Garrick Gustafson
Eric Kuritzky
Lourdes Solera
Rossana Dolan
Joyce Shore
Neil Hall
Mary Jane Grigsby
Sharon Del Bianco
Roymi Membiela

Board Member absent:

Rick Gonzalez, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Government Analyst
Trent Manausa
Emory Johnson
Kim Perry
Phil Bulon
Christie Spagnola
Ginger Kaw
Lorraine Bragg

Dean Yates
Chris Liddle
Aida Bao-Garciga
Julie Hargove
Janice Young
Steve Jernigan
Mickey Jacob
Vicki Long
Mark H. Smith
Harvey Goldstein
Dawn Mages
Jessica Vandenbasch
Linda Nobel Welch
Pat Johnston
Shari Silkoff

Court Reporter: V. Liz Nieves, Argus Reporting, 3410 Henderson Blvd, Tampa, FL 33609.
Telephone 813.490.0003, Fax 813.831.1599

Addendum

Request for reinstatement of void license

Ron Jaffe – Interior Design

Mr. Jaffe was not present. Mr. Johnson presented the application for reinstatement and commented that the Mr. Jaffe's license lapsed delinquent in 2001 and void in 2003 for failure to renew. He commented that Mr. Jaffe was requesting a reinstatement due to an unusual hardship and based on Chapter 455.271, Florida Statutes.

Mr. Johnson commented that Mr. Jaffe provided documentation of an auto accident that was a physical hardship and he took care of his elderly mother-in-law. Mr. Hall asked if Mr. Jaffe completed any continuing education. Ms. Estes commented that all information provided by Mr. Jaffe was in the agenda materials.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board continue the application until the next meeting.
Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Application Reviews

Christopher Liddle (architecture endorsement)

Mr. Liddle was present and sworn in. Mr. Liddle commented that he served on the Vermont Board of Architects and he failed to pay his taxes timely. He commented that he paid his taxes in full and took full responsibility for the matter. He commented that based on advice from his Certified Public Accountant that he did not believe taxes were due. He commented that he had some personal issues that compounded the problem.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board approve the application as presented.
Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Antonio Del Moral (interior design endorsement)

Mr. Del Moral was not present. Ms. Estes provided the board a letter from Mr. Del Moral requesting to withdraw his application.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board approve the request to withdraw.
Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Patricia Canfield (interior design endorsement)

Ms. Canfield was present and sworn in. Mr. Johnson presented the application. Ms. Canfield provided the board with additional information regarding her course curriculum that was in question. Mr. Johnson commented that Mr. Butler was not able to review the additional information provided. He commented that the additional information provided did not meet the threshold for the statutory requirement. Ms. Canfield commented that her programs covered industrial, graphics, and interior spaces. She reviewed her number of years of interior design experience and training. She commented that she passed the NCIDQ examination.

Mr. Johnson referred the board to a letter from Ms. Canfield's education institute that affirmed that the program met the board's statutory requirements.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve the application as presented.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she disagreed. She commented that the statute and rules were specific. She commented that Ms. Canfield did not have three years of specific interior design education and that the letter from her institute should not be taken on face value. Ms. Del Bianco commented that she did not feel that institutes fairly assessed the rule because they have a vested interest.

Ms. Shore suggested that Mr. Butler be given an opportunity to review the course curriculum. Mr. Johnson suggested that Ms. Canfield withdraw her application and contact the educational institute in her area that is an acceptable program.

Ms. Canfield requested to withdraw her application.

Judith Del Viscio (interior design endorsement)

Ms. Del Viscio was not present but provided a letter requesting to withdraw her application.

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

January 16, 2007 – telephone conference call

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve the minutes as presented.
Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

March 20, 2007 – telephone conference call

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve the minutes as presented.
Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ratification Lists

Applicants

Interior Design individuals licensed by exam or endorsement
Items 1-49

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 1-49.
Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Interior Design Businesses
Items 50-86

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 50-86.
Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Architecture Businesses
Items 87-143

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 87-143.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Architecture individual by exam
Items 144-170

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 144-170.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Architecture by endorsement
Items 171-305

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 171-305
Second: Mr. Gustafson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Continuing Education

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve architecture and interior design continuing education courses as presented.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Architecture Discussion

Letter from Gordon Mill, Candidate for NCARB First Vice-President

For the board's information there was no discussion.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she received the NCARB resolutions for the upcoming June meeting. Ms. Chastain commented that a telephone conference call would be scheduled to discuss the resolutions prior to the NCARB meeting.

