

MINUTES

**Board of Architecture and Interior Design
Wyndham Bay Point Resort
4114 Jan Cooley Drive
Panama City, Florida 32408
850.236.6000**

**October 23, 2012
9:00 a.m.**

General Business

Call to Order

Mr. Ehrig, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was established and an invocation performed.

Board Members Present:

John Ehrig, Chair
Miguel "Mike" Rodriguez, Vice-Chair
Jonathan Toppe
Warren Emo
Francisco "Frank" Costoya
Aida Bao-Garciga
Kenan Fishburne
Wanda Gozdz
Emory Johnson

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Dr. Anthony "Tony" Spivey, Executive Director
Terri McEwen, Government Analyst
Steve Jernigan

Court Reporter: Sharon McAllister, Accurate Court Reporters, Inc., 400 W 11th Street, Suite C, Panama City, Florida. Telephone 850.763.0674.

Disciplinary Cases

The following items were handled by a consent agenda because the settlement agreements mirrored the probable cause panel's recommendations.

Settlement Stipulations

Licensed

DBPR vs. Orestes L. Lopez-Recio
Case Number 2011-019126
PCP: Shore, Gozdz, and Hall

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Jeffrey Gilger and S. Jeffrey Gilger Design Services, Inc.
Case Number 2011-040956
PCP: Hall, Shore, and Gozdz

Mr. Rodriguez commented that he was recused from the review of the case 2011-019126 because of a financial relationship with the complainant.

Motion: Mr. Toppe moved that the board place case numbers 2011-019126 and 2011-040956 on a consent agenda.

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

Motion: Ms. Gozdz moved that the board approved case numbers 2011-019126 and 2011-040956 as presented on the consent agenda.

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

Motion for Order Waiving Formal Hearing

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Lesly Gaillard
Case Number 2011-024357
PCP: Shore, Gozdz, and Hall

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Ms. Gozdz is recused from the case based on her participation on the probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on the unlicensed practice of architecture through a contract offering architectural plans for a church. Probable Cause was found to file a one count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license. Service of the administrative complaint was achieved by hand delivery to the respondent on July 24, 2012. The respondent failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

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

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board find that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto.

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

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

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board impose a \$5,000 fine plus costs.
Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Settlement Stipulations

Licensed

DBPR vs. Roy D. Murphy
Case Numbers 2011-061204 and 2011-055294
PCP: Shore, Gozdz, and Hall

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Ms. Gozdz is recused from the case based on her participation on the probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on the respondent signing and sealing plans prepared by unlicensed draftsman. The respondent had been unable to provide proper documentation for signing and sealing drawings prepared outside of his office. In addition, the respondent was offering services through a business without a certificate of authorization which was a second offense. The respondent also violated the successor architect rule.

Probable Cause was found to file a four count administrative complaint for improperly certifying work prepared by another person, aiding the unlicensed practice of architecture, failing to notify the original architect of the intent to use his/her work, and offering architectural services through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel's recommendation was a reprimand, 2 years probation, and a \$15,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects a reprimand, 2 years probation, and a \$2,500 fine plus costs.

The board had issues with the fine amount of the settlement stipulation. Mr. Minacci reviewed the settlement stipulation fines based on licensed versus unlicensed and the probation requirements for licensed individuals.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the respondent had not been forth right with information and had several priors for similar matters. He commented that the board should consider suspending the license then placing the license on probation. He commented that suspending the license would protect the health, safety, and welfare instead of a large monetary fine.

The board discussed the number of projects that the respondent may or may not produce for the review during probation, the prior disciplinary history, and a concern about the fine. The board discussed requesting the respondent appear before the board before acting on the order.

Motion; Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board reject the settlement stipulation.

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

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board counter that the respondent's license be suspended for 2 years, followed by 2 years monitored probation with a minimum of 6 projects every 6 months with expert reviews paid for by the respondent, impose a \$2,500 fine plus costs to be paid by the end of suspension, plus any additional costs imposed due to the continuation of prosecution.

Second: Mr. Emo seconded the motion.

Mr. Johnson commented the second offense listed in the disciplinary guidelines allow for a \$5,000 fine, a 1 year suspension, followed by 2 years probation. Ms. Clark commented that the based on the board rejecting a stipulation and offering a counter stipulation that the respondent could accept or reject the counter offer.

The board discussed that until a final order was entered on this case then the respondent could practice until the case is resolved. Mr. Costoya voiced a concern that the licensee would be able to practice for many years before the case is resolved.

