

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Embassy Suites Ft. Lauderdale
1100 SE 17th Street
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316**

**May 16, 2013
9:00 a.m.**

General Business

Call to Order

Mr. Ehrig called the meeting to order 9:14 a.m., provided an invocation and determined a quorum.

Roll Call – Identify excused absences

Board Members Present:

John Ehrig, Chair
Miguel Rodriguez
Aida Bao-Garciga
Francisco Costoya
Emory Johnson
Kenan Fishburne
Jonathan Toppe

Board Member Absent:

Warren Emo, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri McEwen, Government Analyst
Trent Manausa, Expert Witness
Nancy De Santis
Shelley Siegel
Peggy Oberlin
Malgorzata Fedele
Roy Siegel
Angela Colley
Jan Merle
J. H. Gillis

Court Reporter: Neysa Sosa, Apex Reporting, Inc. 66 W. Flagler Street, 7th Floor, Miami, Florida 33130. Telephone 305.545.8434

Ratification of Executive Director

The board ratified Ms. Chastain as the Executive Director.

Disciplinary Cases

DBPR vs. Diaz & Russell Corporation and Nelson R. Diaz

Case Number 2010-055708

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Wirtz

Mr. Diaz was present and sworn by the court reporter.

Ms. Clark commented that there were no probable cause panel members present at the meeting who would be recused from the board review of the case. Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the case due to the fact that he was a witness in a case against Mr. Diaz.

Ms. Clark advised the board regarding the standard of review and procedures for the hearing.

Ms. Clark asked each of the board members the following questions.

Did you receive all materials regarding this meeting in advance of the meeting?

All board members affirmed in the positive.

Did you thoroughly read and review the materials and familiarize yourself with the information presented in the agenda materials prior to the meeting? All board members affirmed in the positive.

Were there any problems with the materials like missing pages, illegible copies, unreadable disc, or any other problems with the materials that should be taken up at this time? All board members affirmed in the negative.

Are you aware of any facts situations or reasons that you feel you would disqualify or otherwise make it improper for you hear and deliberate on the case presented today? All board members affirmed in the negative.

Ms. Clark advised that no exceptions had been filed in the case.

Upon review of the entire record, the board made the following motions.

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board adopt the findings of fact as found in the recommended order as the findings of fact of the board.

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

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved the board adopt the conclusions of law as found in the recommended order as the conclusions of law of the board.

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

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board adopt the recommended order penalty of \$10,000 as that of the board.

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

Mr. Minacci stated that the costs of the investigation, travel, and attending a formal hearing were \$6,867.53 and the board's authority to impose costs is found in Section 455.227(3) (a), Florida Statutes.

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the board impose the costs of \$6,867.53.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Diaz commented that he could not pay the fine and costs within 30 days and requested that the board reduce the amount of the fine and costs.

After discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board impose that the fines and costs be paid in 30 days.

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

DBPR vs. Architecture & Awnings Corporation

Case Number 2011-061015

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

Mr. Costoya was recused from the review of the case based on his participation with the probable cause panel. George Abril was present and represented Camilo Nino the respondent. Probable cause was found to file a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and offering architectural services through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs. The stipulation reflected a \$2,500 fine plus costs and an appearance was required as part of the stipulation. The fine was reduced because this was a first time offense; the respondent agreed to comply and this was an advertising case. The respondent agreed to remove word "architectural" from the title of the business.

The respondent changed the name of the business and asked for Mr. Minacci's approval of any future business names. They understand that the word "architecture" was the issue. The respondent does special textiles and used the description as architecture textiles. He only provided large awning covers.

Mr. Abril provided information regarding the confusion with the web site which was not used or created by the company.

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board adopt the settlement stipulation as presented.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion.

Mr. Toppe withdrew his motion and the Ms. Bao-Garciga withdrew her second to the motion.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board reject the stipulation and offer a counter stipulation imposing a \$1.00 dollar fine plus costs.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The respondent accepted the counter stipulation.

Respondent's Counsel: George Abril, 1221 SW 27th Avenue, 2nd Floor, Miami, Florida, 33135.

DBPR vs. Style Homes Flooring and Drywall Corp and Luis H. Reis

Case Number 2011-018617

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The case was before the board based on the respondent contracting architectural services for a residential project, used the title architect, and offered the services through a business entity. Probable cause was found to file a three count administrative complaint for using the title architect without a license, practicing architecture without a license, and offering architecture services through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

Mr. Reis disputed the facts and the case was sent to the Division of Administrative Hearings. At hearing Mr. Minacci spoke with Mr. Reis and he now understands the issues. The issue was using the word "architect" in the residential contract. The Administrative Law Judge relinquished jurisdiction to the board.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs. The respondent admitted his mistake and now understands the law.

