

# **MINUTES**

## **Board of Architecture and Interior Design**

**Gaylord Palms  
6000 W Osceola Parkway  
Kissimmee, Florida 34746  
407.586.0000**

**May 10, 2010  
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 a prayer performed. Mr. Ehrig welcomed Mr. Johnson to the board as a new member.

#### Board Members Present:

Eric Kuritzky  
Joyce Shore  
Wendell Hall  
Emory Johnson  
John Ehrig  
Wanda Gozdz  
Rossana Dolan  
Aida Bao-Garciga  
Garrick Gustafson

#### Board Members Absent:

Lourdes Solera, excused

#### Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel  
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney  
Anthony Spivey, Executive Director  
Terri Estes, Government Analyst  
Trent Manausa  
Janice Young  
Other interested parties

Court Reporter: Letha Wheeler & Associates, 1308 Wall Street, Eustis, FL  
32726. Telephone 352.589.8852

## **Disciplinary Cases**

### *Motion to Modify or Reconsider*

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. GERAL POORMAN and G. WILLIAM ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.  
Case Number 2008-039597

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Poorman was present and sworn in by the court reporter and represented by Eric Triveti. Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. Mr. Minacci requested that the board reduce the amount of the fine. The case was originally brought before the board for a three count administrative complaint and the respondent signed a settlement agreement reflecting a \$15,000 fine plus costs.

Mr. Triveti commented that Mr. Poorman was not financially able to pay the \$15,000 fine plus costs and was not aware of the consequences of signing the settlement stipulation in an effort to comply with the board's statutes. He commented that a \$5,000 fine plus costs was difficult but that amount was reasonable.

Mr. Minacci requested that the board impose a \$5,000 fine plus costs and the case be closed.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board impose a \$5,000 fine plus costs to close the case.

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

### **Locke vs. Board**

Update from Jon Glogau

Appeal – Brief from Appellants, Interior Design Amicus Brief, and Interior Design Notice of Appearance

Mr. Glogau briefed the board on the appeal process. He reported that three amicus briefs were filed in support of the plaintiff but they typically do not affect the outcome of the case and every person should have their say.

Mr. Glogau commented that the briefs address Freedom of Speech, the Commerce Clause, and the rationale of the statute.

Mr. Glogau reported that he would have a response prepared by the end of the week.

Mr. Glogau commented that Judge Hinkle recognized the distinction between interior decorating and interior design based on the building codes in commercial settings. The board has the ability to interpret the statutes.

The board thanked Mr. Glogau for his work on the lawsuit.

Motion for Final Order

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. David Randall Young / Designs & Permit Drawings LTD

Case Number 2009-042904

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on an advertising case for commercial design. A two count administrative complaint was filed for practicing architecture without a license and offering architectural services through a business entity without a license.

The respondent requested a hearing before the Division of Administrative Hearings. The Administrative Law Judge relinquished jurisdiction to the board based on no disputed facts in the case. The case is based on Chapter 481.229(1)(c), F.S. exemptions for buildings costing less than \$25,000 except for schools, auditorium, or other buildings intended for public use.

Mr. Minacci commented that a building intended for public use is a building that the public can access of a street. He commented that an Administrative Law Judge issued an opinion that essentially agreed with his interpretation.

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

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

Mr. Young was present and sworn in by the court reporter. He commented that he reviewed the statutes and building codes. He commented that he was not able to locate a definition of public use in the statutes but located one in the legal dictionary. He reviewed the building code that changed and eliminated him from being allowed to do small commercial buildings.

Ms. Clark commented that his advertisement did not place the exemptions that he quoted. She commented that his advertisement reflected permit drawings for small commercial jobs. She commented that he did not clarify the limitations on his advertisements.

The board reviewed the definitions of architecture and the exemptions/exceptions. Mr. Young reviewed the building code that allowed

individuals to prepare drawings for buildings costing less than \$50,000. Mr. Young commented that the definition of public use was not consistent between the board's interpretation of the statutes and the building code.

The board discussed how Mr. Young obtained work, pulled permits and received approval for his drawings. Mr. Young commented that he researched the statutes and codes and that the definition of public use should be looked at in more depth for clarification. After board discussion the following motion was made.

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

The probable cause panel recommended a \$5,000 fine plus costs. The case was based solely on an advertisement.

