

MINUTES

BOARD OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
850.413.9245 OR TOLL FREE 877.651.3473**

**GENERAL BUSINESS MEETING
MARCH 12, 2004**

Call To Order

Mr. Davis called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Members Present

Paul Davis, Chairman
Phil Graham
Elizabeth Gillick, Vice Chair
Elizabeth Marshall-Beasley
Collene Walter

Others Present

Barbara Edwards, Board Counsel
Brian Higgins, Prosecuting Attorney
Juanita Chastain, Executive Director
Terri Estes, Government Analyst
Linda Tinsley, Government Analyst
Andrea Beacraft
Frederic Stresau
Paul Gibbs
Daniel Suggs
Dana McClain

Application Review

Daniel Suggs

Ms. Estes presented the application to the board and stated that the applicant had originally been licensed in Florida and the license went null and void. The application was before the board because he had been practicing with a null and void license.

Mr. Suggs was present and Ms. Edwards asked the Chair, Mr. Davis to swear him in.

Ms. Edwards asked Mr. Suggs if his South Carolina license was current.

Mr. Suggs stated that it was.

Ms. Gillick asked Mr. Suggs how his South Carolina license renewal was forwarded to him and the Florida renewal was not.

Mr. Suggs stated that the South Carolina board forwarded the renewal information and Florida did not forward the information.

Ms. Gillick asked Ms. Chastain if that was correct.

Ms. Chastain stated that that was true, the renewals are not forwarded.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley asked Mr. Suggs how he discovered that his license was null and void.

He stated that a friend had called and stated that his name was not on the list.

Ms. Edwards stated that the statutes make it the licensee's responsibility to renew their license.

Ms. Walter asked Mr. Suggs if he had taken any continuing education courses in the last two years.

Mr. Suggs stated that he had not.

Ms. Edwards asked if Mr. Suggs had taken the CLARB.

He stated that he had taken the test in the early eighties and he also graded the CLARB exam in the following years.

Ms. Beasley asked Mr. Suggs if he had taken the LARE and the Florida section of the examinations.

He stated he had.

Ms. Beasley asked if the Department had a record of Mr. Suggs passing those two exams.

Ms. Estes stated that it was on record that Mr. Suggs had passed the two exams.

Mr. Graham asked if the board rule requires that the applicant has to be re-examined.

Mr. Davis stated that the application is an endorsement application and he is licensed in another state and he feels he does not have to be re-examined if he had passed the exams in the past.

Mr. Davis stated that the issue was he has been practicing without a current license.

Ms. Gillick stated that Mr. Suggs had obviously practiced since his license went null and void and it appeared to be an innocent mistake even though it went on for a long period of time. Ms. Gillick stated that she knows Mr. Suggs is a competent Landscape Architect although that does not prejudice her thinking as a board member. She stated that she does not feel he should be re-examined.

Ms. Gillick advised the board that maybe the board needs to look at the problem of the renewal notices not being forwarded.

Ms. Estes advised Ms. Gillick that it was statutory requirement that the licensee notify the Department of their current mailing address. She stated it was the same requirement for all professions.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that she does not feel Mr. Suggs should be re-tested but the time involved was of concern to her. Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that maybe this could be remedied with a fine and re-instate his license.

Ms. Walter stated that section 61G10-14.003, F.A.C. which sets forth the disciplinary guidelines for practicing with a revoked license. She stated that for self reporting the fine had been one thousand (\$1000.00) in the past.

Mr. Higgins stated that Rule 61G10-14.003 is the guideline for a revoked license.

Ms. Estes stated that the license was not revoked.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that he had missed four (4) renewal periods and failed twice to change his address.

Ms. Gillick stated that she agreed with Ms. Marshall-Beasley that the time period was excessive and the five hundred dollar (\$500.00) fine issued in the past was not appropriate.

Ms. Walter stated that she felt nine (9) years was a long period of time to practice without a license.

Mr. Graham stated that this was a serious length of time to practice without a license and he felt a two thousand dollar (\$2,000.00) fine was appropriate.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that Mr. Suggs missed four (4) renewals which is twelve hundred dollars (\$1,200.00) and a fine of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) which is a total of seventeen hundred dollars (\$1,700.00).