Luis Reis was present and sworn in by the court reporter.

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as found in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board impose a \$1,000 fine plus costs to be paid in 24 months.

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

DBPR vs. Roy D. Murphy

Case Numbers 2011-061204 and 2011-055294

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

Paul Turick and Roy Murphy were present and sworn in by the court reporter. The case before the board was based on the respondent signing and sealing plans for a commercial project that were prepared by an unlicensed draftsman and the respondent had been unable to document supervision for plans prepared outside of his office. The respondent violated the successor architect rule and offered architectural services through a fictitious name without a license.

Probable cause was found to file a four count administrative complaint for improperly certifying the work of another, aiding the unlicensed practice of architecture, violating the successor architect rule, and offering architectural services through a business without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs and two years probation. Mr. Minacci commented that he presented a settlement stipulation at the October 2012 board meeting reflecting a reprimand, \$2,500 fine plus costs and two year probation. The board rejected the settlement stipulation and counter offered a two year suspension, two year probation, and \$2,500 fine plus costs.

Mr. Murphy was present and sworn in and explained that Paul Turick was the supervisor at the time of building the project. Mr. Turick commented that he was a private provider inspector and plans examiner.

After discussion the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as found in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board impose a reprimand, \$2,500 fine plus costs with 24 months to pay.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion, it passed and Mr. Rodriguez opposed.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board impose three years probation during which time he shall submit for review any architectural plans; at his expense; reviewed prior to submitting for permitting and must appear before the board prior to the termination of his probation ending further discipline possible discipline.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion.

The question was called and the motion failed.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board revoke Mr. Murphy's license.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved to reconsider reprimand, fines and costs.
Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board impose no reprimand, fines or costs.
Second: Mr. Costoya seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Samuel Vasquez, Jr. and ARC Steel Homes, Alternative Residential Components, Inc.

Case Number 2011-041313

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

Mr. Vasquez was present and sworn in by the court reporter. Probable cause was found to issue a one count administrative complaint for using the title "architect" without a license. The administrative complaint was hand served December 15, 2012, and the respondent failed to timely respond. The probable cause panel recommended a \$5,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Ms. Fishburne moved that the board impose a \$2,500 fine plus costs to be paid within 24 months.

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

The board recessed for lunch from 12:17 p.m. and returned at 1:41 p.m.

Settlement Stipulations on the Consent Agenda

Consent Agenda

DBPR vs. Arkitektur + Kasai, Inc. and Keith A. Snider

Case Number 2012-003056

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

DBPR vs. J & P Design Group, Inc. and C. Paul Precht

Case Number 2011-017478

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

DBPR vs. LIM Design and Lorna Jaquiss

Case Number 2011-044814

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

DBPR vs. Sunday E. Enogieru and SCD Corporation
Case Number 2011-034162
PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

DBPR vs. Samuel D. Justice
Case Number 2011-035326
PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

Mr. Costoya was recused from the vote due to his participation with the probable cause panel.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board approve the above settlement stipulations on the consent agenda.
Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Voluntary Relinquishment on Consent Agenda

DBPR vs. Merchandising Plus
Case Number 2012-029076

DBPR vs. Richard Lawrence Markel
Case Number 2011-060324

DBPR vs. Wendy Romanyszyn
Case Number 2012-052666

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board approve the voluntary relinquishments as presented.
Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Faulkner Eyo
Case Number 2011-039332
PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz
Not present or represented by counsel.

Mr. Minacci withdrew this case and will place it on the August agenda.

DBPR vs. Harry Leonard Rothstein
Case Number 2011-046579
PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Costoya was recused from review of the case due to his participation on the probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on the respondent signing and sealing deficient plans. Probable cause was found to file a three count administrative complaint for negligence, signing and sealing plans not sufficiently detailed, and failing to perform a statutory obligation.

The administrative complaint was served by certified mail February 15, 2013. The probable cause panel recommended revocation, a \$7,000 fine plus costs. Mr. Rothstein responded to the investigation, requested additional time but did not respond to the administrative complaint or appear before the probable cause panel or the board.

The board discussed the respondent's multiple violations, the fact that the respondent did not provide any additional information or respond to serious allegations.

