

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Boca Raton Resort & Club
501 Camino Real
Boca Raton, FL 33431
888.491.2622**

**July 25, 2006
General Business
9:00 a.m.**

Call to Order

Mr. Gonzalez, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Roll Call – identify excused absences

Board Members Present:

Joyce Shore
Roymi Membiela
Rick Gonzalez, Chair
Rossana Dolan
Lourdes Solera
Neil Hall
Mary Jane Grigsby
Sharon Del Bianco

Board Members Absent:

Garrick Gustafson, excused
Kenneth Horstmyer, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Board Staff
Trent Manausa
Emory Johnson
Michael Wirtz
Steve Jernigan
Dana Philpott
Steve Hefner
Carrie Riley
Susette Crosby

Pat Levenson
Shelley Siegel
Bill Kobrynich
Aida Bao-Garciga
Lorraine Bragg
Mario Mangone
Nancy Bredemeyer
Jane Howard
Phil Bulone
Pat Johnston
Tom Matthias
Jill Smith
Stan Schachne
Tom Atkinson
Richard Guzman
Lauren Simmons
Julie Luxton
Michael Liss
Vicki Long
Micky Jacobs

Court Reporter – Susan Sugden, Official Reporting Service, LLC, 524 S. Andrews Avenue, Suite 302N, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301, 954.467.8204.

Request for application withdraw

Peter Shawinsky

Mr. Shawinsky was not present but submitted a letter for the board to consider. Ms. Estes advised the board that they reviewed Mr. Shawinsky's application on a previous telephone conference call and he was not able to attend. Ms. Clark advised that there was a filed notice of intent to deny and that Mr. Shawinsky was requesting that the board reconsider his application and allow him to withdraw.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to reconsider the application.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to vacate the notice of intent to deny and allow Mr. Shawinsky to withdraw his application.

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

Application Review

Interior Design Endorsement

Susan Sentell

Ms. Sentell was not present. Mr. Johnson advised the board that Mr. Butler performed an education review and Ms. Sentell's education did not meet the minimum requirements pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(b) and 481.209(2), Florida Statutes. Mr. Johnson recommended denial.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to deny the application based on insufficient education pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(b) and 481.209(2), Florida Statutes.

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

Interior Design Certificate of Authorization

You and I Design

No one was present from the firm. Mr. Johnson commented that a citation may be due for prior practice. Mr. Minacci advised the board that a citation had been issued, served via certified mail June 24, 2006 and with no response. Mr. Gonzalez requested that Mr. Minacci look into the fact that there were two addresses and he wanted to make sure that there were two interior designers on staff. It was determined that the citation was issued based on the application information not a formal complaint from the public.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to deny based on open discipline.

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

Architect Endorsement

Jeffrey Magnuson – state

Mr. Magnuson was not present. Mr. Manausa advised that Mr. Magnuson applied pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(b), Florida Statutes and based on the initial application review he did not meet the minimum education requirements. He commented based on a recent letter from Iowa State University he was granted a five year Bachelor of Architecture degree and recommended approval of the application.

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

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

Charles Rosati – NCARB

Mr. Rosati was not present. Mr. Manausa presented the application and commented that Mr. Rosati applied pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(c), Florida Statutes and his education does not meet the minimum standards set forth in Rule 61G1-13.003, Florida Administrative Code. He commented that Mr. Rosati was granted an NCARB certificate based on the Broadly Experienced Architect provision. He commented that Mr. Rosati received a Bachelors of Science in Architecture from Kent State University and was initially licensed in 1994 in Ohio. Mr. Manausa recommended denial of the application.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to deny the application.

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

Trevor Harrison – state

Mr. Harrison was not present. Mr. Manausa presented the application and commented that Mr. Harrison applied pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(b), Florida Statutes and he did not meet the minimum education requirements. He commented that Mr. Harrison was initially licensed in 1995 in New York which allowed for equivalent education pursuant to Part 69, New York Statutes. Ms. Clark referred the board to Part 69.1a2, New York Statutes allowed for a combination of education and experience to meet the education requirements for licensure in New York. She commented that based on the review of Florida's and New York's law and rules they were not substantially equivalent at the time of initial licensure.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to deny the application based on the statutes not being substantially equivalent.

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

Architect Certificate of Authorization

AE Design, Inc. (corporation)

AE Design, Inc. of Georgia (fictitious name)

No one was present from the firm. Ms. Chastain advised the board that the firm requested a continuance and waived the statutory application processing time frame.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to continue the application.

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

Anderson Design Studios

No one was present from the firm. Mr. Minacci advised that a citation was pending which was served on July 15, 2006 but no one had responded. Ms. Membiela commented that this applicant came forth to comply with the requirements. She commented that she had difficulty penalizing an applicant for trying to come into compliance. She commented that the board should encourage people to come into compliance and had difficulty penalizing applicants when they do. Mr. Gonzalez commented that the fines were smaller for individuals that corrected the issue on their own by coming forth. Ms. Membiela commented that she was not necessarily questioning the fine but the denial of applicants based on the pending disciplinary issue. She commented that she did not want the board to send the wrong message by denying applications based on the pending disciplinary issues.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to approve pending resolution of the citation.

Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Ms. Clark advised the board that the applicant was not present to agree to the conditions of the citation. She advised the board that they could deny the application based on the pending disciplinary action or approve the application without conditions.

Ms. Membiela withdrew her motion and Mr. Hall withdrew his second.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to deny the application based on the pending disciplinary action.

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

Brian D. Combs Architect, Inc.

No one was present from the firm. Mr. Minacci advised the board that a citation was issued due to prior practice and the applicant had complied with the conditions of the citation.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to approve the application.

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

Joseph B. Kaller & Associates, PA

No one was present from the firm. Mr. Minacci advised the board that a citation was issued due to prior practice and the applicant had complied with the conditions of the citation.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to approve the application.

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

Ms. Del Bianco asked Ms. Clark if the board could implement a staggered fine for the number of years that a firm practiced without a license. Ms. Clark advised that they could address the issue in the citation rule.

Mario Mangone Architect, PA

No one was present from the firm. Mr. Minacci advised the board that a citation was issued due to prior practice and the applicant had complied with the conditions of the citation.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to approve the application.

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

Ms. Dolan commented that Mr. Mangone submitted a letter stating that the reason he did not obtain a certificate of authorization before now was because he contacted the department and the Customer Contact Center advised him that he did not need one. Ms. Chastain commented that the Customer Contact Center had frequently asked questions and this requirement was addressed in the frequently asked questions, newsletters, and additional training was provided to the Contact Center representatives.

Addendum Items

Application Review

Interior Design

Stephanie Kitts – direct endorsement

Ms. Kitts was not present. Mr. Johnson commented that the applicant applied pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(a), Florida Statutes. He commented that she met the education, experience, and examination requirements. He commented that her current work experience verification form raised some questions for him and he sent an e-mail to Ms. Clark regarding his concerns which was provided in the agenda.

Ms. Clark asked if there was an open disciplinary matter regarding the application. Mr. Minacci replied in the negative. Ms. Clark commented that she received Mr. Johnson's e-mail, however, she was to give legal advice to the board not the public. She commented that the board could answer questions by application approval or denial, by petitions for declaratory statement, by petitions for rule variance or waiver, or by ruling on disciplinary matters. She commented that she would not recommend that the board respond to letters or requests that do not come to them in the proper format. Ms. Clark commented that she did not respond to Mr. Johnson because she does not give legal advice to the public and would not provide legal advice without direction from the board.

