

MINUTES
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE AND INTERIOR DESIGN

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL

March 9, 2009

10:00 a.m. Eastern Time

Toll Free 888.808.6959 Conference Code 9218690

Call to Order

Ms. Shore called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Roll Call – identify excused absences

Board Members Present:

Joyce Shore
John Ehrig
E. Wendell Hall
Rossana Dolan
Eric Kuritzky
Lourdes Solera
Mary Jane Grigsby
Garrick Gustafson
Wanda Gozdz

Board Members Absent:

Roymi Membiela, excused

Others Present:

Mary Ellen Clark, Board Counsel
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Anthony Spivey, Executive Director
Tim Vaccaro, Division Director
Maureen Olson, Deputy Secretary
Charlie Liem, Chief of Staff
Steve Jernigan, AIA Florida
Vicki Long, AIA Florida
Emory Johnson
Janice Young
Peter Chorman
Michael Liederfell

Application Review

Peter Michael Chorman

Mr. Chorman was present. The application was before the board based on state endorsement. Mr. Chorman was licensed in New York by examination with a Bachelor of Science degree. He reported to the board that he was a Professor and taught architectural courses. Mr. Chorman does not meet Florida education requirements for licensure.

Mr. Chorman provided his education and experience for licensure in New York and current projects. He commented that his experience made up for the five year education requirement. He suggested some changes to the application instruction sheet. Ms. Chastain commented that the department was working on an application streamlining processing.

The board discussed that there was proposed legislative language that may assist Mr. Chorman in the future.

Mr. Chorman requested to withdraw his application.

Discussion

Senate Bill 1542

Ms. Chastain commented that the Bill language was on the agenda for review. She commented that the board should not take a position on the language because the language was subject to change through the Legislative process. She informed the board that AIA Florida monitored all Bills that impact Chapter 481, Florida Statutes.

Mr. Ehrig commented that the proposed language reduced the education requirements and he was not in favor of that change because it was not in the best interest in the public health, safety, and welfare.

Mr. Jernigan commented that AIA Florida through a Committee headed by Miguel Rodriguez to formulate a written position paper on the issue. He commented that they wanted to preserve the high standards but provide a reasonable alternate.

Mr. Johnson commented that the board was requesting associations and organizations to carry forward the protection of the public. He commented that the department should represent the board's position; not the associations or organizations.

Mr. Ehrig commented that he did not feel the board had the ability to lobby this aspect but requested the department's support in voicing the board's concern regarding the proposed legislation.

Ms. Chastain commented that she would take the board's concerns to the Department's Legislative Affairs Office.

Mr. Kuritzky commented that there should be an avenue for individuals like Mr. Chorman that had many years of experience but not the minimum education. He commented that many years of experience was as valuable as education. He commented that he would like an avenue available beyond NCARB's BEA program for the board to review and evaluate an

individual's experience plus education to determine their ability to practice the profession. He commented that 20 plus years experience was as valuable as a five year degree in architecture. He commented that he would have more confidence in an individual that had practiced the profession for 20 plus years than a new graduate that took and passed the examination for licensure.

Ms. Long commented that AIA Florida did not have a position paper. She commented that they felt there was an area for compromise. She commented that the board members could lobby the Legislature.

Ms. Clark reviewed her letter of March 2004 regarding the board lobbying the Legislature.

Mr. Ehrig commented that education, experience, and examination were the minimum requirements for licensure. He commented that his concern was with the proposed language reducing the education requirements that were in place for many years. He commented that the education requirements were established more than 16 years ago and he could not support reducing the licensing standards.

Ms. Clark commented that the requirement for the five year degree had been in place since 1969.

Mr. Vaccaro commented that the board should not take an official position on the Bill because the Bill could change multiple times before the end of session. He commented that the board's concerns about the changes to the education requirements would be reported to the Department's Legislative Affairs Office.

Mr. Kuritzky commented that the law had minimum requirements but too much emphasis was on the education and the board should have a route to allow for evaluation of experience over the minimum interior development program. He commented that he was glad to see AIA Florida working to reach a compromise with the evaluation of experience with education for individuals that had been licensed in the profession a long time.

New Business

Mr. Liem addressed the board regarding the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID) and the Interior Design Protection Council (IDPC). He reported that the IDPC is pushing for Florida to repeal or soften the interior design statute. He commented that there was a Bill regarding office furniture, commercial furniture, etc. that was a small part of the movement.

Mr. Liem reported that the Institute for Justice with a host of national support was backing the change regarding the statute. He commented that the Institute for Justice and the IDPC had targeted Mr. and Mrs. Chastain's personal relationship on a national level since Mrs. Chastain was the Executive Director of the board and Mr. Chastain worked as an Investigator for the board's Prosecuting Attorney. Mr. Liem commented that there was no ethical violation or lapse however the Secretary would like to change the Executive Director for the board so their relationship was not debated on a national level. He commented that they would rather any issues be debated on the regulation of the board and profession.

Ms. Shore commented that Ms. Chastain had no involvement in the decision making regarding disciplinary action or procedures.

Mr. Liem reported to the board that Ms. Chastain was being moved to the Electrical Contractors Licensing Board (ECLB) and presented Mr. Anthony Spivey as the new Executive Director for the Board of Architecture and Interior Design.

Ms. Shore commented that she is disappointed about Ms. Chastain leaving but was excited about Mr. Spivey's appointment.

Mr. Kurtizky commented that if the change protected the integrity of the board he understood the reason for the change.

Ms. Young commented that Ms. Chastain was an excellent representative of the board and she understood the reason for the change as well. She commented that IDPC and the Institute of Justice was not targeting just interior design but the deregulation of Chapter 481, Florida Statutes. She commented that IDPC and the Institute for Justice were interrelated and commonly funded. She commented that they were explained in detail that there were no conflicts with the working relationship between Mr. and Mrs. Chastain.

Mr. Liem commented that he was aware of them targeting the space planning and interior design. He commented that the department does not have a position on the issue with IDPC or the Institute for Justice. He commented that he was not aware of any language to deregulate the profession.

Mr. Liem thanked the board for their support with the Executive Director change.

The board was disappointed to hear Ms. Chastain was leaving and thanked her for service.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board confirm Mr. Spivey's appointment as the Board of Architecture and Interior Design's Executive Director.

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

Mr. Johnson commented that the department could provide factual information to IDPC and that information would not be posted in their publications. He commented that removing Ms. Chastain from the board would not eliminate the cross fire from IDPC but just target Mr. Spivey in her place.

Mr. Ehrig requested an update on the proposed changes regarding the board's General Counsel.

Mr. Liem reported that as part of the department's budgetary review process a suggestion was made to transfer the board's counsel support to the department. He commented that it was proposed that the department could manage that support function more efficiently. He commented that the Attorney General's cost has increased beyond the department's budget. He commented that last year the Legislature did not allow a department increase to cover the cost. He commented that the department completed a cost analysis and if the staff providing the board counsel services was housed in the department, the department could provide those

services within the department's budgetary limits and it was presented to the Legislature. He reported that some boards were not happy with the counsel services they received from the Attorney General's Office.

The board expressed that they were pleased with Ms. Clark's service.

Mr. Liem commented that he did not believe the budgetary issue would result in the board's counsel changing. He commented that the department was working with the Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Kuritzky commented that engineers were taking over construction projects without the input of an architect. He voiced a concern for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare.

The board tentatively set a telephone conference call April 9, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.

Old Business

No old business.

Adjourn

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board meeting adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.