Ms. Chastain advised the board that they may want Mr. Suggs to take the Florida section of the exam.

Mr. Graham asked Ms. Chastain how much the Florida section cost.

Ms. Estes stated that it was two hundred and eighty two dollars (\$282.00).

The board agreed that Mr. Suggs should not be tested again.

MOTION: Mr. Graham made a motion to impose a two thousand dollar (\$2,000.00) fine and approve the application.

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Edwards advised Mr. Suggs to request a copy of the laws and rules from the board office.

Ms. Estes stated that the laws and rules were available on the web and that she would send him a copy.

McClain Design Group, Inc.

Ms. Estes presented the application to the board and stated that the application listed projects and that there was currently a complaint against the applicant that was filed in February of 2004.

Ms. McClain was present and was not represented by counsel.

Mr. Graham asked Ms. McClain what was the nature of the services she provides her clients.

Ms. McClain stated that she does landscape planting plans with plants and materials, schedules, details and notes and meets with landscape contractors.

She stated that she was individually licensed with the State and she had no idea that her business needed a license. She informed the board that she received a letter from Andrea Beacraft that she had an ad in the yellow pages and that she needed a license with the Department for her landscape business. She stated that Ms. Beacraft was very helpful and she sent her an application immediately.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley asked Ms. Chastain if Ms. McClain was part of the sweep that was conducted by the Department.

Ms. Chastain stated that she was.

Mr. Graham asked staff when an application for a corporation was submitted to the Department of State was the Department notified.

Ms. Chastain advised Mr. Graham that a notice is sent to the corporation that they need to check with other state agencies pertinent to their profession.

Ms. Edwards advised the board that Ms. McClain had been incorporated for seven (7) years.

Mr. Graham asked staff what the renewal fee was for a corporation.

Ms. Estes stated that the renewal fee was four hundred and fifty five (\$455.00) dollars.

Ms. Edwards advised the board that the fine might be something that should be dealt with during the complaint process.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Edwards if that was something that could be dealt with now or did it have to go through the complaint process.

Ms. Walter asked if it was possible to dispense with the complaint issue at the same time the board addressed the certificate of authorization.

Mr. Higgins stated that the board could contact investigative services and ask that the complaint be shut down.

Ms. McClain asked the board if Andrea Beacraft was present and maybe she could answer some questions.

Ms. Beacraft stated that this was unusual and she thought the board had asked Ms. McClain to be present to answer questions about her application for a business license. She stated that the board was discussing discipline issues and the complaint process had not worked its way fully through the system.

Mr. Graham stated that the board needed to deal with one issue. He stated that he liked the track the board was taking regarding the length of time the applicant was practicing and the amount of renewal fees and some punitive amount on top of that. Mr. Graham stated that maybe the board could dispense with this item and the complaint would be dealt with separately.

Ms. Edwards stated that Ms. McClain does have a pending complaint and the previous applicant did not.

Ms. Walter asked if the board could consider imposing a fee of sixteen hundred dollars (\$1,600.00) and impose a one thousand dollar (\$1,000.00) fine and dispense with the fine.

Ms. Walter stated that the complaint is solely related to the certificate of authorization and that was a waste of time to process a complaint that the board has rectified.

Mr. Higgins advised the board that the complaint had already been processed.

Ms. Walter asked Mr. Higgins if there was a fine attached to the complaint.

Ms. Edwards stated that if probable cause was found and it was not unlicensed practice then the board will assess the amount of the fine.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that if probable cause is found and it does come before the board the board could consider what took place on this date and dismiss the case.

Ms. Gillick stated that the board should impose a fine and the case should go through the proper channels and be brought back to the board and the board can dismiss the fine.

Ms. Edwards stated that this was an unlicensed activity case and it will not come back to the board.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that she did not want Ms. McClain to end up in a bureaucratic maze.

Ms. Gillick asked Ms. Edwards for guidance.

Ms. Edwards advised the board to impose a fine of sixteen hundred dollars (\$1,600.00) and let it go.