After lengthy discussion regarding how counter stipulations work, the question was called. The motion passed unanimously.

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Don Stevenson Design and Don Stevenson

Case Number 2011-031802

PCP: Shore, Gozdz, and Hall

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Ms. Gozdz was recused from the case based on her participation on the probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on the respondent offering architectural services through a fictitious name without a certificate of authorization.

Probable cause was found to file a one count administrative complaint for practicing architecture through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$5,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$1,000 fine plus costs. The fine was reduced

because the respondent agreed to come into compliance, worked with a license professional, and the violation was an advertising issue.

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

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

Rules

Rules Report

A summary provided for information only. No discussion.

NCIDQ Examination Challenges

NCIDQ agreement for exam administration

E-mails from the public regarding NCIDQ exam review

Mr. Spivey reported that NCIDQ does not allow examination reviews based on individuals received a passing grade then a failed grade based on a computerized error.

Ms. Bao-Garciga commented that based on the complaints received from the public that the board may consider appointing 3 board members to review the examination for the individuals that were affected by this situation.

The board had designated the NCIDQ exam and they are not going to review the examination. The department can offer a review if the department administers the examination. The board is bound by the NCIDQ agreement that does not allow exam reviews.

Mr. Johnson commented that he spoke with Mr. Kenny and Mr. Baker and they reported that the pass then failed notices were a data merge error on June 5, 2012. He commented that NCIDQ offered candidates the ability to retake the examination at no cost. He commented that the NCARB and NCIDQ are the identified examinations approved by the board by rule. Mr. Johnson commented that the Florida Board of Professional Engineers' does not allow the reviews of the practicum examination which is similar to NCIDQ. He commented that the board would have to break the contract or agreement to move away from the NCIDQ.

Mr. Johnson commented that two independent individual's review the practicum examination with the comments and a third independent individual reviews the practicum and based on those three scores determines the outcome. Mr. Johnson was concerned with the lack of response from NCIDQ regarding this item. He commented that NCIDQ was not in the business to teach candidates how to pass the test.

Ms. Fishburne asked if the board needed to clarify the board's position and NCIDQ's portion for the public so they know that the board does not have the ability to review the examination.

Mr. Spivey commented that during the board's efforts to clean up Rule 17.002 (8) it was determined that the language allows for a review when in fact NCIDQ does not. He commented that the board needed to update the rule or leave as it was until they reached a resolution.

Ms. Clark advised that the board was bound by the current agreement with NCIDQ, or the board could get their own exam, or encourage the department to negotiate the NCIDQ agreement. Ms. Bao-Garciga requested that Mr. Johnson ask NCIDQ for a mechanism for the Florida board candidates to be able to review the examination.

Mr. Wirtz commented that the board was talking about reviewing the exam. He commented that NCIDQ gave up the appeal process.

The board discussed the three choices: not use the NCIDQ exam, create an interior design exam, or take concerns to NCIDQ and request that they offer review for Florida candidates only. Ms. Bao-Garciga would like to have a way for the candidate to have the ability to appeal or review the grade which the agreement does not allow for currently.

Ms. Fishburne encouraged Mr. Johnson to voice the board's concerns. She commented that the board should not consider leaving NCIDQ. She commented that they provide a good exam and they are good for the interior design profession even though the candidates or board are not happy about this situation.

Mr. Johnson commented that the board had made every effort to make the candidate's licensure path a direct and easy process but NCIDQ is not online with the board's statutes and rules. The board is required to be online with NCIDQ's requirements.

Mr. Johnson commented that he and Mr. Spivey could lay the ground work for opening the discussions at the upcoming NCIDQ meeting. It would be up to the department to work with NCIDQ on the written agreement.

Mr. Wirtz recommended that staff research prior agreements or contract to determine if there was an appeal process and when it was removed. Ms. Clark commented that department had the power to negotiate with NCIDQ. Mr. Rodriguez commented that rather than challenging the signed agreement, a board member or staff should reach out to other states that require licensure and

utilize the organizations to create change in order to accomplish what the Florida board would like for their candidates.

Mr. Johnson commented that they have the avenue to influence the change needed to assist with the appeal process. NCIDQ has a board of directors and they have a strong voice regarding the agreement and he would be a strong advocate to make the changes through the department's agreement.

After discussion the board determined not to change or repeal Rule 17.002(8), to allow for feedback from the NCIDQ meeting and additional information from the department's negotiations with NCIDQ.