Ms. Clark advised the board that they should grant or deny the application and if there was a disciplinary matter that needed to be investigated then the application could be referred to Mr. Minacci for further review.

Mr. Johnson commented that his concern was that she worked for JEA and her experience was gained under a licensed interior designer, however, the licensed designer left the firm and the applicant has been working in the same capacity. Ms. Solera commented that there appeared to be a question if she could count one year of experience after the licensed designer left the business and that would be "no". The board reviewed the application and determined that she met the experience requirements. Ms. Grigsby commented that the concern was whether she was practicing interior design without licensure or direct supervision.

Mr. Hall commented that there was a concern that she was practicing the profession without a certificate of authorization and she was not licensed. Ms. Clark commented that there was a distinction because the services were not provided to the public but in house only for the company. Mr. Hall commented that the public frequented the company. Mr. Johnson commented that was his concern and wanted direction from the board.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve the application and refer the application for a complaint to be filed.

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

Mr. Hall commented that this type of practice happens in other agencies.

Jennifer Schoening – state endorsement

Ms. Schoening was not present. Mr. Johnson presented the application and commented that the applicant applied pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(a), Florida Statutes with reference to Chapter 481.209(2), Florida Statutes. He commented that Ms. Schoening did not meet the educational standards set for in Rule 61G1-22.003, Florida Administrative Code. He commented that a review was performed on her Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Environmental Design from the University of Buffalo, SUNY.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to deny pursuant to Chapter 481.213(3)(a), Florida Statutes.

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

The board discussed the need to further define when and whether there was a need for companies to have certificate of authorizations if they have licensed individuals practicing the profession strictly for in house purposes.

Ratification Lists

Applicants (handout)

Interior Design Applicants by Endorsement

Items 1-10

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 1-10.

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

Interior Design Businesses

Items 11-14

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 11-14.

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

Architect/Architecture Businesses applying for Interior Design (dual)

Items 15-17

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 15-17.

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

Architecture applicants by passage of Examination

Items 18-44

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 18-44.

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

Architecture by Endorsement

Items 45-125

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 45-125.

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

Ms. Del Bianco asked Mr. Minacci to review item 90.

Architecture Business

Items 126-149

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 126-149.

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

Architecture Business Name Change

Items 150-156

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve items 150-156.

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

Continuing Education

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve the architecture and interior design continuing education courses as provided.

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

Architecture Discussion

2006 NCARB Annual Meeting and Conference

Summary of resolutions

Mr. Hall commented that they voted in line with the other states regarding all of the resolutions with the exception of resolution 7 because it was extended. Mr. Hall encouraged all architects to attend if and when it was possible because it was an informative meeting.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that he, Ms. Dolan, and Ms. Chastain attended the meeting. He commented that it was important that an administrator with the board attend the meeting and would like that to occur at future meetings. Mr. Gonzalez commented that Ms. Chastain presented helpful web navigation information to other states regarding accessing the Florida Building Code advance courses. He commented that they reported that half of Florida's licensees were out of state and recent legislative changes regarding responsible supervisory control.

Portions of the tape were inaudible.

Interior Design Discussion

NCIDQ Bylaw Amendment for 11-06 Council of Delegates Meeting

NCIDQ Call for Resolutions

NCIDQ Board of Directors' Meeting minutes January 2006

Ms. Shore reviewed the NCIDQ Bylaw Amendment proposed by Nevada. Mr. Wirtz commented that the board delegates should suggest to NCIDQ that they allow a state board committee member of the board serve since they would have experience at a board level which would expand the pool of people. Ms. Grigsby and Ms. Del Bianco disagreed.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to support the state of Nevada.

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

Ms. Grigsby commented that Interior Design Continuing Education Council (IDCEC) would like more member boards send representatives to their meetings. Ms. Solera commented that it was beneficial for other states to attend to know the value of what trends were in the continuing education realm.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the Foundation of Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) was going to change their name to the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA). She commented that they were going to offer pre-accreditation programs. She commented that this would affect applicants that apply for licensure during the CIDA pre-accreditation years.

Ms. Clark commented that the board would have to seek legislation to have FIDER changed to CIDA in the statutory language. She commented that they should work with the department and associations to accomplish the name change. Ms. Del Bianco asked when the department's deadline was for submitting legislative language. Ms. Clark replied that it was during the summer.

Mr. Johnson commented that FIDER was going to use CIDA as doing business as or "dba" so they may not need to pursue a legislative language change.

Rules Report and Discussion

Rule Tracking

Ms. Clark commented that rules 61G1-17.001(13) and 17.002(16) were noticed for development of language for the reinstatement of a void license. She commented that she understood that the department had an application in place and the board should determine a fee for that application. She advised the board that the language for Rule 61G1-17.002(16), should not include the word "null and". The board discussed the method of determining a fee.

Ms. Clark advised that this provision was for an individual that was previously licensed in Florida by meeting the education, examination, and experience requirements needed at the time of licensure but the individual did not timely renew the license and that license was now void. She advised that the applicant would have to prove the unusual hardship for not renewing timely.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to set the void application fee at \$500.
Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the fees for NCIDQ were different than what was reflected. Ms. Solera commented that the fees for NCARB were different than what was reflected. The board requested that the rules 61G1-17.001(1) and 17.002(9) be reviewed and updated to reflect the current examination fees. Ms. Del Bianco suggested language, that the examination fee shall be determined by NCIDQ or NCARB. Ms. Clark commented that they could submit the language and see if the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee (JAPC) would accept it but they may return to the board and advise that they have a duty to inform applicants of the examination cost.

Ms. Clark suggested the following language that the fee shall be set by and paid directly to NCARB or NCIDQ. Mr. Manausa commented that he thought the board addressed the issue previously and it was rejected by JAPC. Ms. Del Bianco asked if they put the wrong amounts in the rules could the board be held liable. Ms. Clark replied that if a suit were filed she was sure it could be resolved. The board requested that Ms. Clark research the last time the issue was addressed, what language was submitted, and the outcome.

Ms. Clark commented that rules 61G1-21.003 and 24.002 were noticed to update the continuing education handbooks. She commented that the rule would need to be re-noticed to allow them to continue to work on the handbooks since rule noticing was valid only for a year.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to re-notice rules 61G1-21.003 and 24.002.

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

Ms. Clark commented that she advised Ms. Printy with JAPC that the proposed revisions to rules 61G1-23.010 and 23.015 were withdrawn, therefore, the matter was closed.

Seals – Rule 61G1-16

Ms. Clark commented that staff requested that the board review the rule language based on changes to the statute. She commented that the statute previously specified that an “impression” seal was required. She commented that when the statutory language changed to allow for electronic signing and sealing the “impression” language was removed. She commented that with that language removed some individuals interpret it to mean a rubber stamp is acceptable. Ms. Clark commented that if the board determines that a rubber stamp is not acceptable and that only an impression or electronic seal is acceptable she requested the board notice the rule 61G1-16.002 for rule development.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to notice rule 61G1-16.002 for rule development.

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

Mr. Wirtz requested that the board develop a rule imposing a citation for licensees that do not respond to a request for information from the Prosecuting Attorney. He commented that licensees would respond at the last minute and there had been a lot of time put into reviewing and investigating cases only to be dismissed once the information is received. He commented that if they would timely respond this would save time and resources. He requested that a citation be issued for lack of timely response.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to notice the rule 61G1-12.005 for rule develop to implement a penalty for failure to timely respond to request for information.