Interior Design Discussion

National Council for Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ)
Annual Council of Delegates Meeting November 10-12, 2006
Michael Alin letter regarding George F. Will's article in the Washington Post
Florida Interior Design Schools, addresses and program directors
Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) – Candidacy Status Policy and Procedure
CIDA Education Program Standards related to NASAD Standards
NCIDQ February 2007 Minutes
NCIDQ Model Language Comments (Joyce Shore)

Ms. Shore reviewed the NCIDQ meeting summary. She reviewed the article published in the Washington Post and advised that there was a web site that individuals could go to and post comments regarding the article.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would like to discuss the CIDA standards compared to the National Association of Schools of Arts and Design (NASAD) during the rules discussion.

Ms. Shore commented that NCIDQ requested comments on their Model Language. She commented that the Model Language started in 1990 was created by a group of interior designers, legislators, etc. She commented that every year they update the Model Language and requested comments from the states. Ms. Shore commented that she had reviewed the language and had no comments.

Rules Report and Discussion

Rule Tracking
Definition "intern-architect"

Ms. Clark commented that the board voted to repeal the rule defining "intern-architect" in February. She commented that the rule effective date was April 15, 2007. She commented that Rules 61G1-22.003 and 24.002, F.A.C. regarding the continuing education handbooks were noticed for rule development.

Ms. Clark commented that Rule 61G1-22.003, F.A.C., regarding the education for interior designers was noticed for rule development.

Ms. Del Bianco commented and requested that CIDA focus on interior design program and NASAD focus on the school not individual programs. She requested that the board remove the language that allowed for NASAD approved programs.

Mr. Hall commented that the Probable Cause Panel discussed the reason why the board removed the definition for “intern-architect”. He commented that there was a concern that individuals were using the term when they were not registered in an intern program. Mr. Manausa suggested the following language as a new definition for “intern-architect”:

An applicant for licensure that is exam eligible, graduated from a NAAB accredited program, enrolled in NCARBs IDP program, and meets the requirements of Chapter 481.211, F.S., Internship requirements, and under the direct supervision of a licensed architect may use the term “intern-architect”.

Mr. Manausa commented that the statute requires an internship and individuals should be able to use the term “intern-architect”. Ms. Bao-Garciga requested that language be drafted for the interior design profession.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that NCIDQ offered an internship program called IDEP. She commented that there was an avenue for interior design internship through this program and would like to draft language. Ms. Grigsby commented that Florida did not have statutory requirements for internship and there were no clear guidelines.

Ms. Young asked the board if IDAF pursued legislative language this year would they like them to include interior design internship language as a requirement. Ms. Del Bianco commented that most of the practice act states require internship. Ms. Young commented that it could be a facilitating requirement.

Ms. Dolan asked how long an individual could use the term “intern-architect”.

Mr. Jacob commented that graduates from NAAB accredited schools are staying within the industry but not necessarily gaining licensure. He commented that there are many requirements to gain licensure and they choose not to complete those requirements. He commented that it drives them to alternative industries like drafting, graphics, teaching, etc. He commented that they are not paid well during internship and that drives them to other professions. He commented that completing the examination is taking some interns longer than expected.

Mr. Jacob commented that AIA created an “associate emeritus” status for individuals that remain as “intern-architects” through out their career. He commented that it was important to keep the term “intern-architect”. He commented that individuals that are education make contributions that stay with firms that may not require them to gain licensure.

Mr. Jacob supported the language that Mr. Manausa proposed.

Mr. Hall asked if they would have an obstacle for putting the language back in the rule. Ms. Clark replied in the positive.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board notice Rule 61G1-11.003, F.A.C., for development.
Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would like to develop language for the interior design profession. Mr. Manausa cautioned her about that because they did not have statutory authority.