Intern Development Program – Florida interns with a Masters of Architecture

Letter from Ms. Van Aken

Mr. Ehrig presented that when the law changed it changed the requirements for NCARB Intern Development Program (IDP) from two years to three years regardless of the degree earned. Prior to the law change an individual with a Masters degree was required to complete only two years of NCARB IDP to gain Florida Licensure. However, the individual could not gain NCARB certification until they completed three years of NCARB IDP. After additional information the board discussed whether to write a rule to address the issue or let the individual's affected, petition the board for rule waivers.

The board reviewed information from NCARB and the number of exam candidates that were in the internship development program with a Masters degree from November 2007 to current date. Board staff was not able to provide statistical information for candidates that were approved prior to 2007.

The board discussed the outstanding examination candidates that have been in the examination process for many years and notifying them of the law change in an effort to close out old files.

Dr. Spivey recommended that the board create a rule to cover all applicants approved prior to the July 1, 2012 law change that would address the issue. This would allow candidates that were approved under the prior law the ability to be licensed without having to file a rule waiver. Mr. Toppe agreed.

Mr. Ehrig commented that he had an issue with allowing individuals that have a Masters degree to be licensed with two years of IDP without completing all core categories of the program. He was concerned that the interns were not getting the full experienced needed to practice the profession. Candidates licensed in Florida with two years of NCARB IDP will not gain the NCARB certificate until they complete three years of NCARB IDP.

The board discussed the length of time it takes to complete all portions of the exam and the reality of an individual completing all exams within two years based on the wait time required between certain sections of the exam. Based on data it takes candidates multiple years to complete the examination and they would more than likely meet the three years of NCARB IDP or 5600 hours threshold regardless of their degree.

The board discussed being proactive by sending a notification letter to clean up and close out the 1,100 old outstanding records. Ms. Clark advised the board that there was not a mechanism in Chapter 481, F.S., to close approved examination files within a certain number of years like other professions. She commented that she was not aware of the department notifying candidates in the manner the board was discussing. She commented that the board should defer to the department regarding closing the files. Chapter 455.203(10)(a), F.S., gave the department some authority to close deficient files after two years. Ms. Clark was not sure if the department could utilize that law in effort to assist the board with their request.

Mr. Emo commented that the responsibility should be on the applicant to resurrect their dormant file. After further discussion the board determined not to request the department to send a letter.

The board discussed creating rule language to address the individuals with a Masters degree that were approved for examination prior to July 1, 2012 or require candidate's petition for a variance or waiver to the current rule upon completing the exams if they want licensure prior to completing the required NCARB IDP 5600 hours.

Mr. Jernigan asked how individuals would know if they would be eligible for licensure based on the two year requirement or if they would be required to file a rule variance or waiver. Ms. Clark responded that the individuals should be aware of the requirements based on when they made the original application for examination, such as Mr. Van Aken was aware and brought the issue to the board's attention.

Wait for the present language to become effective before noticing the rule development. Upon conclusion of the current rule language effective or hold off until January 2013.

Motion: Ms. Fishburne moved that board notice Rule 13.001 for development.

Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion.

Ms. Clark reviewed the current status of that rule and when it would be effective. She requested that the board wait until the present language in process, becomes effective then move forward with noticing the rule for development.

Ms. Fishburne withdrew her motion and Mr. Rodriguez withdrew his second.

The board discussed letting the current rule language move forward for adoption and require candidates to file a rule variance or waiver as the issues arise on an individual basis.

Rule 61G1-22, F.A.C., Interior Design Experience and Education

Mr. Rodriguez commented that at the last telephone conference call it was brought to light that a portion of the rule for the interior design curriculum was not being utilized and it was more for accreditation purposes. He referred the board to Rule 61G1-22.003(4) and currently that paragraph was not being used in the review of board approved interior design programs.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the board should determine if they want Mr. Butler to consider paragraph four in his review and find a means to comply with that requirement or remove paragraph four as Mr. Butler recommended.

Ms. Clark referred the board to Chapter 481.209(2), F.S. the last paragraph of that section allows the board to adopt rules for the review of programs, schools, and colleges of interior design. Mr. Butler was appointed by the board to perform the reviews for approval as meeting the standards set forth by statutes and rules.