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

General Discussion / For Information

Meeting attendance – Review of Rule 61G1-11.0061, F.A.C.

Ms. Chastain commented that this was for the board’s information and review.

Future Board Meeting Dates

Ms. Grigsby requested that the board consider meeting in conjunction with American Society of Interior Designers (ASID) conference September 28-30, 2006. The board was not able to accommodate the request.

The board scheduled a telephone conference call August 18, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.

The board scheduled the next face to face meeting for October 23-25, 2006 in the Cocoa area.

Reports

Chair's Report – Rick Gonzalez

Mr. Gonzalez commented that the next big item for the board was the upcoming open bid of the Invitation to Negotiate for the board's prosecutorial and investigative services. He commented that the board was pleased with the current services.

Executive Director's Report – Juanita Chastain

Request for Input – Budget Allotment and Preparation Process

Financial Report – March 31, 2006

Ms. Chastain commented that the budget reflected funds for the department wide document management system to move to a paperless system. She advised that she submitted the travel plan for future board meetings and conferences. She advised that the per diem had increased and budget was allotted for that increase.

Ms. Chastain reviewed the financial reports which was more informative and user friendly. The board reviewed the figures regarding the number of telephone calls taken by the Customer Contact Center and applications by the Central Intake Unit.

Ms. Chastain requested that the board evaluate Ms. Clark's performance. She advised that other boards vote on their Board Counsel's performance, take a vote, and a letter is written the Attorney General's Office regarding the outcome. Ms. Del Bianco commented that Ms. Clark was a marked improvement from the previous counsel and was willing to assist the board promulgate rules. Mr. Gonzalez commented that she pursued answers for the board quickly and professionally. Mr. Hall commented that she helped the board understand their role as to what they should or should not do and provided excellent professional guidance. He commented that in Probable Cause Panel her service was invaluable and she worked well with the Prosecuting Attorney.

IDAF Report – Steve Hefner

Mr. Hefner commented that this was his last meeting as President of IDAF and introduced the new President, Aida Bao-Garciga.

AIA Report – Vicki Long

Ms. Long, Mr. Jernigan, and Mr. Jacobs were present.

Ms. Long commented that they continued to encourage their membership to attend board meetings. She reported that Bill 2060 passed and requested that the board thank Senator Clary for his efforts with the bill. She reported that they offer a 2 hour advanced Florida accessibility code course online that was approved by the Department of Community Affairs and AIA National which was to assist the out of state licensees meet the continuing education requirement. She reported that it was a DVD tape that was available via the internet.

Ms. Long commented that AIA Florida was involved with Disaster Preparedness on a National level. She encouraged the board members to review the Florida Caribbean Magazine that was available at the conference because it included an article on Design Guidelines.

Mr. Jernigan commented that AIA Florida would like to be involved in the ITN process and was supportive of the privatization of that board function. He commented that they felt it was a big success.

Mr. Jacobs reported that they were being aggressive with lobbying candidates through the Florida Political Action Committee and the Breakfast of Champions programs. He reported that they were identifying candidates that had helped them in the past or would help them in the future. He reported that their successes had been noticed and they were recognized as a force in the state. He reported that AIA Florida's Breakfast of Champions program was adopted by AIA National and would be implemented in 50 states as the governmental affairs program. He commented that the goal was to create and implement a program that had an architect with direct relations with Senators and or Congressmen.

Ms. Long reported on bills that they were involved in that passed which included the Joint and Civil Liability act, Repose act, Good Samaritan act, and Chapter 481 language. She commented that their Legislative Affairs Commission would be meeting in October to work on the upcoming Legislative session. Mr. Gonzalez asked if they were going to pursue construction administration language in 2007. Mr. Long replied in the negative. Mr. Jacobs commented that they were going to work on a platform to address the issue again in the future. Mr. Gonzalez suggested pursuing support from the building officials. Ms. Long reported that they had building officials support during the past. Mr. Jacobs commented they needed more support from the architecture profession to help overcome the opposition.

Mr. Jacobs commented that they needed to be able to provide to the legislature a smoking gun as an example as to why and how construction administration is warranted.

Mr. Hefner requested that AIA Florida not oppose IDAF performing Chapter 481 language cleanup regarding space planning.

Board Counsel's Report – Mary Ellen Clark
No report.

Prosecuting Attorney's Report – David K. Minacci
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

Citations

Licensed/Administrative Hours

April 2006

May 2006

Unlicensed Billable Hours

April 2006

May 2006

Results of April 7, 2006 PCP Meeting

Results of May 1, 2006 PCP Meeting

Results of May 3, 2006 Board Meeting

Press Releases/Speaking Engagements/Other Correspondence

Mr. Minacci reviewed the reports provided in the agenda. He reported that there were approximately 100 building code citations outstanding and should have those completed soon. He reported that they hired another full time investigator. He reported that he had given 4 presentations in the past few weeks to interior designers in the Tampa and Sarasota areas.

The board recessed at noon.

The board reconvened at 1:35 p.m.

Continuing Education Task Force Meeting – begin at 1:00 p.m. or shortly thereafter

Task Force Members – Thomas Matthias, Stan Schachne, Jack Ahern, Rita Sholtz, Lorraine Bragg, and Steven Hefner

Mr. Schachne, Mr. Matthias, Ms. Bragg, and Mr. Hefner were present.

Continuing Education Application Review

Educad – AutoCad for Architects

Ms. Chastain advised the board that the course was before the board because one reviewer approved the course and one denied. Mr. Gonzalez commented that the board historically denied AutoCad courses. Mr. Schachne commented that he approved the course because he took exception to the applicant's age. He commented that he recently took an AutoCad course for updating on AutoCad software. He commented that since he took the course he saw no reason why individuals should not receive credit especially since he felt the recent course he took was extremely helpful in everyday work and general knowledge of the software. He commented that it was helpful and related to the health, safety, and welfare of his clients. He requested that the board approve AutoCad courses.

Mr. Matthias commented that he denied the course based on the board's previous direction to deny AutoCad courses. He commented that AutoCad was an ever changing product but was always considered by the board as basic knowledge. Portions of the tape were inaudible.

Mr. Schachne commented that an individual learning AutoCad was enhancing a licensee's knowledge. Mr. Gonzalez commented that basic courses should not be considered but if there was more of the course above basic knowledge than it should be considered for credit an example was Mr. Schachne's upgrade of the software.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the board should not try to decide if the course is basic or advanced for an individual because it would vary based on that individual's knowledge of AutoCad. She commented that they should let the market determine whether they benefit from the course and grant credit for continuing education if the course was taken for continuing education. Portion of the tape was inaudible.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that the market was changing rapidly and the board should change as well. He commented there appeared to be a need for AutoCad. Mr. Schachne commented that AutoCad was used and it was updated and individuals should stay up with the changes.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to approve the course.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion.

Mr. Hall felt there was a need for AutoCad courses. Mr. Manausa commented that he would like to see the term AutoCad renamed. Mr. Gonzalez commented that the term referenced for computer aided drawing and graphics.

The question was called and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that all computer aided design (Cad) courses be approved as determined by the task force members.

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

Association of Licensed Architects – request for automatic provider status

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to deny.

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

Mr. Schachne commented that he worked with National American Institute of Architects (AIA) when they began offering continuing education courses. He commented that they help the state of Florida create their continuing education program because they wanted to be automatically accepted and approved as a provider.