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved that the board impose a \$1,000 fine plus costs.  
Second: Ms. Gozdz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Young requested more time to pay the fine.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board allow Mr. Young 12 months to pay the fine and costs.  
Second: Ms. Gozdz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### Motion for Final Order

Licensed

DBPR vs. Faulkner A. Eyo and DZN International, Inc.  
Case Number 2008-068062  
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. The case was before the board based on the respondent contracting to offer architectural services for a commercial building, was paid, and did not provide complete or corrected drawings for permitting. The plans were rejected by the fire/building department multiple times. A one count administrative complaint was filed for misconduct in the practice of architecture.

The respondent elected a formal hearing with the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH). DOAH relinquished jurisdiction to the board because Mr. Eyo failed to respond to the requests for discovery submissions.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$3,000 fine plus costs, one year suspension, and two years probation.

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

Mr. Eyo was present and sworn in by the court reporter. Mr. Eyo commented that the complaint was filed by the client's daughter not the client. He reviewed the contract and what was required in the contract. Portions of the tape were inaudible.

Mr. Eyo commented that he moved during the complaint and hearing process. After discussion regarding the permitting process, the circumstances surrounding the drawings, and the lack of response to the board or the Division of Administrative Hearings the following motions were made.

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

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved that the board impose a \$1,000 fine plus costs, one year probation, two years probation with reporting every six months.  
Second: Ms. Gozdz seconded the motion.

Mr. Eyo requested that the board not suspend his license because he had practiced for 16 years without an incidence and this was a first offense. After discussion the following amended motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved that the board impose a reprimand, \$1,000 fine plus costs, and two years probation.  
Second: Ms. Gozdz seconded the motion, it passed with Mr. Hall, Ms. Shore, and Mr. Kuritzky opposed.

Mr. Minacci requested that the following cases be handled by a Consent Agenda.

### Settlement Stipulations

Licensed

DBPR vs. Jamie Ledo  
Case Nubmer 2008-038499  
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Gregorio Batista and G. Batista Associates  
Case Number 2009-033209  
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

DBPR vs. Cheree Roberts and SW3 Consultants, Inc.  
Case Number 2009-034683  
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Motion: Ms. Gozdz moved that the board approve the settlement stipulations as presented.  
Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the cases based on participation with the probable cause panel.

Voluntary Relinquishment

DBPR vs. James W. Jones  
Case Number 2009-041613  
Mr. Minacci presented the case and commented that the complainant withdrew the complaint and the licensee decided to relinquish his license.

After board discussion the board voted to accept the voluntary relinquishment of Mr. Jones' license.

Motion for Order Waiving Formal Hearing

Licensed

DBPR vs. Shelly O. Landry  
Case Number 2006-063992  
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Neil Hall  
Mr. Johnson was recused from the review of the case based on his participation with the probable cause panel. Ms. Landry was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the respondent failing to comply with a final order entered in 2006. A one count administrative complaint was filed for violating a lawful order of the board. Service of the administrative complaint was attempted by hand delivery but was successful by publishing a notice in the Capital City Press. The respondent failed to respond.

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

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

that the board adopt the findings of fact as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

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

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

Motion: Mr. Wendell Hall moved that the board revoke the license.

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

#### Unlicensed

DBPR vs. David Lee Cogswell and David Lee Cogswell House & Garden Décor  
Case Number 2009-018931

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Minacci requested that the case be pulled from the agenda due to a noticing issue.

DBPR vs. Cesar Magnorsky and European Onyx, LLC

Case Numbers 2007-045164 and 2007-045200

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Minacci requested that the case be pulled from the agenda.

DBPR vs. Miami Architect Designs, Inc. and Angel D. Gamboa

Case Number 2008-036428

PCP: Rodriguez and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the respondent offering architectural services on a web site and offering architectural services through a business entity without a license. A three count administrative complaint was filed for practicing architecture without a license, using the title architect without a license, and offering architectural services through a business entity without a certificate of authorization. Service was achieved by hand delivery February 17, 2010.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs.

Motion: Ms. Gozdz moved that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to be heard for failure to timely respond thereto; further that the board adopt the findings of fact as set forth in the administrative complaint.

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

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

Ms. Clark commented that this was an advertising violation and had Mr. Minacci received a response a cease and desist order would have been issued as opposed to the fine. Mr. Minacci commented that the respondent's attorney failed to respond. After board discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved that the board impose a \$6,000 fine plus costs.  
Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### Motion for Final Order

Licensed

DBPR vs. David Beatty  
Case Number 2009-019508  
PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the respondent signing and sealing residential plans with a suspended license and without meeting with the client. The respondent requested a formal hearing with DOAH however jurisdiction was relinquished to the board because the respondent did not respond to requests for discovery.