Mr. Johnson commented that Rule 61G1-22.003(2), F.A.C., reflect that the board approval professional standards was based on the professional standards established by CIDA. He commented that the language was in conflict with some recent program approvals by the board. He commented that satellite programs should not be blanket approved.

Mr. Johnson asked for direction regarding Rule 61G1-11.012, F.A.C., which established an education advisory committee to work in conjunction with the consultant.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that he understood the board had statutory authority for the rule. He commented that paragraph four was not being utilized in the review of programs and wanted to have the consultant comply with paragraph four or notice the rule for development and remove paragraph four. He commented that prior reviews were curricular reviews only, not items listed in paragraph four. He commented that he did not want institutions submitting a letter that they meet the requirements of paragraph four. Accreditation requires a site visit which the board does not have the ability to do.

The board discussed the need to have Mr. Butler review programs and the institutions should comply with paragraph four.

Mr. Wirtz commented that when the rule was originally written the board did not want to be an accrediting body. He commented that the board adopted rules to allow for a comparison to the FIDER/CIDA requirements.

The board discussed an education committee that could work with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the statute states the board shall review the curriculum. The board utilized the FIDER/CIDA requirements to write the rule to assist with reviewing the courses. He requested the board strike paragraph four and Mr. Butler agreed. The board does not have the ability to send Mr. Butler to the site visit. The board approval is not accreditation approval.

Mr. Costoya commented that the items in paragraph four were boiler plate language. The board discussed the cost and time for accreditation site visits. Mr. Johnson commented that the language was written to accommodate schools that have two year programs board approved to programs that could not obtain FIDER/CIDA accreditation due to the cost of accreditation. He commented that either Mr. Butler should request and review the items listed in paragraph four or he could work with an educational advisory committee.

The board shall adopt rules for reviewing and approving interior design programs. CIDA does not accredit two or three year programs.

The board determined that Mr. Butler should request the items in paragraph four. The board was not an accredited body and Mr. Butler was reviewing the programs based on criteria set by CIDA which is an accrediting body. Mr. Rodriguez commented that the board did not have the option to only accept CIDA accredited programs based on the law. He commented that he did not see where paragraph four was necessary. He commented that the curriculum was being thoroughly reviewed.

The board requested that Mr. Butler request and review items listed in paragraph four. The education reviews were for non accredited programs.

The board broke for lunch at 12:35 p.m. reconvened at 2:00 p.m.
Ms. Fishburne left the meeting due to illness.

General Discussion

Public Service Announcements (PSA) update

Ms. Poreda was not able to attend and sent her apologies. Mr. Spivey provided an update and reviewed the PSA. He reviewed the timeline and what had happened up to today's date. Mr. Spivey thanked AIA Florida, Vicki Long and Steve Jernigan, for working with the department to sponsor the contest.

The board discussed that there would be an interior design PSA contest forthcoming.

Jonathan Toppe and Miguel Rodriguez were appointed to judge the PSA entries.

Letter from Mr. Sheeley regarding the procedures of issuing citations
Currently Mr. Minacci issues a \$250.00 citation for this offense and there is a rule for notice of non-compliance that allows the licensee 15 days to correct the violation.

Motion: Ms. Gozdz moved that the board instruct Mr. Minacci to issue a notice of non-compliance before issuing a citation.
Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion.

Mr. Johnson commented that he was in favor of issuing citations instead because it is going to take longer than 15 days to correct. He commented he would like to reward the individuals that are doing it properly.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that the web pages are an issue as well because they take time to correct if the company went out of business etc. The question was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gozdz left the meeting at 2:26 p.m. for a scheduled flight.

Monitoring Continuing Education update
Ms. Bao-Garciga would like the board to have 100% continuing education monitoring. Mr. Spivey provided an update on the current monitoring statistics with more than 80% compliance. It would cost in excess of \$370,000 to perform a 100% continuing education monitoring for the board.

Mr. Rodriguez commented that AIA Florida challenged the rule for 100% monitoring. Secretary Carr wrote an exception for this profession.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that Mr. Spivey request a waiver from the 100% continuing education monitoring from the department due to a burden of costs and a burden on licensees.
Second: Mr. Costoya seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Apply Now – Streamline applications
Application for Threshold Building Inspector Certification
Application for Individual Reactivation - architect
Architect Seeking Licensure as Interior Designer
Application for Certificate of Authorization – architecture
Application for Licensure by Endorsement – architecture
Application for Individual Maintenance Form
Application for Business Maintenance Form

Application for Reinstatement of a Null and Void License
Application for Licensure by Exam – interior designer
Application for Individual Reactivation – interior designer
Application for Licensure by Endorsement – interior design
Application for Certificate of Authorization – interior design

The board was provided a copy of the current applications and the updated applications. Mr. Spivey reviewed the applications and explained the Apply Now process to streamline the applications at the Governor's direction to make it easier to transact business in Florida. Mr. Johnson voiced a concern regarding foreign graduates and foreign corporations. Ms. McEwen explained the different applications as one was for an individual and one was for a company with directions on how to register with the Department of State as a foreign corporation.

