

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Ritz-Carlton Orlando, Grande Lakes
4012 Central Florida Parkway
Orlando, Florida 32837.
Telephone (407) 206-2400**

**July 23, 2019
General Business
9:00 a.m.**

Call to Order

Ms. Bao-Garciga, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and a quorum was established.

Board Members Present:

Miguel Rodriguez
Jonathan Toppe
G. Steven Jernigan
Aida Bao-Garciga, Chair
Holly Dennis
Timothy Nolen
John Ehrig, Vice Chair
Ivette O'Doski
Dylan Rivers

Board Members Absent:

Francisco "Frank" Costoya, unexcused

Others Present:

Robert Milne, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Amanda "Mandie" Ackermann, Executive Director
Terri McEwen, Government Analyst
Melissa Minacci, Investigator
Robert Frankel, Esquire, representing Interiors by Steven G.
Steven Gurowitz, Interiors by Steven G., Inc.
Mike Huey, Esquire, Florida Association of the American Institute of Architects (AIA)
Lee Weintraub, Esquire, representing M.A. Wood
Other Interested Parties

Court Reporter: Magnolia Court Reporting, Cindy Green, 3213 Hargill Drive Orlando, FL 32806 Telephone 407.896.1813 ReportingOrlando@aol.com

Petition for Declaratory Statement

- Interiors by Steven G., Inc. (Robert Frankel)

- Florida Association of the American Institute of Architects, Inc. Motion to Intervene (Mike Huey)
- Response in Opposition to Interior by Steven G, Inc. Petition for Declaratory Statement (Lee Weintraub)

Mr. Frankel provided a brief synopsis regarding Mr. Wood's complaint with the board and civil case against Interiors by Steven G., Inc. He advised that the Probable Cause Panel reviewed the complaint and closed the case.

Interiors by Steven G, Inc., is a large business that has been in business for more than 30 years with more than 80 employees.

Mr. Frankel reviewed the procedures regarding the filing of a petition for declaratory statement, the legality of the petition, and the petitions to intervene; as well as quoting prior case law. He referred to the definition of interior design per Section 481.203(8), Florida Statutes (F.S.).

In short, the petition requests that the board declare that the method of Interiors by Steven G, Inc., be allowed, through the definition of Section 481.203(8), F.S., to act on behalf of a client. The petition requests that Interiors by Steven G., Inc. be allowed to hire contractors, electrical contractors, architects, engineers, etc., on behalf of their client through a power of attorney with full disclosure.

The board discussed that they were not able to opine on other professions such as contractors and engineers.

Mr. Frankel represented that AIA Florida's petition to intervene is incorrect because Interiors by Steven G., Inc., would not be practicing architecture but hiring licensed architects with full disclosure.

Mr. Frankel referenced the Diaz Russell case regarding design build contracts and the court decision that an architect is not required to be identified within a design build contract. The contractor that operates through a design build contract must hire a licensed architect to perform the architectural services.

The board discussed how Interiors by Steven G, Inc.'s business is structured, how they would be the owner's representative providing construction administration by hiring and paying contractors and design professionals. The board discussed that the petition affects more than just Interiors by Steven G., Inc., and this may be a rule making issue instead of a declaratory statement.

Mr. Frankel filed the declaratory statement in an effort to be cautious of violating the statutes or rules and to seek direction from the board.

The board discussed that the petition was too broad and answering in the affirmative would be in direct violation of the architecture statutes. Having a power of attorney does not over-ride the statutory requirements regarding the practice of or the offering of architecture services.

Mr. Frankel objected to Mr. Wientraub's testimony.

Mr. Weintraub voiced a concern that the petition for declaratory statement affects more than just Interiors by Steven G, Inc. (IBSG). The authority of the power of attorney they request does not give Interiors by Steven G, Inc., the competency, education, qualifications, or experience to provide construction management, administration or make decisions for owners when selecting architects, contractors or engineers. IBSG is requesting that the board validate their current business practices, which is in violation of the Florida Statutes and Rules. Mr. Weintraub commented that this was not good policy for protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public and he did not think the board had the authority to grant this petition.

Mr. Frankel reiterated Section 481.203(8), F.S., the definition of interior design which allows for the administration of design construction contracts relating to nonstructural interior elements of a building or structure.

Mr. Huey voiced that their association would be impacted based on the ruling of this declaratory statement. The legislature went about the statutory definitions to protect the public and divide the professions intentionally based on education, internship, and examination. He voiced that IBSG is asking for the board's endorsement for how they are doing business, which is engaging practice beyond interior design. He voiced a concern that IBSG is asking the board to endorse unlicensed activity of architecture through the issuance of a power of attorney. He also mentioned that this type of practice was happening with developers.

After board review and discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board find that Mr. Frankel, Mr. Huey, and Mr. Weintraub had valid standing regarding the matter.
Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion.