Mr. Johnson commented that he did not agree with bringing the term “intern-architect” to the definitions. He commented that the board discusses at almost every meeting the problem with individuals using the title architect or interior designer. He commented that a graduate could use the term intern. He commented that once a graduate enters the professional area as an “intern-architect” and moves to a different career path say drafting, they drop the word intern and that is where individuals get in trouble. He commented that individuals are creative with the name of their occupation. He commented that the board discussed this issue at length before removing the term from the rule.

Mr. Smith commented that internship starts after graduation. He commented that he supported the proposed definition. He commented that if an individual used the term incorrectly the Prosecuting Attorney will pursue that issue. Mr. Manausa commented that the language was extremely important. He commented that it was a shame that individuals that have completed school and are required to complete an internship are not allowed to call themselves an “intern-architect”.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would like to create internship language for interior designers. She commented that the interior design profession required experience and would like to find a way to utilize or include an internship to meet that requirement.

Ms. Grigsby commented that the NCIDQ IDEP program was new and not required by states. She commented that she did not think it was a good idea to include the requirement in a rule. Ms. Johnston commented that she would like to see NCIDQ IDEP included in the rule. She commented that it would allow for another pathway for graduates to gain experience. Ms. Young commented that the statute needed to be stronger before pursuing this rule.

Mr. Manausa requested that the architects move on implementing the term first then try for the interior designers.

Mr. Johnson referred the board to Rule 61G1-22.003(5), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), that requires a certain number of years of experience to be eligible for the NCIDQ examination and suggested that may be an avenue to pursue using IDEP.

Mr. Yates commented NCARB IDP was structured and documented. Ms. Del Bianco commented that NCIDQ IDEP was structured like NCARBs.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved that the board remove the words, “and/or National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)” from Rule 61G1-22.003(1), F.A.C.

Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Del Bianco reviewed the Council of Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) candidacy status, which allows for education approval of graduates from schools while waiting for accreditation. She would like the board to consider accepting the graduates from programs that are in candidacy status since the program must graduate two years of students to be eligible for accreditation. She commented it would assist in the board's review process for non-CIDA accredited programs.

Mr. Johnson cautioned the board in automatically accepting candidacy status students because after the accreditation review process some programs were not accredited. Ms. Young commented that candidacy status is a process that provides guidance but because some programs were not approved, she would not support automatically accepting the candidacy status students.

Continuing Education Applications

American Construction – Manufactured Homes

Ms. Del Bianco commented that this was an installation course and not related to architecture. The board discussed that the course outline was not complete. Ms. Clark commented that the handbook allows courses in construction documents and services and materials and methods. The board discussed the materials provided and notes provided by the continuing education task force reviewer.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved to approve the course as presented.

Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Claire Wiley – Edinburgh Scotland, Glasgow & Lochness

Ms. Shore commented that the course was recommended for denial because the applicant did not submit a log of learning. Ms. Clark referred the board to page 142 of the agenda, which appeared to be a log of learning. The applicant requested four hours of self-directed study.

Motion: Ms. Shore moved to approve the course as presented.

Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

General Discussion / For Information

Future board meeting information

This was for the board's information. The board scheduled a telephone conference call June 12, 2007 at 2:00 p.m.

Legislative Language 2006 – Contract Construction Administration

Letter from the Department of Community Affairs – definition of interior designers

Architectural Registration Examination 4.0 Transition information

The board did not discuss the items. They were provided for the board's information.

Reports

Chair's Report – Mary Jane Grigsby

Ms. Grigsby commented that she did not have a report but was concerned about the board's vacant positions.

Executive Director's Report – Juanita Chastain

Financial Report December 31, 2006

Ms. Chastain reviewed the Financial Report. She commented that staff had started the continuing education audit for the 2007 renewal cycle. She commented that the continuing education handbooks would be ready for final board review on the upcoming June telephone conference call. She requested that board members submit any outstanding travel as soon as possible. She commented that the board was financially sound.

AIA Report – Vicki Long

Ms. Long introduced members in attendance from AIA Florida. She apologized for not being able to attend the February meeting. She commented that she was at the grassroots meeting in Washington, D.C.