Mr. Minacci voiced a concern about the certificate of authorization application and the deletion of questions regarding offering services prior to licensure. He explained that a citation was issued for prior practice. Mr. Spivey commented that the purpose was to get individuals in compliance with the law not penalize them for applying for the license.

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

July 16, 2012 – Probable Cause Panel (ratify)

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board ratify the probable cause panel meeting minutes.

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

July 17-18, 2012 – General Business Palm Beach, Florida

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

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

August 21, 2012 – Telephone Conference Call

Correction - Mr. Johnson was present at the meeting.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board approve the meeting minutes as corrected.

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

September 25, 2012 – Telephone Conference Call

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

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

Ratification List(s)

Licensure

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board approve the July 7, 2012 through October 1, 2012 licensure ratification list as published in the agenda.

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

Continuing Education

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the board approve list as published on in the agenda.

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

Reports

Board Correspondence

Items were mentioned previously talked about in the agenda and were reviewed with the discussion items. An example was the Van Aken letter.

Chair's Report – John Ehrig

Thanked AIA Florida for their assistance with updating and completing the changes to clean up the statutory and rule language. He reported that the board members and executive director were 00able to attend the national meetings. He commented that the new language will assist with processing applicants and be in line with NCARB requirements. He thought the PSA was helpful with to the public and unlicensed activity. He was excited about the PSA for interior designers.

Executive Director's Report – Tony Spivey

Financials for the period ending June 30, 2012

Mr. Spivey confirmed the board's balance of \$668,111. Mr. Johnson commented that there was a significant increase in the Attorney General's Office and the Bureau of Education and Testing. He commented the administrative costs and information technology costs were decreased by almost 50%. He commented that the board had come a long way with the budget and commended the board office for their efforts.

Ms. McEwen reported that she was working with the renewal unit to obtain updated information for business items such as current qualifier information, responsible supervisor, license consolidation, etc. during the upcoming renewal cycle. This will assist with portal inquiries.

Department/board providing free continuing education

AIA Report – Vicki Long

Mr. Steve Jernigan provided the AIA Florida report to the board. He reported that they would be proactive in the advocacy area with the Legislature regarding the regulatory body and the licensing requirements.

Mr. Jernigan reported that they were working with eight other states regarding NCARB and working with them, he commented that AIA would be proactive in the approach regarding the changes to Chapter 481 with the Master's degree and intern development program.

Mr. Ehrig thanked the board of directors and appreciated the funding for the PSA.

IDAF – Doug Feldman
No report. It will be forthcoming.

ASID – Dave Roberts
Mr. Roberts, Governmental Affairs Consultant, with Akerman Senterfitt law firm reported that he would work to obtain funding for interior design PSA and he would attend future meetings.

Prosecuting Attorney's Report – David K. Minacci
Open Licensed/Unlicensed Cases
Fines Chart – Summary
Fines Chart – Unlicensed
Fines Chart – Licensed
Billable Hours June 2012
Billable Hours July 2012
Billable Hours August 2012
Board Meeting Results July Board Meeting
Press Releases/Speaking Engagements/Other Correspondence
Tenth Annual Report

No discussion.

Elections

Chair/Vice-Chair

Motion: Mr. Toppe nominated Mr. Ehrig for Chair and Mr. Rodriguez as Vice-Chair.

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

Future Board Meetings

The board set a December 4, 2012, at 2:00 p.m. telephone conference call.

Hilton Historic Bayfront
32 Avenida Menedez
St. Augustine, Florida 32084
January 23, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

January 24-25, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – General Business Meeting

Embassy Suites Ft. Lauderdale – 17th Street
1100 Southeast 17th Street
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316
954.315.1314

May 15, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

May 16-17, 2013, 9:00 a.m. – General Business Meeting

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

No old business.

Adjourn

Motion: Mr. Costoya moved that the meeting adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:13 p.m.