Based on Rule 61G1-12.003(3)(a), F.A.C., aggravating factors were a history of previous violations, negligence in the scope of the project, evidence of violations in other jurisdictions, and a letter of guidance previously issued.

After discussion the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board revoke the license and impose a \$7,000 fine plus costs to be paid within 30 days.

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

DBPR vs. Russell G. Brabec and Design and More

Case Number 2011-058193

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on failure to comply with a final order entered March 8, 2012. Probable cause was found to issue one count administrative complaint for failure to comply with a lawful order of the board. The administrative complaint was served by certified mail January 18, 2013.

The probable cause panel recommended revocation of the license. Mr. Minacci advised that the respondent advised that he was not going to pay the penalty imposed.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board revoke the license.

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

DBPR vs. Francis DiGiovanni

Case Number 2011-054792

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was based on the respondent contracting to provide service on a commercial project without a license. Probable cause was found to file a one count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license. The administrative complaint was hand served January 22, 2013. The respondent failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

Mr. Ehrig commented that he knew Mr. DiGiovanni and that his prior relationship with the respondent would not prevent his being fair or impartial.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$5,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the board impose \$5,000 fine plus costs.

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

DBPR vs. Florida Designs for You and Bob Fowler

Case Number 2012-017986

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Costoya was recused based on his participation with the probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on the respondent offering architectural services on a web site and on a commercial project without a license. Probable cause was found to issue a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and offering architectural service through a business entity without a certificate of authorization. On March 27, 2013 the respondent sent an election of rights and did not dispute the facts.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs.

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

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

Motion: Mr. Fishburne moved that the board impose the \$10,000 fine plus costs.

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

DBPR vs. John Arnold

Case Number 2011-041067

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. A citation was issued for failing to take the Florida Building Code core course and a fine imposed. Probable cause was found to file a one count administrative complaint for failing to comply with a lawful order of the board. Mr. Arnold took the course, paid fine and costs and has complied.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved to approve the settlement stipulation as presented.

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

DBPR vs. Ruben J. Pujol and Ruben J. Pujol Architectural, PA

Case Number 2011-044504

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the respondent signing and sealing plans for a church project that were not of sufficient detail or meet the standard of practice. Probable cause was found to file a three count administrative complaint for the negligence of the practice of architecture, plans were not sufficiently detailed, and committing misconduct in the practice of architecture.

The probable cause panel recommended a reprimand, \$6,000 fine plus costs, and two years probation. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$3,000 fine plus costs and a two year reporting probation.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board adopt the settlement stipulation as presented.

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

DBPR vs. A Phipps Design, Inc. and Brian Phipps

Case Number 2011-054832

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board for offering architectural services in an advertisement without a license. Probable cause was found to file a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and offering architectural service through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$5,000 fine plus costs. The fine was reduced because this was a first time offense, the respondent agreed to come into compliance and it was an advertising case.

Motion: Ms. Boa-Garciga moved that the board to adopt the settlement stipulation as presented.

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

DBPR vs. Giselle Coujil

Case Number 2011-046972

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Costoya

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Costoya was recused based on his participation with the probable cause panel. Probable cause was found to issue a one count administrative complaint for using the title "architect" without a license.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$5,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$2,500 fine plus costs.

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board adopt the settlement stipulation as presented.

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

DBPR vs. Icon Unlimited and Robert San Martin

Case Number 2011-042241

PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the respondent contracting to offer architectural services and offered those services through a business without a license. Probable cause was found to file a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and offering architectural services through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$10,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects \$5,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board to adopt the settlement stipulation as presented.

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

Recess

The meeting recessed at 2:41 p.m.

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Embassy Suites Ft. Lauderdale
1100 SE 17th Street
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316**

**May 17, 2013
9:00 a.m.**

General Business

Call to Order

Mr. Ehrig called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and a quorum was established.

Roll Call – Identify excused absences

Board Members Present:

John Ehrig, Chair
Miguel Rodriguez
Aida Bao-Garciga
Francisco Costoya
Emory Johnson
Kenan Fishburne
Jonathan Toppe

Board Member Absent:

Warren Emo, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri McEwen, Government Analyst
Trent Manausa, Expert Witness
Shelley Siegel
Dave Roberts
Ann Rollon
Doug Feldman
Jennifer Keith
Danilo Guiso
Chris Zimmerman
Christina Sainmervil

Court Reporter: Neysa Sosa, Apex Reporting, Inc. 66 W. Flagler Street, 7th Floor, Miami, Florida 33130. Telephone 305.545.8434

Rules Report

Ms. Clark reviewed the rules report. She reported that the text the board approved for Rule 61G1-11.012 was adopted May 1, 2013.