Ms. Long reported that she met with Secretary Benson and encouraged her to keep the privatization efforts in place and was pleased with the board and staff. She encouraged the Secretary to continue the budget to maintain the privatization efforts and that AIA Florida would monitor that budgetary item.

Ms. Long commented that they were concerned with the composition of the board. She commented that they have lobbied for their members to receive board appointments.

Mr. Smith, President AIA Florida, commented that his focus was on sustainability and green design. He commented that he was lobbying for legislation that would address government buildings or state and/or county funded building be LEED certified or green rated. He commented that that legislation passed in the House and Senate. He commented that they have created a pilot program that would include green schools. He commented that they are working to reduce dependency on foreign oil.

Ms. Grigsby asked if the interiors of the buildings were green. Mr. Smith replied that LEED certification or accreditation was a total approach. He commented that it was interior and exterior. He commented that contractors were required to recycle left over building materials. He commented that it was new construction, remodeling, and interiors.

Mr. Jacob commented that the LEED accreditation process was a complete package. He commented that it included the exterior, interior, operations, maintenance, and life cycle of the building.

Mr. Hall asked if they thought green was a fad because architects should do this naturally. Mr. Smith replied that he was correct that architects should do this anyway. He commented that the difference from 1970 until now is cross ventilation. He commented that the interior of the buildings determined a healthy environment. He commented with a healthy environment, productivity increased. He commented that they had to stop pumping carbon into the atmosphere.

Mr. Hall asked how they encourage owners to go green. Mr. Smith replied that the Sarasota County building departments will fast track green building permits. He commented that there was a monetary incentive and it was the right thing to do for the public and environment.

Mr. Jacob commented that a national incentive was a 2030 Policy which states that any building designed with a benchmarked of 2010 will be designed with 50% percent less of the energy and resources used for the same building designed in 2005. He commented that the policy would continue to require a 10% percent reduction every five years until 2030 when all building designs would be carbon neutral.

Mr. Jacob commented that the U.S. Conference of Mayors adopted the 2030 Policy last June. He commented that in Florida, the Mayor of Miami adopted the policy and there was growing support of the policy.

Mr. Jacob commented that sustainability and green buildings encourage better life styles.

Ms. Long thanked the board for reconsidering the definition of "intern-architect".

Ms. Long reported that Mr. Rodriguez would act as AIA Florida's representative to the board.

Ms. Long reported that AIA Florida surveyed their members to determine the support of Construction Contract Administration (CCA). She reported the response was not enthusiastic if it was not a service already provided. She reported that 16 of 25 states did not require CCA. She reported that the state that required CCA had a range of basic to stringent requirements. She reported that they contacted the construction industry representatives and received opposition to the requirement.

Mr. Jernigan reported that in 2006 when they pursued CCA, AIA Florida spent political and monetary efforts to gain support of the language. He commented that the construction industry and their membership rejected the language. He commented that the members thought the requirement would incur more liability.

Mr. Hall commented that building officials do not respect architects because they do not know the codes as well. He commented that the image architects portray is a leader to protect to health, safety, and welfare of the public. He commented that the building departments and the public do not think they need architects.

Mr. Smith commented that architects know the codes. He commented that some architects require CCA in their contracts. He commented for CCA to succeed they need the support of the building officials, insurance companies, and contractors pushing the requirement legislatively. He commented that the perception is the requirement is self-serving. He commented that need should be defined on a broad spectrum including the Fire Marshalls, insurance industry, and building departments. He suggested starting with threshold buildings to require CCA and start there.

Mr. Manausa commented that everyone understood the opposition but he wanted AIA Florida to understand there were good architects but also bad architects. He commented that the level of complaints that were filed the building officials indicated architects do not know the building codes well. He commented that was a board concern. He commented that the building officials and contractors were not trained to design and build buildings. He commented that the board would like architects involved to protect the public by assuring their design is properly constructed.

Mr. Hall commented that there is an industry known as plan runners. He commented that the architects should have a relationship with the building official and not use the plan runners because comments and plan changes are lost.