Mr. Manausa commented that Association of Licensed Architects method of reviewing and approving courses was not submitted for review and did not feel that should receive provider approval. Mr. Matthias commented that they were requesting automatic provider approval not course approval. He commented that the board could require that they submit their courses for review and approval by the task force.

Mr. Hall commented that the organization was national and was in competition with AIA because not every licensed architect is a member of AIA.

Mr. Matthias commented that the board previous differentiated between an automatic provider and an approved provider. He commented that the new hand book groups the two together.

The board requested that Ms. Chastain send the Association of Licensed Architects a letter requesting information on how they review their course content for approval.

Discussion Items

Need for AutoCad courses –

Letter from Richard Krent and letter from Betty Sanchez-Zeinalli

This was reviewed during the course review of EduCad.

Architecture Continuing Education Handbook

Interior Design Continuing Education Handbook

2 hours of continuing education credit for a laws and rules questionnaire

4 hours of continuing education for attending board meetings

Florida Building Code Advanced Course Accreditors – Thomas Matthias and Steven Hefner

Ms. Chastain commented that the handbook had been updated to reflect the Florida Building Code core and advance courses, course approval would be valid for two years from the date of approval, providerships would expire May 31, odd years, provider evaluation forms would no longer be submitted to the department but maintained by the provider in case of audit, and addition of the laws and rules questionnaire. She commented that the laws and rules questionnaire was problematic for workload, monitoring, updating issues. Ms. Chastain suggested that it be included in the renewal insert.

Ms. Del Bianco suggested that individuals receive twice the continuing education credit for taking laws and rules courses. Ms. Clark commented that they may have a problem getting the language approved by the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee (JAPC) because the statute grants credit for participating in 50 minutes of course work.

Ms. Chastain advised that the board office sent congratulatory letters to new licensees and could include the questionnaire with those packets. The board suggested including in the newsletters.

Mr. Gonzalez did not agree with the provider keeping the evaluation forms. Ms. Estes commented that the forms were looked at but there had not been any comments that generated an audit of a course. She commented that the provider would be required to obtain the forms for three years in case the course was audited. Ms. Del Bianco commented that the provider may not submit negative comment forms. Ms. Chastain advised that the department reviews the forms and stores them. Mr. Gonzalez commented that they could try the new format and if it was not successful then return to having them submitted to the department.

The board discussed the differences between an approved provider and an automatic provider. An approved provider was required to submit courses for approval and an automatic provider was not required to submit courses for approval they were accepted without further review. Mr. Manausa commented that the reason the board decided to allow automatic providers was to take the workload off of board staff because AIA was a large provider with numerous courses.

The board discussed the fact that IDCEC approves universities and colleges that are approved by FIDER. The board agreed to allow architects to receive continuing education credit for IDCEC approved courses and interior designers to receive continuing education credit for AIA approved courses.

Mr. Hefner requested that the board provide a letter to the task force members when they audit a course so the provider realizes they were auditing on the board's behalf. Ms. Clark commented that a letter from the board chair or the executive director would be appropriate.

Ms. Del Bianco asked for information on how to access the Florida Building Code advanced courses. Ms. Estes replied that the information was published in the newsletter and available on the department's web page.

Educators' Task Force Meeting – begin at 2:00 p.m. or shortly thereafter

Educators' Task Force Members – Nat Belcher from Florida International University, Rodner Wright from Florida A& M, Nick Markovich from Palm Beach Community College, Andy Ray from Valencia Community College, Jill Smith from Seminole Community College, Norman Hervieux from Ringling, and Janine King from Florida International University.

Mr. Belcher, Ms. King, and Ms. Smith were present.

Discussion Items

Appoint a board contact for the task force

Review the rule for the need for a task force and define what duties are

It was discussed that the board contact was a liaison between the educators' and the board. It was discussed that the Educators' Task Force was composed of representatives from accredited and non-accredited schools.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the term task force may not be the appropriate designation. She explained that in past years the board met with the task force twice a year and now they meet once a year. She commented that a task force was utilized for a specific need or reason an example was a change in education requirements for licensure. Mr. Hall commented that the dialog between the board and the educators' was beneficial during the time the board discussed changing the education requirements from a two year degree program to a four year degree program. Ms. Del Bianco commented that a task was usually formed to solve a problem.

Mr. Belcher commented that the board may want to distinguish between non-accredited and pre-professional programs. He commented that architecture has articulation agreements to accommodate students transferring from a community college. He commented that was different from a school or college that had no intention of seeking accreditation.

Ms. Smith commented that Seminole Community College had an articulation agreement with Florida State University. She commented that Seminole Community College was recently informed that Florida State University had freshman declaring majors that there was no need for the agreement. She commented that there were community college students in the interior design program that already had bachelor degrees but were returning for specific knowledge. She commented that if students were eligible to take the licensing examination then there was no need to transfer to an accredited four year program.

Mr. Belcher explained how Florida International University review and consider applicants from the community colleges for entering their architecture program.

Ms. King commented that universities were under a lot of pressure to keep their students and not accept transfer students. She commented that they were looking at retention rates from freshman to graduation.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would like students to be able to articulate from community colleges to universities for both professions.

Mr. Belcher commented that there were caps on the number of architectural students accepted because of the 24 hour physical space requirement. He commented that they provide for all of the disciplines and therefore their population is controlled. He commented that the access to the profession was capped because of the space requirement.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the Interior Design Educators' Council (IDEC) professional members could take the NCIDQ examination for no charge. She commented that the candidates were encouraged to take all three sections at once. She briefly discussed registering, cancelling, and reexamination. She commented that there appeared to be a shortage of the interior designer educators' shortage which requires a Masters level for college level teaching. She commented that there were very few Masters of Interior Design degrees or programs.

Ms. Smith commented that the Southern Association of College and Schools (SACS) accreditation is strict and requires that educators' must have a degree in interior design to be able to teach that profession.

Mr. Gonzalez appointed Ms. Del Bianco to be the educators' board liaison.

Mr. Belcher commented that the Doctorate of Architecture was approved as a professional degree nationally and it was considered a first professional degree not a Ph.D. He commented that the program was specific to students that had educational backgrounds other than architecture. He commented that he was not sure if the board was accepting the degree. Mr. Gonzalez commented that if the degree was accredited or accepted by the National Architecture Accreditation Board (NAAB) then Florida would accept the degree.

Mr. Belcher commented that there was issue regarding landscape architecture projects created but never executed and whether a licensed practitioner would need to be overseeing the projects. Mr. Gonzalez commented that if students were creating projects in theory there was no need for a licensed practitioner to be involved. Ms. King commented that businesses may ask the schools to do projects that are exploratory or envisioning in an effort to get ideas to do fund-raising or citizen groups. She commented that sometimes the projects may represent the work as master planning or interior designing and therefore the professional practice may think that the school is taking work away from the licensed practitioners. Ms. King commented that the school contacted the board of landscape architecture and the chair advised that there were certain words that they should not use to avoid confusion.

Ms. King and Mr. Belcher asked for direction from the board regarding terms that they could or could not use when proposing these types of visionary projects or if there was a written policy regarding the issue. Ms. Clark advised that the protected terms were architect, architecture, interior design, interior designer, or words to that affect. She commented that the board was not allowed to have written policies separate from the laws and rules and the only exceptions were answers to petitions to declaratory statements or variance or waivers.

FIDER name change

The discussion was that the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) was now doing business as the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA).

Title of degrees – architectural engineer, interior architecture, merchandising, etc.