Mr. Johnson asked if on line seven the word “and” should be “or” between practicing architect “and” interior designer.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board notice Rule 61G1-11.012, F.A.C., for rule development.

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

A statement of estimated regulatory cost (SERC) checklist would be prepared by staff for the next board meeting.

Rule 61G1-22.003, F.A.C., Education Requirements for Interior Designers – proposed draft language

Mr. Butler and Ms. Fishburne worked with Ms. Clark to prepare the proposed draft language. The language updated the rule that referenced dates and removed accreditation language that was not used to review programs for board approved curriculum.

Motion: Ms. Fishburne moved that the board notice Rule 61G1-22.003, F.A.C., for rule development with proposed text presented.

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

Staff provided a statement of estimated regulatory cost (SERC) check list reflecting no impact.

Motion: Ms. Fishburne moved that the board approve the SERC check list as presented and that the proposed language changes to Rule 61G1-22.003, F.A.C., would not require a SERC.

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

Annual Regulatory Plan 2013 Instructions and Template

Ms. Clark reviewed the instruction and template and intent of the plan. She reported that she and staff would bring rules and proposed rule language for the board’s review at the next meeting.

Petition for Variance or Waiver of Rule 61G1-22.002(1) and 22.001(1) Florida Administrative Code

Susan Pridgen

Ms. Pridgen was not present or represented by counsel.

After review of the petition and discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved to deny the petition for waiver/variance finding that the petitioner had not established that the purposes of the underlying statute would be met or that the application of the rule to her circumstances would violate the principals of fairness or impose a substantial hardship on her.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion, passed and Ms. Fishburne opposed.

Application Review

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board deny the application as presented based on the lack of experience.

Second: Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, it passed and Ms. Fishburne opposed.

General Discussion

Architecture Customer Satisfaction Survey

Mr. Ehrig commented that he was provided some additional information regarding the survey and would report on that information at the next meeting.

Request for Board approved curricula per Rule 61G1-22.003, F.A.C.

David Butler's Review and Recommendation for Indian River State College (formerly Indian River Community College)

Indian River State College Associate of Science (AS) degree in Interior Design Technology

Mr. Johnson welcomed Ms. Roccon.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board approve the Indian River State College, Associate of Science (AS) degree in Interior design as presented.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion.

After the discussion, the question was called and it passed unanimously.

NCARB General Session and Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Mr. Ehrig and Ms. Chastain attended the meeting in March and there were bylaw changes that cleaned up some of the issues. The board reviewed the information and there were no comments or conversation.

Public Service Announcement (PSA) Awards Presentation

Florida International University (FIU)

1. Team Musgrave/Usbeck – first place
2. Team M&K Production
3. Team Drescher/Arroyave

Mr. Toppe commented that the contest submittals were great and it was a difficult decision. Mr. Ehrig thanked AIA Florida for providing the funds for the contest and for being present to present the awards. The submittals were presented to the board and the audience. Team Drescher/Arroyave was present to receive their award.

Mr. Ehrig thanked FIU for the outstanding number of entries and quality of entries to the PSA contest.

NCARB Draft of the Resolutions – 2013 Annual Meeting

Mr. Ehrig commented that several of the resolutions were brought about through the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) program. Mr. Ehrig reviewed the BEA program with regard to the combination of education and experience to meet a minimum educational standard.

Mr. Ehrig commented that he was supporting the changes in the resolutions with the exception of 2013-06. He requested input from the board members regarding the on resolution 2013-06. The board had no comments or objections to resolutions A through F.

Mr. Ehrig commented that the Inter-recognition Agreement with Canada was driving Resolution 2013-06. The Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB) is now known as the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA). The original agreement is being dissolved and the CALA is proposing a new agreement. Mr. Ehrig commented that he has an issue with their internship program, the shortened period of two years instead of three years. Their internship criteria has been modified as well. The only way an intern can get experience will be in an architect's office under the direct supervision of an architect. There are also dissimilarities in the exams that need to be understood prior to acceptance of the new Mutual Recognition Agreement. The exam is changing in Canada as well.