MOTION: Ms. Marshall-Beasley made a motion to impose a fine of sixteen hundred (\$1,600.00) dollars.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley asked Mr. Higgins if he understood the board's intent with Ms. McClain's case.

Mr. Higgins asked Ms. Edwards to repeat what the board's consensus was.

Ms. Edwards stated that the board's consensus was to fine her what it would have cost her if she would have renewed during the seven years she was in practice and let the penalty for having practiced without a license go forward through the complaint system.

Ms. Gillick stated that she wanted to know why the board was waiving the fine for a non voluntary violation.

Mr. Davis advised Ms. Gillick that they were not waiving the fine the board was letting the complaint go through the process.

Ms. Gillick stated that she wanted the case on the agenda under new business at every meeting so the board can track it.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that she did not want to change the process that was in place and she did not want to see it dismissed.

Mr. Higgins stated that in unlicensed activity cases it was up to the prosecuting attorney.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that the board may want to let the prosecuting attorney understand what their actions were and that fines should be levied for each unlicensed activity case. She stated that it should be conveyed to the prosecutor in writing.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Edwards what kind of communication to the prosecuting attorney would be appropriate.

Ms. Edwards stated that a letter to the unlicensed prosecutor would be appropriate. She stated that she would draft a letter.

Mr. Higgins advised the board that if the case was pursued the fine would be at least five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) if the case was pursued.

Mr. Nam advised the applicant that she may want to put her counsel on notice that due to an oversight on the part of counsel that she was subject to some very significant penalties.

Ms. McClain asked the board if they could work something out. She stated that she did not want to go through the legal process for the next few months.

Mr. Higgins stated that there was flexibility and what was the board's desire in this situation.

Ms. Walter stated that in the past the fine has been five hundred dollars (\$500.00) if the applicant came forward voluntarily and if they have not come forward voluntarily and they were found to be practicing unlicensed the fine was one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00).

Mr. Graham stated that without the complaint the fine would be one thousand (\$1000.00) dollars and the renewal fees of sixteen hundred (\$1600.00) dollars. He stated that he felt this was what the board should do in this case and board counsel can write a recommendation to the prosecutor.

Ms. Gillick stated that she would like to do what Mr. Graham suggested but the board does not have the authority to waive a complaint and she does not want to set a precedence. She stated that the complaint should go through the system and counsel could send a letter to the prosecutor stating their intent to impose a one thousand dollar (\$1,000.00) fine.

Ms. Chastain asked Mr. Higgins that if the individual is now licensed doesn't that have an affect on the case.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley stated that she hopes the prosecutor looks at the license and does not impose the maximum due to the good faith effort of the applicant.

Mr. Graham stated that the fine should be imposed now and each case be considered on an individual basis.

After discussion by the board the following motion was made.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick made a motion to impose a one thousand dollar (\$1,000.00) fine in addition to the collection of renewal fees of sixteen hundred dollars (\$1,600.00) that are in arrears and a letter from board counsel to the unlicensed prosecutor stating the board's policy.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Stresau, Smith & Stresau

Ms. Estes stated that the application was before the board because the applicant previously had a license that lapsed into a null and void status in 1995 and they continued to practice.

Mr. Stresau was present and was not represented by counsel.

Mr. Stresau stated that he was issued a cease and desist from the Department.

Ms. Edwards asked Mr. Higgins if a cease and desist notice meant that was the penalty that was imposed.

Mr. Higgins stated that was correct. He stated you do not need a case to generate a cease and desist order.

Ms. Walter stated that Mr. Stresau had not had a certificate of authorization for nine (9) years.

Ms. Edwards stated that a portion of the application was not filled out that asks if the company has solicited for and offered Landscape Architect services. Ms. Edwards stated that the license should not be granted until that portion of the application is filled out.

Mr. Stresau stated that it was a technicality and he had admitted that he had offered landscape services.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick made a motion to fine Mr. Stresau one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) and impose fees in the amount of two thousand and fifty dollars (\$2,050.00) and issue his corporate license after the fees are received.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any discussion on Ms. Edwards point that the form was not complete.