A three count administrative complaint was filed for plan stamping, using an architectural license while suspended, and signing and sealing plans that do not conform to acceptable architectural practice standards.

The probable cause panel recommended a reprimand, \$3,000 fine plus costs, and two years probation.

Mr. Beatty is located in South Carolina and teaches the architecture and interior design profession. After board discussion the following motions were made.

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

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved that the board impose a reprimand, \$3,000 fine plus costs, one year suspension after the current suspension ends, and two years probation.  
Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### Settlement Stipulations

Unlicensed

DBPR vs. Fred Hatfield / Gamble & Associates Construction, Inc.

Case Number 2009-038831

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the fact that the respondent contracted to offer architectural services for a church project without a license. A two count administrative complaint was filed 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 a \$2,500 fine plus costs. The fine was reduced because this was a first time offense and the subject agreed to come into compliance.

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

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

DBPR vs. Kerby Glenn

Case Number 2009-004683

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the respondent using the title Master Architect on his letterhead without a license. A one count administrative complaint was filed for using the title architect without a license.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$2,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflects a \$1,000 fine plus costs. The fine was reduced because this was a first offense and Mr. Minacci met with the respondent and explained the laws and rules.

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

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

DBPR vs. Adolfo Perez-Llana

Case Number 2008-011579

PCP: Rodriguez, Wirtz, and Gustafson

Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Johnson were recused from the review of the case based on participation with the probable cause panel. The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. The case was before the board based on the fact that the respondent contracted to offered architectural services for a country club without a license. A three count administrative complaint was filed for practicing architecture without a license, using the title architect without a license, and offering architectural service through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

The probable cause panel recommended a \$15,000 fine plus costs. The settlement stipulation reflected a \$2,500 fine plus costs. The fine was reduced because this was a first offense, financial hardship, and the subject agreed to comply.

Motion: Mr. Kuritzky moved that the board reject the settlement stipulation and offer a counter stipulation in the amount of a \$1,000 fine plus costs.

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

#### **New Business**

No new business.

#### **Old Business**

No old business.

#### **Recess**

The meeting recessed at 1:05 p.m.

# **MINUTES**

## **Board of Architecture and Interior Design**

**Gaylord Palms  
6000 W Osceola Parkway  
Kissimmee, Florida 34746  
407.586.0000**

**May 11, 2010  
9:00 a.m.**

### **General Business**

#### **Call to Order**

Mr. Ehrig, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and a quorum was established.

#### **Board Members Present:**

Eric Kuritzky  
Joyce Shore  
Wendell Hall  
Emory Johnson  
John Ehrig  
Wanda Gozdz  
Rossana Dolan  
Aida Bao-Garciga  
Garrick Gustafson  
Lourdes Solera

#### **Others Present:**

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel  
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney  
Anthony Spivey, Executive Director  
Terri Estes, Government Analyst  
Trent Manausa  
Janice Young  
Jorge Trelles  
Vicki Long  
Richard Logan  
Other interested parties

Court Reporter: Letha Wheeler & Associates, 1308 Wall Street, Eustis, FL  
32726. Telephone 352.589.8852

## **Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes**

January 27, 2010 Probable Cause Panel Meeting Minutes

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

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

## **Request for Waiver/Variance of Rule 61G1-22.002(1), F.A.C. (VW2010-139) and application review**

Stephanie Hellstrom – interior design endorsement

Ms. Shore commented that Ms. Hellstrom had the required education, provided proof that she passed the NCIDQ examination, and provided documented work experience. She commented that the experience was not in the usual format but was acceptable.

Motion: Ms. Shore moved that the board grant the petition for waiver of Rule 61G1-22.002(1), F.A.C.

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

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board approve her application for licensure by endorsement.

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

## **Request for Waiver/Variance of Rule 61G1-13.0021, F.A.C. (VW2010-180) and application review**

Jorge L. Trelles – architecture examination

Mr. Trelles was present and sworn in by the court reporter. Luis Trelles was present to answer questions regarding his mentorship of Mr. Jorge Trelles. He commented that he was devoted to the practice of architecture, taught for 20 years, and brought his mentors with him. He commented that he passed all the examination parts in 1987 but did not complete the intern development program through NCARB. He commented that the board administered the intern program at the time he began the examination process.

Ms. Estes explained that Mr. Trelles was no longer able to register with NCARB for Intern Development Program because he missed the June 2009 deadline. She explained that he would be required to begin the intern program from today's date and none of the past experience would count towards the three year required internship.