NCARB is looking at the initial development of the new ARE 5.0 in the future.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that he did not have an issue with the changes to the internship. Originally the ARE test was focused on education not experience. There is a push for shorting the time it takes to get licensed and to get through the education process faster to decrease the cost. Mr. Rodriguez commented

that they were forward. Their exam may be stronger than the ARE. He commented that he wanted to watch the direction it goes.

Ms. McEwen commented that there may be an issue with the Canadian exam if they exempt portions of the exam based on education. She commented that the rule defines the prescribed licensure exam by Rule, 14.001, F.A.C., which states the acceptable examination as administered by NCARB. The board discussed updating the rule to address the Canadian exam and if it is equivalent to the NCARB administered exam.

The board was contacted recently about changes to the IDP that were approved by the NCARB Board of Directors.

After a brief discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the board approve the proposed changes to the IDP.

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

New York Bill - Proposed Interior Designer Practice Act
For information purposes, no discussion

David Butler – Retirement Reception
For information purposes, no discussion

Signing and Sealing with a permanent ink stamp vs. metal impression

Mr. Rodriguez offered to draft language Rule 61G1-16.001, 16.002, and 16.005 and bring to the next meeting. Staff will prepare the statement of estimated regulatory cost (SERC) checklist. This will be placed on the August agenda.

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2013 Probable Cause Panel, St. Augustine (ratify)

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board accept the minutes as presented.

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

January 24-25, 2013 General Business, St. Augustine

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the board approve the minutes as presented.

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

Ratification List(s)

Licensure

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved to approve the licensure ratification list as presented in the agenda materials.

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

Continuing Education

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board approve the list as presented in the agenda materials.

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

Reports

Chair's Report – John Ehrig

Mr. Ehrig provided his report as a part of the previous discussion on the various topics related to NCARB.

Executive Director's Report – Juanita Chastain

Financial Report

Financials for the period ending March 31, 2013

Ms. Chastain reported that information technology increased \$30,000 due to the licensure system being updated. The board's operating account ended with \$1.8 million and \$410,000 for unlicensed activity.

Ms. Chastain reported that the continuing education audit letters were sent out. She commented that all board members were confirmed during session.

AIA Report – Vicki Long

IDAF – Doug Feldman

ASID – Dave Roberts

Prosecuting Attorney's Report – David K. Minacci

Open Licensed/Unlicensed Cases

Fines Chart – Summary

Fines Chart – Licensed

Fines Chart – Unlicensed

Billable Hours December 2012

Billable Hours January 2013

Billable Hours February 2013

Billable Hours March 2013

Results of January 2013 Board Meeting

Press Releases/Speaking Engagements/Other Correspondence

For information purposes only.

AIA Report – Danilo Guiso

Ms. Long was not able to attend the meeting. AIA Florida legislative day was held April 3, 2013 and it was very successful. The posters and brochures were very well received and tied into the Viva Florida 500. The Fairness in Liability would be effective July 1, 2013. All review boards must have licensed architects on the review board and committees.

AIA National is repositioning efforts of the association and looking at the bearers of licensure and the fact that new licensees are not keeping up with the individuals retiring.

The board discussed committees and local councils putting non Florida licensed architects on councils for community planning and review. The board discussed looking at what the person sitting on the board actually does because it may be in title only and not practicing architecture.

Mr. Rodriguez commented review boards will render a binding decision on architectural issues. Individuals seeking an appointment as an architect to sit on the board or council may be a licensed architect but not in Florida.

IDAF

Doug Feldman commented that IDAF supported AIA Florida on the Professional Liability Legislation. He reported that they had funding for an Interior Design Public Service Announcement and would report back at the next meeting. He reported that they would continue to offer support with ASID and IIDA. He reported that they were keeping an eye out on some watered down deregulation bills.

ASID

Dave Roberts reported that they supported AIA Florida and the passage of Fairness in Liability. He reported they were watching the deregulation bill. He reported they would try to educate the legislature regarding the interior design profession.

Future Board Meetings

Hilton Orlando Bonnet Creek
14100 Bonnet Creek Resort Lane
Orlando, Florida 32821
407.597.3600

August 5, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

August 6-7, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – General Business Meeting

Hampton Inn & Suites – Downtown St. Petersburg
80 Beach Drive NE
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701

727.892.9900

November 20, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

November 21-22, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – General Business Meeting

New Business

No new business.

Old Business

NCIDQ examination review letter -

Mr. Ehrig commented that he was writing a strong letter requesting Florida candidates be allowed to review their examination.

Adjourn

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the meeting adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.