Mr. Jacob commented that the profession and the demands of the market are changing. He commented that architects are not valued in the marketplace because there are quicker and faster alternatives. He commented that architects are perceived as a necessary evil. He commented that they should address leadership within the community, government agencies, and political structures. He commented that with leadership comes respect and value.

Ms. Del Bianco recommended that they work with the insurance industry. Mr. Hall commented that the statute exempts residential plans from being prepared by a license architect. He commented that most counties required residential plans be signed and sealed by an architect. He commented that drafting services are being caught in the middle and he requested that AIA Florida assist with this problem. He commented that the problem is drafters and architects violate the statute.

Mr. Smith asked the board how they handled overseas projects. Mr. Manausa replied that there was a rule in place regarding responsible supervisory control outside of an architect's office.

Ms. Dolan commented that the county had imposed more stringent requirements than the state. Mr. Smith commented that some counties require residential homes within 120 mile an hour wind zone be designed by an architect. He commented that the state sets minimums and the local municipalities could set additional standards. He commented that some residential homes are larger than some small commercial projects and they should require an architect to be involved. He commented that politically it was a difficult issue.

Ms. Dolan suggested that AIA Florida work with the counties to establish a base line and then work up to the Legislature. She commented that if you are not able to achieve the goal from the top start at the bottom. She thanked AIA Florida for their efforts with the Legislature and support of the Construction Contract Administration.

Mr. Smith commented that AIA Florida worked primarily with the Legislature and the local AIA Chapters worked with the counties.

Ms. Long reported that she serves on the National Disaster Response Team and they have formalized a process. She reported that recently tornados touched down in North Florida and they provided continuing education training within 24 hours. She reported that they had architects complete the training and were able to assist the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) with recovery and relief efforts. She reported that they were working with DCA to receive accreditation and compile a database of architects ready for deployment to areas in need.

Ms. Long provided a brief review of a windshield assessment, rapid assessment, and long-term assessments.

Mr. Jacob commented that AIA National was working to assure appointment of an architect to the Architect of the Capitol located in the District of Columbia. He commented that the Architect of Capitol is responsible for all Federal buildings including monuments, the White House and the Capitol within D.C. He commented that they had been advised that the Congressional Committee was not interested in an architect filling that position. He commented that they wanted an administrator with a minimum of 10 years experience of supervising 1,500+ personnel. Mr. Jacob commented that AIA National was searching the U.S. for an architect with that experience. He commented that they recommended Mr. Cohen and his application was denied. He commented that it would be the first time in the history of the U.S. that the Architect of the Capitol would not be an architect.

IDAF Report – Aida Bao-Garciga

Ms. Bao-Garciga reported that they wrote CCA language but it was only for interior designers. She reported that they were working with Ms. Long to create language that included both professions. She reported that they would work to together to obtain support for the language.

Ms. Bao-Garciga reported that this week Mr. Minacci would be a speaker at a continuing education course offered by IDAF. She reported that they had a successful student day in Tampa.

Ms. Boa-Garciga reported that they were working with Miami-Dade regarding LEED certifications and sustainability. She reported that they provided three LEED courses to encourage and support the green effort.

Board Counsel's Report – Mary Ellen Clark

No report.

Prosecuting Attorney's Report – David K. Minacci

Annual Audit Report Year Ending October 31, 2006

Licensed Architects Legal Cases

Licensed Interior Designers Legal Cases

Unlicensed Architects Legal Cases

Unlicensed Interior Designers Legal Cases

Licensed Architects Investigative Cases

Licensed Interior Designers Investigative Cases

Unlicensed Architects Investigative Cases

Unlicensed Interior Designers Investigative Cases

Fines Chart

Licensed Administrative Hours December 2006

Licensed Administrative Hours January 2007

Unlicensed Billable Hours January 2007

Unlicensed Billable Hours February 2007

Unlicensed Billable Hours March 2007

Results of February 5, 2007 PCP Meeting

Results of February 7, 2007 Board Meeting Results

Results of March 26, 2007 PCP Meeting

Press Releases/Speaking Engagements/Other Correspondence

New Business

Ms. Grigsby appointed Mr. Gonzalez or Ms. Del Bianco to attend the Probable Cause Panel meeting in June and July.

Old Business

No old business.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.