The discussion was that graduates were using their degree titles as professional titles and it was causing problems for graduates because it was a violation of Chapter 481, Florida Statutes. Ms. King commented that the Board of Governors controls what degree programs are titled.

Education equivalency update

Mr. Johnson commented that the National Council of Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ) was in the final stages of the creation of an equivalency program.

If I am not licensed but am in school or completing my experience, what title may I use?

Ms. Estes commented that there were cases in probable cause were individuals that were graduates of an interior design program and/or have taken and passed the NCIDQ or were ASID affiliated were using the title “interior designer” prior to licensure in the state. She commented that she just wanted to let the educators’ know so they could caution their

graduates from utilizing that title until they were licensed pursuant to Chapter 481, Florida Statutes. She commented that she was working on a reference sheet for schools to distribute to students.

The board discussed the different titles and individuals that used the titles.

Handle Educators' issues on a telephone conference call

The educators' agreed to handle and meet via telephone conference calls.

Addendum

Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) Review

Ms. Chastain advised that the ITN provided was a draft and that the Purchasing Director would be in attendance on the upcoming conference call regarding the review and changes to the ITN. She commented that the board would review and approve the final ITN prior to posting on the web. She reviewed the ITN posting, evaluation, and negotiation process.

Ms. Del Bianco asked if there would be a proposal conference. Ms. Chastain replied in the negative. Ms. Del Bianco commented that interviewing the potential contractors was beneficial. Ms. Chastain commented that the interview process was termed negotiations now.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that on page 9 of the ITN should like the awarded contractor be present at board meetings, probable cause and conference calls. She commented that she would like to make sure that they are required to file public notices.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the section regarding personnel changes was removed. Ms. Chastain asked Ms. Del Bianco if she wanted to approve personnel changes. Ms. Del Bianco replied in the negative.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would like define to the use of sub-contractors. The board discussed that the respondent would have to provide that information prior to the board choosing them and that no more than 49% of services could be sub-contracted. They also discussed what could be evaluated by points.

Ms. Clark commented that there should be a consistency of the use successful vendor, respondent or contractor.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that on page 11 and 29 regarding invoicing and payments that services were billed in segments like 6 minutes or 15 minutes. Mr. Wirtz commented that standard practice was 6 minute segments.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that the renewal section was deleted that allowed for renewing the contract for 3 years. The board discussed adding to the section 3.2.

Ms. Del Bianco asked if the conflict of interest was separate and if so for staff to double check.

Mr. Wirtz commented that there should not be joint ventures from respondents section 5.7. The board agreed.

Ms. Del Bianco asked why the Infrastructure and Technology requirement was removed. Ms. Chastain was not sure but would verify. Ms. Del Bianco asked why the minority points were removed. Ms. Chastain replied that was no longer a valid measurement for contract considerations.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that she would like experience to be weighted more heavily. She proposed that the rankings be experience 30 points, understanding 25 points, knowledge 25 points, and qualifications 20 points. Ms. Solera commented that was sided in one direction and it should be opened to any one. She commented that experience was a valuable quantity but if others are not given an opportunity how do they get the experience.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that if they could not be changed then they should all be equally weighted including the cost reply.

The committee would discuss, review, and finalize the ITN on the August 18, 2006 telephone conference call. Ms. Chastain commented that she would provide the comments from today's meeting to the Purchasing Director for changes to be made and the committee would review the updated ITN on the August 18, 2006 telephone conference call.

Mr. Gonzalez requested that automobiles be added to equipment section.

Mr. Hall commented that he would like to include any aspects that the current vendor was performing that may not have been included in the ITN. He commented that experience was important. Ms. Solera commented that they did not have the experience when current vendor submitted during the first bid. Mr. Hall commented that their enthusiasm was a key aspect to the process. Ms. Del Bianco commented that Mr. Minacci had previous experience because he had worked with the department.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that Mr. Minacci goes above and beyond the current requirements in the contract by making presentations and speeches to schools and organizations regarding the profession. The board determined that they wanted that aspect included in the scope of services.

The board discussed the fact that the board did not have to reward the contract to the lowest bidder. The board requested the "department" be replaced with the "board".

Ms. Del Bianco requested that Ms. Clark notice rule development to implement a citation rule that would have a graduated penalty. Ms. Clark requested that Mr. Minacci draft language for that rule.

Mr. Wirtz requested that the continuing education rule address the missing number of hours since the probable cause panel had a case that was missing a half an hour and the rule begins with one hour.

The meeting recessed at 3:50 p.m.

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Boca Raton Resort & Club
501 Camino Real
Boca Raton, FL 33431
888.491.2622**

**July 26, 2006
9:00 a.m.**

General Business Meeting

Call to Order

Mr. Gonzalez, Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Roll Call – identify excused absences

Board Members Present:

Joyce Shore
Roymi Membiela
Rick Gonzalez, Chair
Rossana Dolan
Lourdes Solera
Neil Hall
Mary Jane Grigsby
Sharon Del Bianco

Board Members Absent:

Garrick Gustafson, excused
Kenneth Horstmyer, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Board Staff
Trent Manausa
Emory Johnson
Michael Liss
Dana Philpott
Jorge Gutierrez
Grant Genova
Michael Kotler
Andy Dector

Robert Schennum
Jose Ortiz
Jaime Canaves
Shelley Siegel
Robert Steuber
Luther Eubanks
Kent Seyffer
Jill Smith

Court Reporter – Susan Sugden, Official Reporting Service, LLC, 524 S. Andrews Avenue, Suite 302N, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301, 954.467.8204.

Disciplinary Cases

Mr. Hall was recused from voting on all cases where he served on the probable cause panel.

Consent Agenda

Settlement Stipulations

The following are settlement stipulations that have been entered into with the respondent that reflect the recommendations of the probable cause panel.

Licensed Cases

DBPR vs. Stephen J. Alexander
Case Number 2005-045990
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Carlos Bravo
Case Number 2005-050450
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Neil C. Buck
Case Number 2005-019523
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Thomas Camm
Case Number 2005-020985
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Deborah Desilets
Case Number 2005-065607
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Shirley Friedman
Case Number 2005-020778

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Zandra Henriquez-Simm
Case Number 2005-021441
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Charles Maurice Johnson, Jr.
Case Number 2005-061889
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Alberto Campari Knoepffler
Case Number 2005-056993
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Burton S. Landau
Case Number 2005-061902
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Nancy Neuberg-Wright
Case Number 2005-019504
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Sol Niego
Case Number 2005-020790
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Timothy Salyer
Case Number 2005-062094
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Steven Shortridge
Case Number 2005-045987
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Craig Sinclair Smith
Case Number 2005-056919
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Patricia Stough
Case Number 2005-048312
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Roland V. Stout
Case Number 2004-050234
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to approve the settlement stipulations as presented.
Second: Ms. Grigsby seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

Settlement Stipulations

The following are settlement stipulations that have been entered into with the respondent that reflect the recommendations of the probable cause panel.

Unlicensed Cases

DBPR vs. Jeanne Marie Durr and Durr and Associates, Inc.
Case Number 2005-056173
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Stacey Goldman / Great Spaces Interior Design
Case Number 2004-002097
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Schreiber

DBPR vs. Goodman Design, Inc. / Earle Jay Goodman
Case Number 2005-045386
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

DBPR vs. Interior Marketplace and Dianna Berger
Case Number 2005-043366
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, Bullock and Hall

DBPR vs. Jan Jones / Jan Jones International, Inc.
Case Number 2005-062972
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Kenneth J. Lang, Sr. and KJL, RDC, Inc.
Case Number 2005-007436
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Schreiber

DBPR vs. Simmons and Saray Interiors Group, Inc. / Lauren Simmons
Case Number 2006-008110
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

DBPR vs. Julius H. Wynn / Phoenix Construction Services, Inc.
Case Number 2005-057944
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to accept the settlement stipulations as presented.
Second: Ms. Shore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

Voluntary Relinquishment

The following are voluntary relinquishment agreements entered into by the respondent to settle their case.