Ms. Clark commented that the board should be prepared to expect more requests from individuals for acceptance of their internship not completed through NCARB.

Mr. Luis Trelles, Architect, comment that he was Mr. Jorge Trelles' brother and his mentor. He commented that he was the mentor and supervisor of many interns that gained licensure in Florida. He commented that their family business/firm balances teaching and practicing architecture. He commented that life got in the way of submitting and completing the intern paperwork during the intern process.

Ms. Solera commented that she was familiar with the firms work and she would not object to granting the waiver based on the in depth documents provided.

After board discussion the following motions were made.

Motion: Ms. Dolan moved that the board grant the waiver based on the Intern Development Program periodic assessment reports submitted, the testimony given today by his mentor, Mr. Trelles' deep involvement in the profession through teaching and 20 years of experience under supervision.

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

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

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

### **Application Review**

Ronald Treharne

Mr. Treharne was present and sworn in by the court reporter. The board reviewed the additional information regarding his experience obtained after graduation.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board approve Mr. Treharne's application for licensure.

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

### **Continuing Education Application Review**

Breaking Ground Contracting dba LEED Green Associate Intense

The board discussed the value of the studying for the LEED examination and the lack of a detailed syllabus. The course taught an individual to take the examination. Mr. Ehrig commented that if an individual benefited from preparing for the LEED examination and the individual gained knowledge then it should be approved for credit.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board approve the course for eight hours of optional credit.

Second: Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, it passed with Ms. Shore, Mr. Kuritzky, Ms. Dolan, and Mr. Gustafson opposed.

## **Ratification Lists**

### Licensure

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board approve the licensure ratification list as presented in the agenda.

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

### Continuing Education

Motion: Ms. Solera moved that the board approve the continuing education ratification list as presented in the agenda.

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

## **General Discussion and Information**

### NCIDQ – broadly experienced interior designer

Ms. Shore reported that NCIDQ considered discontinuing route five which allowed for individuals to take the test with 40 semester hours of school and experience. She reported that NCDIQ researched creating an avenue for individuals based on experience only and requiring an additional test. Florida does not recognize either avenue for examination or licensure.

### NCIDQ – sponsored work experience verification

Ms. Shore reported that this was a new form for individuals that are self employed or sponsored to verify their work experience. The board discussed the sponsored work experience verification as an avenue for individuals applying from other states.

### Bylaws of NCIDQ, Revised November 15, 2008

For information only.

### Public and other professions' perception on architects

Mr. Kuritzky commented that the architecture profession was being diminished by the engineering profession and the building departments. He commented that he was concerned because draftsmen and engineers are creating plans that should be drawn by an architect and the municipalities are interpreting the building codes to allow this to continue.

Mr. Logan, President Florida AIA, reported that the association was collaborating with the Building Officials Association of Florida to create a white paper that distinguishes what duties architects and engineers perform and their overlap. He commented that defining incidental practice was an issue but the building officials were willing to work on the document to help clear the gray areas in the statutes.

Mr. Johnson requested that the interior designer's be included in the discussion with the white paper.

## **Rules Report and Discussion**

### **Rules Report**

Ms. Clark reported that Rule 61G1-12.004, F.A.C., disciplinary rule - failure to timely report, being convicted of a crime, pleading guilty, etc. as all violations listed in the statute.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board adopt the proposed language presented and the rule would not impact small business.

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

Ms. Clark reported that Rule 61G1-12.005, F.A.C., citation rule - failure to timely report, being convicted of a crime, pleading guilty, etc. as all violations listed in the statute.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board adopt the proposed language presented and the rule would not impact small business.

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

Ms. Clark reported that Rule 61G1-21.003, F.A.C., continuing education handbook, included technical changes and ready for adoption this week.

Ms. Clark reported on a Bill that passed regarding the Joint Administrative Procedures Act and rule changes. She commented that she was not sure if the Governor signed the Bill it was recommended that he Veto the Bill. She commented that the Bill would require a Statement of Regulatory Costs for all rules and be completed by a third party instead of department staff. Then the Legislature would have to approve the rule change.

## **Addendum**

### **Reinstatement of Null and Void License due to Illness or Undue Hardship**

Randall W. Pinchot

Mr. Pinchot was not present or represented by counsel. After board discussion regarding the hardship and the required continuing education hours, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board approve the application based on the continuing education courses provided and the documented hardship.

The motion died due to no second. After further discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Gustafson moved that the board approve the reinstatement based on the documented hardship but contingent upon proof of the Florida Building Code four hour core course and two two-hour advanced courses within 30 days.