Mr. Milne advised that when there is pending litigation the board should refrain from rendering an opinion on a declaratory statement. Rendering a decision may adversely affect a party with standing in the petition. The petitioner has filed the declaratory statement with good intentions but they are asking for endorsement of past behaviors. The petition should reflect concrete facts and circumstances for a specific situation; however, this petition is too broad and general. The board is not able to opine on other professions, the petition requests endorsement of prior actions, and there is pending litigation which are all obstacles to granting the petition.

The pending litigation is largely construction related. The board discussed rulemaking to address the general applicability of the request.

Mr. Milne advised the board they could grant, deny, or allow the petitioner the ability to withdraw the petition.

Mr. Ehrig commented that the litigation transcript reflects that the Judge advised the respondents to come before the professional boards for direction.

After board discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board answer in the negative to the petition as presented based on the fact that the board cannot opine on other licensed professions such as construction and engineering; answer in the negative the

hiring of architects by interior designers or provide construction administration; that there is pending litigation and the petition is too broad.

Second: Mr. Ehrig seconded the motion.

Ms. O'Doski advised that she spoke with Mr. Gurowitz regarding the interior design profession during the last Legislative Session.

Mr. Rivers commented that he would support a motion to deny the petition and not respond in the negative or positive. Mr. Rodriguez commented that this is a pressing issue that should be answered.

Mr. Milne advised that there were sufficient specific procedural issues that preclude the board from giving an opinion due to pending litigation, general applicability without specific circumstances, and the board cannot opine on the other professions. He advised that the board should deny the petition, reply in the negative, or allow the petitioner to withdraw.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board deny the petition because this board is not in a position to opine on other professions such as contracting or engineering and the items in the petition are contrary to the Florida statutes and rules as well as the petition is overly broad.

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

Disciplinary Cases

DBPR vs. Timothy Stone

Case Number 2018-021361

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, and Rivers

PCP Recommendation: \$137.10 costs and suspension until compliance

Mr. Stone was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused based on their participation with the Probable Cause Panel. The case was presented to the board at the May board meeting in error. The respondent paid the fine and Mr. Minacci requested that the board close the case.

Motion: Mr. Nolen moved that the case be closed.

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

DBPR vs. Epicouture and Sismai Roman

Case Numbers 2017-048278, 2017-048282, 2017-056668, and 2017-056675

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, and Rivers

PCP Recommendation: \$5,000.00 fine plus \$3,147.40 costs

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and practicing architecture through a business entity without a certificate of authorization. The administrative complaint was served through publication in the

South Florida Business Journal. The respondent has failed to respond to the administrative complaint. This is a second violation.

The board reviewed the disciplinary guidelines based on the second offense. After discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that the 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. Nolen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board impose a \$7,000.00 fine plus \$3,147.50 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

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

DBPR vs. Jaime Reyes

Case Number 2018-042940

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Rivers

PCP Recommendation: \$4,500.00 fine plus \$540.00

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and practicing through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The respondent elected a formal hearing before the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH). The respondent failed to respond to the request for admissions and on April 4, 2019, DOAH relinquished jurisdiction to the board.

After discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Nolen moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that the 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. Ehrig seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Nolen moved that the board impose a \$4,500.00 fine plus \$540.00 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

Second: Ms. O'Doski seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Jean Rene Apollon and Creative Designs, Co.

Case Numbers 2018-041829 and 2018-021217

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, and Wirtz

PCP Recommendation: \$4,500.00 plus \$587.40 costs

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the review of the case based on his participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and practicing through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The administrative complaint was hand served on April 15, 2019. The respondent has failed to respond.

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Rivers moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that the 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. O'Doski seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board impose a \$4,500.00 fine plus \$587.40 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

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

DBPR vs. Miguel Jesus Fernandez and One DD Studio, LLC

Case Numbers 2017-053969 and 2017-053972

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, and Rivers

PCP Recommendation: \$5,500.00 plus \$2,322.60 costs

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a three count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license, using the title "architect" without a license, and practicing through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The administrative complaint was hand served on February 13, 2019. The respondent has failed to respond.

After discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Nolen moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that the 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. O'Doski seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Nolen moved that the board impose a \$5,500.00 fine plus \$2,322.60 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

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

DBPR vs. A. Robert Paulding

Case Number 2018-021419

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, and Wirtz

PCP Recommendation: \$5,000.00 fine plus \$812.25 costs

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the review of the case based on his participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a three count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license, using the title "architect" without a license, and using a null and void interior design license.

The administrative complaint was hand served on March 28, 2019. The respondent has failed to respond.

After discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Jernigan moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and that the 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. Nolen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Jernigan moved that the board impose a \$5,000.00 fine plus \$812.25 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

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

DBPR vs. Mario J. Hernandez

Case Number 2013-041550

PCP: Hall, Shore, Toppe, and Rivers

PCP Recommendation: \$4,000.00 fine plus \$622.00 costs

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rivers and Mr. Toppe were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel.