DBPR vs. Scott M. Freeman
Case Number 2005-020691

DBPR vs. John N. Kelly
Case Number 2005-018213

DBPR vs. Michael Loia
Case Number 2005-019144

DBPR vs. Kimberly A. Marks
Case Number 2005-018687

DBPR vs. Virginia L. McGuire
Case Number 2005-021239

DBPR vs. John Meachem
Case Number 2005-018194

DBPR vs. Louis Shulick
Case Number 2005-018847

DBPR vs. Wesley Snyder
Case Number 2005-062097

DBPR vs. Jan Vanhausen
Case Number 2005-017790

Motion: Ms. Shore moved to approve the voluntary relinquishments as presented.

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. Grant V. Genova
Case Number 2005-016637

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Genova was present and sworn. The case was before the board for a citation that was issued for failure of the respondent to take the core curriculum course. The citation was served April 13, 2005, Mr. Genova disputed the citation, the case was presented to the probable cause panel and they recommended that a 1 count administrative complaint be

filed for failure to comply with Chapter 481.215, Florida Statutes. The administrative complaint was served on March 8, 2006, and Mr. Genova filed an election of rights form on April 11, 2006 but failed to check a box on the form. Therefore, Mr. Minacci's position was that Mr. Genova did not dispute the material facts of the administrative complaint.

Ms. Clark read the administrative complaint to determine the actual hearing that should be conducted. Mr. Genova commented that the address of record was incorrect. Ms. Clark explained the different hearings available and determined that a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes, since the facts were not disputed.

Mr. Genova commented that he was embarrassed that he did not complete the requirements and explained that he did not receive timely notice of the requirements due to an incorrect address of record. Ms. Grigsby asked why he didn't correct his address months ago. Mr. Genova replied that he misunderstood that he had to resolve the issue within 30 days of receiving the notice which that time had passed due to difficulty with the mail service.

Mr. Manausa commented that he had 2 years to take the course prior to the citation being issued. He commented that the citation had been issued for more than a year and he still had not taken the course. Mr. Genova commented that he was not aware of the building code core requirement.

Mr. Solera asked if Mr. Genova received his licensure renewal notices. Mr. Genova replied in the positive. Ms. Solera commented that the newsletters were sent to the same address of record as the renewal notice; therefore, he should have been aware of the core requirement. Mr. Genova commented that he did not get the information and the first time he had heard of the requirement was the notice from Mr. Minacci.

Ms. Del Bianco commented that numerous letters in addition to the newsletter had been sent to licensees.

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

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

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to impose a \$500 fine, plus costs, provide proof of completion of the course and the license is suspended until proof of compliance.

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

DBPR vs. Robert A. Schennum

Case Number 2005-065724

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Schennum was present and sworn. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed April 18, 2006, for a violation of Chapter 481.225(1)(j), Florida Statutes, failure to provide proof of completing 20 hours of continuing education during the 2003-2005 renewal cycle. The respondent was properly served, did not dispute the material

facts alleged in the administrative complaint, and requested a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes.

Mr. Schennum commented that he was short 8 hours of continuing education and he understood that he had 180 days to make up those hours based on the audit letter. He commented that he was on a limited budget and took 18 hours as soon as possible which he provided proof of completion. He commented that he had taken an additional 13 hours and was signed up for more hours next month. Mr. Schennum had taken 35.5 hours since he was noticed of the deficiency.

Mr. Minacci commented that the guidelines were a \$500 fine plus costs, make up the missing hours, and take an additional 10 hours within 120 days of the final order. He commented that they could use 18 hours of what he had taken and use the remainder for the upcoming renewal 2007 renewal cycle.

Mr. Schennum commented that he was cited for not having his license number on letterhead. He commented that he and other architects in his area were not aware of the requirement.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board accept 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. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine plus costs, make up the missing hours, and take an additional 10 hours within 120 days of the final order.

Second: Ms. Grigsby seconded the motion.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that he made an effort to correct the situation immediately and exceeded the required hours. He requested that the fine be reduced to \$250.

Ms. Solera amended her motion and reduced the fine amount to \$250 within 90 days. Ms. Grigsby seconded the amendment. The question was called and it passed unanimously.

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Luis Lara

Case Number 2006-008074

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Lara was present and sworn. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint file April 13, 2006, for violations of Chapter 481.223(1)(a) and 481.223(1)(c), Florida Statutes which was properly served. The respondent did not dispute the material facts alleged in the administrative complaint and requested a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes.

Mr. Lara commented that he was trained and educated to be an architect. He commented that he was working with a Florida licensed architect, was an associate member of AIA, and

was an examination candidate with Florida. He commented that he was approached by a contractor to provide drafting services. He commented that he contact AIA on what title he could use and he was referred to Mr. Minacci's office. He commented that he asked if he could use the term "designer" on his drawing. He commented that he used the term "architectural designer".

Mr. Lara commented that there was a disagreement between him and the contractor regarding drafting services so the contractor filed a complaint. He commented that he did not intend to deceive the public with the title used and the contractor knew he was a drafter not an architect.

Ms. Clark commented that the violations were that Mr. Lara drew plans for a commercial project that was not under the direct supervision of an architect and that the he was contracted to perform the services and took the plans to an architect for signing and sealing. She commented that the contract should have been directly with the licensed architect and he could perform the drafting services for the architect not the contractor.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that Mr. Lara's bill for services was misleading to the public because it had 5 references architects or architectural services.

Mr. Minacci commented that the probable cause panel recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs. Mr. Lara requested that the fine be reduced because it would be a huge financial hardship.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to accept 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. Membiela moved to impose a \$3,000 fine plus costs to be paid within 90 days.

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

DBPR vs. Shirley Wooster, Jr.

Case Number 2006-009861

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Wooster and Mr. Antinell were present, sworn and represented by Michael Liss. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed May 10, 2006 for violations of Chapter 481.223(1)(a), 481.223(1)(c), and 481.223(1)(f), Florida Statutes. The administrative complaint was properly served and there was no dispute of material facts.

Mr. Liss commented that this was an unfortunate case and Mr. Wooster let his license lapse since he was no longer practicing the profession. Mr. Antinell, Mr. Wooster's stepson, renovated his home which does not require licensure pursuant to the exemptions. The building department requested that the drawings be signed and sealed. In an effort to assist his son with the bureaucratic paperwork he signed and sealed the plans he sketched.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that there was an exemption for single family homes but in coastal counties they were requiring signed and sealed plans. Mr. Antinell commented that they renovated an existing structure and that when he applied for the permit he was advised he did not need a licensed architect or engineer to perform the sketches. Mr. Wooster sketched the changes for the structure to be submitted to the building department for permitting. He commented that the issue escalated because of hurricane Wilma and when he inquired about his permit they asked for additional items which he complied. He commented that he got aggravated with the process and the building department was aggravated with him so he asked his step father to sign and seal the sketches.

Mr. Wooster had not practiced architecture in a number of years and was retired. He was not compensated for the project and that type of project was usually exempt.