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

Michael Segal

Mr. Segal was not present or represented by counsel. After board discussion regarding the hardship and the required continuing education hours, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Johnson moved that the board deny the reinstatement application based on lack of documentation of hardship.

Second: Mr. Hall seconded the motion and the motion failed.

Ms. Clark commented that the board had been generous with interior design applicants that would not qualify to regain licensure due to the grandfathering provision.

Motion: Mr. Hall moved that the board approve the request for reinstatement based on his explanation provided regarding his hardship.

Second: Mr. Kuritzky seconded the motion, it passed with Mr. Hall opposed.

Letter from Destry Darr Designs, Inc. regarding case 2006-004400

Mr. Johnson requested that he be recused from the discussion. Ms. Clark commented that the board did not have the authority or jurisdiction to grant their request. She commented that they are requesting that the final order entered July 7, 2008 be vacated based on the lawsuit. She commented that the appeal should have been filed within 30 days of the entry of the final order. She commented that at the time the final order was entered the counts were violations of the statute.

The board discussed their direction to Mr. Minacci to remove interior design cases from his web site when the case related to the use of the title interior designer for residential applications. Ms. Clark commented that the unlicensed case could not be expunged from the record. Mr. Minacci recommended handling future requests on a case by case basis and researched the underlying allegations. He commented that he would remove the case from his web site.

## **General Discussion and Information**

NCARB IDP Update and NCARB Resolutions – John Ehrig

Mr. Ehrig reported that he and Mr. Kuritzky would attend the June 2010 NCARB Conference in San Francisco, CA. He reported that he requested that Mr. Spivey be approved to attend the Conference as well.

Mr. Ehrig reported that NCARB was researching eliminating or modifying the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect Program and briefly reviewed the resolutions.

Electronic signing and sealing documents

E-mail from Donald Morris

Ms. Estes reported that the board office receives calls continually about a more user friendly electronic signing and sealing program as well as a stamp. Ms. Young commented that federal jobs only accept electronic signing and sealing.

## **Reports**

Chair's Report – John Ehrig

No report.

Executive Director's Report – Tony Spivey

Financial Report Ending December 31, 2009

Mr. Spivey reviewed the financial report and reported that there would be additional cash sweeps of the account.

AIA Report – Vicki Long

Ms. Long reported on the Legislative Session. She reported that Florida AIA supported the privatization of the board's prosecutorial contract. She reported that they have been requesting that appointments be made to the board as soon as possible. She reported that they continue to oppose Amendment 4.

Ms. Long reported that they receive telephone calls from architects regarding problems with building departments.

Ms. Long reported that the Executive Director of AIA National resigned.

Ms. Long commented that the board's role was to regulate the profession and AIA's role was to advocate on behalf of their membership. They are directed from the National level regarding policies, task forces, etc. She commented that Florida AIA brings information to the board as a courtesy to continue to build rapport. She requested that the board treat the volunteers that attend the meeting to provide those reports with professional respect.

A report was given on Florida AIA's efforts regarding IDP called Career Building Blocks. They met with the education institutions along with NCARB. The board was informed about a newsletter called the EpiGram.

IDAF – Janice Young

Ms. Young reported that IDAF was a coalition not a professional interior design association. IDAF's role is educating the public, working with licensees, working with students and educators regarding licensure in Florida.

Ms. Young reported that IDAF may file an amicus brief in response to the lawsuit.

General Counsel's Report – Mary Ellen Clark

No report.

Prosecuting Attorney's Report – David K. Minacci

Licensed Architecture Legal Cases

Licensed Interior Design Legal Cases

Unlicensed Architecture Legal Cases

Unlicensed Interior Design Legal Cases

Licensed/Unlicensed Investigative Cases

Fines Chart – Summary

Fines Chart – Licensed

Fines Chart – Unlicensed

Billable Hours January 2010

Billable Hours February 2010

Billable Hours March 2010

Board Meeting Results January 28, 2010

Press Releases/Speaking Engagements/Other Correspondence

### **Future Board Meetings**

The board scheduled a telephone conference call June 17, 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

August 16, 2010 Probable Cause Panel Meeting

August 17-18, 2010 General Business Meeting

Location: Ponte Vedra, Florida

November 1, 2010 Probable Cause Panel Meeting

November 2-3, 2010 General Business Meeting

Location: Naples, Florida

### **New Business**

The board briefly discussed the procedures board members would follow to audit continuing education courses.

### **Old Business**

No old business.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.