On October 26, 2015 the board issued a final order imposing a \$4,000.00 fine plus costs. In February 2018, a petition was filed with the Circuit Court to enforce agency action. Through the process Mr. Hernandez hired an attorney, new facts were brought forth, and a settlement agreement was signed.

Mr. Minacci requested that the board settle the matter with a \$2,000.00 fine and no costs.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board approve closing the case upon receipt of \$2,000.00 fine.

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

The meeting recessed 12:25 p.m.

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Ritz-Carlton Orlando, Grande Lakes
4012 Central Florida Parkway
Orlando, Florida 32837
Telephone (407) 206-2400**

**July 24, 2019
General Business
9:00 a.m.**

Call to Order

Ms. Bao-Garciga, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and a quorum was established.

Board Members Present:

Miguel Rodriguez
Jonathan Toppe
G. Steven Jernigan
Aida Bao-Garciga, Chair
Holly Dennis
Timothy Nolen
John Ehrig, Vice Chair
Ivette O'Doski
Dylan Rivers

Board Members Absent:

Francisco "Frank" Costoya, unexcused

Others Present:

Robert Milne, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Amanda "Mandie" Ackermann, Executive Director
Terri McEwen, Government Analyst
Melissa Minacci, Investigator
Marketa Hollingsworth
John Strother
Samuel Vazquez, Jr.
Margaret Sims Patrick
Vicki Long, Florida AIA, Executive Vice-President
Thom Banks, CIDQ, Chief Executive Officer
Wanda Gozdz
Other Interested Parties

Court Reporter: Magnolia Court Reporting, Cindy Green, 3213 Hargill Drive Orlando, FL
32806 Telephone 407.896.1813 ReportingOrlando@aol.com

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

Margaret Sims Patrick

Ms. Patrick was not present or represented by counsel at the time her petition and application were reviewed. She arrived later in the meeting.

- **Petition**

After board discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approve the petition based on the fact that she previously provided experience in order to sit for the NCIDQ examination and her many years of private practice which meets the intent of the law.
Second: Mr. Jernigan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

- **Application**

After board discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approve the application as presented.
Second: Mr. Jernigan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Application Review

Charles Nafie – Architect NCARB Endorsement

Mr. Nafie was not present or represented by counsel. The application was before the board based on an affirmative answer to a background question.

After board discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board approve the application for licensure.
Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Marketa Hollingsworth – Interior Design Endorsement

Ms. Hollingsworth was present and sworn in by the court reporter. The application was before the board based on the board's consultant, Mr. Butler, recommending denial of the application for lack of education as required by statutes and rules. Ms. Hollingsworth holds a Bachelor of Architecture and has not graduated from a program in interior design.

Motion: Mr. Jernigan moved to approve the application based on passage of the NCIDQ examination and architecture education.
Second: Ms. Dennis seconded the motion.

After further discussion and review of the statutes and rules, motion was withdrawn.

Ms. Hollingsworth contacted Seminole Community College for an evaluation of her Bachelor's degree to determine what interior design credits would be needed for a minimum two year degree in interior design.

Ms. Hollingsworth waived her application processing rights in order to work with the college and Mr. Butler to satisfy interior design education requirements.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board continue the application until Ms. Hollingsworth's education is satisfied.

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

Kurt Marin – Architect State Endorsement

Mr. Marin was not present or represented by counsel. The application was before the board based on the board's consultant, Mr. Hicks, recommending denial based on the lack of a five year professional NAAB accredited degree as required by statutes and rules.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board deny the application.

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

John Strother – Architect Direct Endorsement

Mr. Strother was present and sworn in by the court reporter. The application was before the board based on the board's consultant, Mr. Hicks, recommending denial based on the lack of a five year professional NAAB accredited degree as required by statutes and rules. Mr. Strother waived his application processing rights and will contact NCARB to gain a certificate.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board continue the application.

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

Samuel Vasquez, Jr. – NCARB Endorsement

Mr. Vasquez, Jr. was present and sworn in by the court reporter. The application was before the board based on prior discipline for unlicensed activity. Mr. Vasquez, Jr. complied with the disciplinary action imposed and the case was closed.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board approve the application for licensure.

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

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2019 – Probable Cause Panel, Tampa, Florida

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

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

May 16-17, 2019 – General Business, Tampa, Florida

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

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

Ratification Lists

Licensure

Architect Licensed by Initial Examination, Architect Licensed by NCARB Examination, Architect Licensed by NCARB Endorsement, Architect Licensed by State Endorsement, Architect Licensed by Direct Endorsement, Architect Licensed by Null and Void Hardship, Architect Business Licensed by Corporation, Partnership, Fictitious Name, and Limited Liability Company, Interior Design Licensed by Endorsement, Interior Design Licensed by Dual Licensure, Interior

Design Business Licensed by Corporation and Limited Liability Company, and Interior Design Business Licensed by Dual Licensure.

Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the vote because he had two licenses on the ratification list.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board ratify the list as presented.
Second: Mr. Rivers seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Continuing Education

Florida Green Building, Halfmoon Education, Inc., Indian River State College, Miami-Dade County of Regulation and Economic Resources, and RedVector.com, Inc.

Motion: Mr. Nolen moved the board ratify the list as presented.
Second: Mr. Ehrig seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Discussion and Correspondence

Thom Banks, Chief Executive Officer with CIDQ, NCIDQ Examination

Mr. Banks was present to review the examination eligibility requirements, provide the passage rate, provide the experience requirements, advise that the examination is computerized including the practicum which is available to applicants nationwide and Canada, provide jurisdictional registration and regulation information, provide an updated definition of interior design, and provide updates to their portal information that is available to member boards.

The board discussed options regarding updating the rule language to allow for additional educational routes to gain interior design licensure. The NCIDQ certificate would be an asset to evaluating education and experience to gain licensure.

NCARB Mutual Recognition Agreement with Canada

Florida licensed architects are being rejected licensure in Canada due to the fact that the Florida Board has not signed the Mutual Recognition Agreement. The board did not sign the agreement due to the change in the examination that is administered in Canada known as the Examination for Architects in Canada (ExAC). The board discussed that the ExAC was not equivalent to the Architecture Registration Exam (ARE) according to NCARB. However, in totality, with education and examination the Canadian exam is considered equivalent according to NCARB.

After board discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that rule 61G1-14.001(1), F.A.C., be noticed for rule development.
Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed with Mr. Ehrig opposed.

Rules Report

Rules Report

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that rules 61G1-14, 61G1-17, 61G-23, 61G1-21, and 61G1-24 be included in the annual regulatory plan.
Second: Mr. Nolen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Rule 61G1-17, Fees

- Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board approve a fee reduction of \$25.00 for all fees over \$50.00.
- Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

SERC language

- Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the rule amendment would not have an adverse impact on small business or be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity, including government, in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within 1 year after the implementation of the rule.
- Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
- Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the rule would not constitute a minor violation and was not applicable.
- Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
- Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved to promulgate the amendment to the rule.
- Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Rule 61G1-23, Responsible Supervisory Control

The board discussed the proposed language and made suggested changes. The board will review the updated language on a future telephone conference call before the October meeting.

Rule 61G1-21, Continuing Education Interior Designers

- Handbook

Rule 61G1-24, Continuing Education Architects

- Handbook

The board discussed separating the provider and licensee information from the handbook and the rule.

Continuing Education Rule Examples

- Construction Rule 61G4-18, F.A.C.
- Building Code Administrators and Inspectors Rule 61G19-9, F.A.C.
- NCARB Continuing Education Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW)

For information purposes only.

Financial Projections for Fee Reductions

For information purposes only.

Reports

Board Chair – Aida Bao-Garciga

No report.

Executive Director's Report – Amanda "Mandie" Ackermann

No report.

AIA Florida – Vicki Long

Ms. Long reported that they were working on and monitoring sea level rise and forms of flooding, monitoring the Florida Building Code updates and revisions, and discussed future board appointments. She advised that updates to the Professional's Guide have stalled.

IDAF – Cynthia David

No report.

ASID – Dave Roberts

No report.

Prosecuting Attorney's Report – David K. Minacci
Prosecutor's Case List Licensed/Unlicensed Cases
Investigator's Case List Licensed/Unlicensed Cases
Fines Chart – Summary
Fines Chart – Unlicensed
Fines Chart – Licensed
Billable Hours – April 2019
Billable Hours – May 2019
Billable Hours – June 2019
Results of the May 2019 Board Meeting

Future Board Meeting Dates and Locations

September 5, 2019, 10:00 a.m.

Telephone Conference Call

October 23-24 - Palm Beach Area

October 23, 2019, 9:00 a.m. Probable Cause Panel

October 24, 2019, 9:00 a.m. General Business

January 30-31, 2020 – North Florida area

January 30, 2020 – Probable Cause Panel

January 31, 2020 – General Business

April 16-17, 2020 – St. Petersburg area

April 16, 2020 – Probable Cause Panel

April 17, 2020 – General Business

July 7-8, 2020 – Palm Beach in conjunction with Florida AIA

July 7, 2020 – Probable Cause Panel

July 8, 2020 – General Business

October 22-23, 2020 – South Florida area

October 22, 2020 – Probable Cause Panel

October 23, 2020 – General Business

New Business

No new business.

Old Business

No old business.

Adjourn

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the meeting be adjourned.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:38 p.m.