Mr. Minacci advised the board that the probable cause panel recommended the maximum fine because Mr. Wooster was not present at the meeting. He commented that the notice was served via the Florida Administrative Weekly and none appearance at the panel meeting should not be held against him. Mr. Wooster contacted Mr. Liss immediately to remedy the issue. Mr. Gonzalez requested that Mr. Minacci verify if respondents were previously licensed and as a courtesy notify them via other means than just the Florida Administrative Weekly.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to accept the findings of fact and conclusion of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to impose costs of \$312.

Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that there should be a fine imposed for signing and sealing drawings when his license was not current. Ms. Dolan agreed because professions should be held to standards. Mr. Liss requested that the fine be proportionate to his income.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to impose \$1,000 fine plus costs.

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

Settlement Stipulation

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. J.C. Forbes and Architectural Design & Plans

Case Number 2005-043062

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Forbes was present and sworn. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint which reflected violations of practicing architecture without a license, using the title architect without a license, and practicing without a certificate of authorization. Mr. Forbes originally disputed the facts in the administrative complaint and the case was set for

formal hearing. After deposing Mr. Forbes, he realized there was a violation of the statute and agreed on a settlement stipulation with Mr. Minacci.

Mr. Minacci entered a settlement stipulation with Mr. Forbes based on his income and discussions regarding the statutes. Mr. Forbes was present and wanted to withdraw the settlement stipulation. Mr. Minacci advised that the board could vote on the stipulation as presented.

Mr. Minacci advised that the board could accept the stipulation as presented or reject the stipulation and counter offer a penalty.

Mr. Forbes commented that the settlement stipulation that he signed with Mr. Minacci seemed to be a solution to the issue. He commented that he retired from the construction industry due to health issues. He commented that he found a niche for performing drafting and design work on residential applications for a local architect. Mr. Forbes was contacted to remodel an existing building to expand a day care facility. He commented that the customer only wanted preliminary drawings because he was not sure he was going to be able to expand the building and did not want to pay an architect or engineer's fees for those drawings.

Mr. Forbes commented that his mistake was agreeing to draft the preliminary drawings and placing them on his residential heading. He thought that he was working under the architect's direction. The customer did not contact him for a year and when he met with him again the customer had already made the changes on the building without a permit. He commented that he provided the drawings to the customer and advised that the plans must be signed and sealed by an architect and the customer submitted the drawings to the building department without an architect's seal.

Mr. Forbes commented that he realized what he did was wrong but since signing the settlement stipulation his income situation had dwindled further. He commented that he did not intentionally break the law, it would not happen again, and requested leniency regarding the fine.

Ms. Clark advised the board how to proceed regarding the signed stipulation. She advised that the board could accept the stipulation as presented or reject the stipulation and counter offer at which time they could impose a higher penalty.

Mr. Forbes requested that his stipulation be withdrawn. Ms. Clark commented that the board would proceed with a Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes since there were no disputed issues of material fact.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved to accept Mr. Forbes request to withdraw the stipulation presented.

Second: Ms. Membiela seconded the motion, Ms. Grigsby opposed and the motion passed.

Mr. Manausa commented that this was a serious plan stamping case and cautioned Mr. Forbes from withdrawing his stipulation. Mr. Minacci reminded the board that the current stipulation was a \$5,000 fine plus costs to be paid in 24 months.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to accept 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. Grigsby moved to impose a \$7,500 fine plus costs to be paid in 24 months.

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

DBPR vs. Clara T. Garcia / Adonai Design & Construction, Inc.

Case Number 2006-002296

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Ms. Garcia was not present but was represented by Mr. Ortiz. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint which reflected violations for unlicensed practice of architecture, using the title architect, and practicing without a certificate of authorization. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs and the stipulation reflected a \$5,000 fine.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to accept the stipulation as presented.

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

DBPR vs. Richard Guzman

Case Number 2005-057926

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Guzman was present, sworn and represented by Mr. Atkinson. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint reflecting violations for the unlicensed practice of architecture, using the title of architect when not licensed, and practicing without a certificate of authorization. The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs and the stipulation reflects \$5,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to accept the stipulation as presented.

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

The board discussed Mr. Guzman's education and whether he understood the statutory exemption regarding residential services and how he was able to provide services to licensed professionals not the public.

DBPR vs. Christopher Sanchez and JSA Group

Case Number 2005-039787

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Sanchez was present, sworn and represented by Mr. Garcia. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint reflecting violations of unlicensed practice of architecture and using the title architect without a license. The probable cause panel

recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs and the stipulation reflects a \$5,000 fine plus costs.

Mr. Garcia thanked the board for allowing them to appear and requested that they accept the stipulation as presented.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to accept the stipulation as presented.

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

Motion for Order Waiving Formal Hearing

Licensed

DBPR vs. Luther L. Eubanks

Case Number 2005-056099

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Eubanks was present and sworn. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed April 18, 2006 for alleged violations of Chapter 481.225(1)(j), Florida Statutes. The administrative complaint was properly served on April 24, 2006 via certified mail.

Mr. Eubanks apologized to the board for the oversight and he did not dispute the facts alleged. Ms. Clark advised that a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes would be held instead of a motion for order waiving formal hearing. Mr. Minacci advised that when an individual provides no proof of continuing education the rules impose a \$1,000 fine, make up continuing education hours missing plus 20 additional, and the license is suspended until proof of compliance.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to accept the findings of fact and conclusions of law and set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to impose a \$1,000 fine, make up the missing hours plus 20 additional, and the licensed is suspended until proof of compliance.

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

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

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Kent Seyffer and Seyffer & Koch

Case Numbers 2006-001841 and 2005-049277

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Seyffer was present and sworn. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed May 5, 2006 which reflected violations of unlicensed architecture practice, using the title architect without a valid license, and practicing architecture without a certificate of authorization. Mr. Seyffer responded timely to the administrative complaint and

did not dispute the facts therefore a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes would be held.

Mr. Seyffer commented that they were building a second home in Florida and he currently practices in New Jersey. He commented that his accountant advised that he should put a business telephone line in his home in Florida for tax purposes. Mr. Seyffer commented that he did not offer services in Florida but the telephone phone book publication reflected his company name because of the business line. He commented that he was previously licensed in Florida but let the license go because he only performed one project.

Ms. Membiela asked if received any business calls for services or clients. Mr. Seyffer replied he received a telephone call from an engineer wanted to offer their services to the architect. He commented that he had received and performed no services in Florida.

Mr. Minacci advised that the panel recommended the maximum penalty of \$15,000 fine plus cost for unlicensed cases and he was not invited to the panel meeting.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Gonzalez requested that Mr. Minacci invite previously Florida licensed architects to the panel meetings to remedy issues of this nature.

Application Review

Canthus Incorporated

Canthus Incorporated (dual)

Mr. Kotler was present and represented the firm. Mr. Minacci commented that the firm had a disciplinary case heard earlier and the issue was resolved.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to approve the application as presented.

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

Simmons & Saray Interiors Group, Inc.

Ms. Luxton was present and represented by Ms. Perrera. Mr. Minacci commented that the firm had a disciplinary case heard earlier and the issue was resolved.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to approve the application as presented.

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

Motion for Order Waiving Formal Hearing

Licensed

DBPR vs. Irving Addis

Case Number 2005-061759

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz and Bullock

No one was present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint filed for failure to perform a statutory obligation and was served certified mail May 20, 2006. Mr. Addis responded to the administrative complaint advising that his wife was ill during that time, paid the fine plus costs but requested that the suspension be waived to allow completion of the required continuing education hours.

Mr. Minacci advised the board that Mr. Addis did not dispute the facts and proceed with a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved to imposed a \$1,000 fine plus costs, make up the missing continuing education hours plus 20 additional, and suspension until compliance.

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

Request to Dismiss

Robert Stueber

Mr. Stueber was present and sworn. Ms. Clark advised the board that they heard Mr. Stueber's case and a final order that was entered on June 21, 2006. She advised that the order directed that Mr. Stueber's license be suspended until he paid a \$5,000 fine and \$213 costs in his previous case and \$222 costs for this case.

Ms. Clark advised that Mr. Stueber could have filed an appeal to the order but he did not. She advised that they had no jurisdiction if an appeal was not filed.

Mr. Stueber commented that he did not understand that he would have to pay an additional \$222 costs for the most recent case since he had paid the \$5,000 fine and \$213 costs for the previous case. He commented that he thought the recent case was a mute issue since he had paid the previous case fines and costs. He commented that he did not understand that when he met with the board at the last meeting and wanted the board to waive the recent costs.

The final order stood and no action was taken by the board.

Motion for Order Waiving Formal Hearing

DBPR vs. Roger Allen Bartels

Case Number 2005-061768

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Bartels was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to perform a statutory obligation which was served certified mail April 27, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine plus costs and completion of 17.5 hours of continuing education with 120 days of the final order.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived his right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to accept the panel's recommendation of a \$500 fine plus costs and completion of 17.5 hours of continuing education within 120 days of the final order.

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

DBPR vs. Kenneth Buyyounouski

Case Number 2005-056972

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Buyyounouski was not present. The case before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to perform a statutory obligation which was served certified mail on March 18, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised the board that the probable cause panel recommended a \$1,000 fine plus costs, 40 hours of continuing education, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived his right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$1,000 fine plus costs, 40 hours of continuing education, and suspension until compliance.

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

DBPR vs. Sharon L. Gold

Case Number 2005-020705

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Ms. Gold was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was served certified mail March 21, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived her right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

DBPR vs. David Hawkins

Case Number 2005-015530

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Hawkins was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was served certified mail April 27, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived his right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

DBPR vs. Shelley Landry

Case Number 2005-020762

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Ms. Landry was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was

served certified mail March 18, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived her right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

DBPR vs. Warren Lee Lisenbee

Case Numbers 2005-031899 and 2005-033883

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Lisenbee was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for 2 counts for signing and sealing plans that do not conform to acceptable architecture standards, 2 counts for signing and sealing plans for a project that were not sufficiently detailed and was served certified mail March 20, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a 6 months suspension, 2 years probation, and \$1,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived his right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a 6 months suspension, 2 years probation, and \$1,000 fine plus costs.

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

DBPR vs. Sondra H. Schiffman

Case Number 2005-020792

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Ms. Schiffman was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was served certified mail April 27, 2006 with no response. Mr. Minacci advised that the

probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served and the respondent waived her right to dispute the facts by failing to timely respond.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

DBPR vs. Robert B. Snell

Case Number 2005-020282

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Snell was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was served certified mail May 13, 2006. Mr. Snell responded but failed to dispute the facts.

Ms. Clark advised the board that this case should be considered as a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes and not a motion for waiver. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

DBPR vs. Thomas Testerman

Case Number 2005-021039

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Testerman was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was served certified mail August 12, 2005. Mr. Testerman responded to the complaint and elected a formal hearing. Mr. Minacci advised that he did not dispute the facts alleged in the administrative complaint.

Ms. Clark advised the board to review Mr. Testerman's response and determine whether there was a dispute of material facts. She advised that if there was not a dispute of material facts then the board could proceed with a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes.

Motion: Ms. Grigsby moved that the respondent did not dispute the material facts alleged in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to impose a \$500 fine, provide proof of course completion, and suspension until compliance.

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

Mr. Gonzalez presented Mr. Rodriguez, former board member, with a plaque in appreciation for his dedicated service to the state of Florida.

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Robert Coba

Case Number 2005-028649

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Coba was not present. Mr. Minacci advised that Mr. Coba was deceased, provided a copy of the obituary and request that the board nolle prosequi the case.

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

Licensed

DBPR vs. Donald Chapman

Case Number 2005-015788

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

Mr. Chapman was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to provide proof of compliance of Chapter 481.215(5), Florida Statutes and was served certified mail March 8, 2006. Mr. Chapman responded to the complaint and did not dispute the facts. Mr. Minacci advised the board that he recently received a settlement stipulation from Mr. Chapman requesting to voluntarily relinquish his license.

Motion: Ms. Solera moved to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

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

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

DBPR vs. Christine Desiree Snyder
Case Number 2005-046362
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Schreiber

Ms. Snyder was not present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for violating an order of the board and on April 5, 2006 the respondent prepared an election of rights form requesting a formal hearing. Mr. Minacci commented that she did not dispute the material facts.

Ms. Clark advised the board to review the response and determine if there was a dispute of material facts alleged in the administrative complaint. The administrative complaint file January 5, 2006 alleges that she had not complied with the terms of the final order filed May 20, 2005.

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

Ms. Clark advised that the board established no dispute of facts and could proceed with a hearing pursuant to Chapter 120.57(2), Florida Statutes.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to 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.

Ms. Snyder is a licensed interior designer and the previous case was for a violation of using the title "architect" and practicing without a certificate of authorization. Mr. Minacci advised that Ms. Snyder's license was suspended for failure to take the Florida Building Code course.

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to impose suspension until compliance with the previous final order.
Second: Ms. Solera seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Richard T. Stagg
Case Number 2005-061962
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

Mr. Stagg was not present. The case before the board for an administrative complaint for failure to perform a statutory obligation and the respondent filed an election of rights form on May 8, 2006. Mr. Minacci advised that the probable cause panel recommended a \$1,000 fine plus costs, 40 hours of continuing education, and suspension until compliance.

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

Motion: Ms. Del Bianco moved to impose a \$1,000 fine, 40 hours of continuing education, and suspension until compliance.

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

Settlement Stipulation

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Carrie's Interiors and Carrie Nemec

Case Number 2005-024740

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

No one was present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for using the title "interior designer" when not licensed and practicing without a certificate of authorization. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$5,000 fine plus costs.

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

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

DBPR vs. Constance Jean Crosby / Constance Crosby Interiors, Inc.

Case Number 2005-049611

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Bullock

No one was present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for using the title "interior design" when not licensed and practicing without a certificate of authorization. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$2,500 fine plus costs.

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

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

DBPR vs. Reiner A. Sanchez and RAS Construction Corp.

Case Number 2004-027260

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Hall

No one was present. The case was before the board for an administrative complaint for using the title "architect" when not licensed, practicing architecture, and practicing without a certificate of authorization. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$7,500 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Membiela moved to accept the stipulation as presented.

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

New Business

Mr. Minacci asked the board to consider implementing a procedure for removing specific degrees of violations from his web site after a set time frame. Ms. Chastain reminded the board that there was a statutory provision that allowed the individual to make a request and have it reviewed by the department to expunge the record.

Mr. Minacci commented that he and the board office receive requests for notice of cease and desist orders that the board never sees be removed from Smith, Thompson, Shaw and Manausa's Google web site.

The board decided to leave the cases posted indefinitely.

Old Business

Ms. Del Bianco reported that the Foundation of Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) was doing business as (dba) for the Council of Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA).

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.