Ms. Walter stated that the applicant did admit that he had practiced without a license under the corporate name and that the board could take that admission in lieu of that portion of the application.

Ms. Gillick stated he answered verbally and that he took his time to attend the meeting.

Ms. Chastain advised the board that there were two (2) applications on the addendum that had to be reviewed.

Ms. Chastain stated that the applicants were on line.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick made a motion to amend the agenda to review with the people that were on line.

SECOND: Ms. Marshall-Beasley seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Bruce Howard and Associates of Florida

Ms. Chastain stated that the application was before the board because the applicant previously had a corporate license that lapsed into a null and void status in 1995 and a new corporation was formed in 1997 and he was practicing without a certificate of authorization.

Mr. Howard was present and was not represented by counsel.

Mr. Howard advised the board that he was shocked to hear that they were not current with their certificate of authorization. Mr. Howard stated that he was current with his personal license.

Mr. Howard asked the board if they listed their last three (3) projects and the clients on the application would the State go back to those clients and inform them that they were practicing without a current license.

Mr. Higgins informed Mr. Howard that it depends on the circumstances. He stated that if a complaint was filed the complainant might be called as a witness if there was harm to the consumer.

Ms. Edwards advised the board that she would send a copy of the letter she sends to the Unlicensed Activity Prosecuting Attorney to the individual defendant.

After discussion by the board the following motion was made.

MOTION: Ms. Marshall-Beasley made a motion to fine Mr. Howard one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) and impose fees in the amount of sixteen hundred dollars (\$1,600) and issue his corporate license

after the fees were received and Ms. Edwards Should send a copy of the letter that is sent to the Unlicensed Prosecuting Attorney to Mr. Howard.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Community Land Design, Inc. – Paul Gibbs

Ms. Estes advised that the applicant was before the board for conducting a landscape architecture business without a certificate of authorization.

Mr. Gibbs was present and was not represented by counsel.

Ms. Chastain advised the board that Community Land Design had been incorporated since December of 2000.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Estes if there had been a previous license.

Ms. Estes advised Mr. Davis that there was not a previous license.

Mr. Gibbs advised the board that he is a one-person company. He stated that he did not realize that he needed a business license. Mr. Gibbs advised the board that he applied on line and paid the fee in November 2002. He stated that he never submitted the actual application. Mr. Gibbs stated that after he received a letter from Andrea Beacraft he filled out the application for a certificate of authorization.

After discussion by the board the following motion was made.

MOTION: Mr. Graham made a motion to impose a fine of one thousand six hundred and eighty five dollars (\$1,685.00).

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Individual Approve/Deny Deficient Continuing Education Credits

Gerhard Sommer

Ms. Chastain advised the board that the next three (3) items on the agenda were individuals that had renewed and they were sent letters that their continuing education was deficient. She stated that the Bureau of Education and Testing

had some questions for the board concerning these licensees response to the letter.

Ms. Edwards advised the board that in the past individuals who wanted to use their experience as teachers or instructors had to send a letter from the Dean to the Department. Ms. Edwards asked Ms. Estes if she was able to find a copy of the letter that was sent from individuals in the past. Ms. Estes replied in the negative.

Ms. Edwards stated that the second item on the agenda was a request for variance and waiver. Ms. Edwards stated that she would send a form letter to Lynn Thorndyke that explains the rule variance and waiver process.

Ms. Edwards asked the board to table Mr. Sommer and Mr. Walker until the next meeting and at that time the board could look at the letter that was used in the past and tweak it for future use.

Ms. Marshall-Beasley asked if the licensees were practicing without a license.

Ms. Chastain stated that their license had been renewed.

Review of Continuing Education Providers and Courses

American Society of Landscape Architecture/Florida Chapter *Wildland/Urban Interface Fire – Designing Firewise Communities-2 hours* *Fire Concerns in Florida-2 hours*

Ms. Walter advised the board that the applications were complete and they may be considered for optional credit.

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the two (2) courses submitted by the American Society of Landscape Architecture.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Cherry Lake Tree Farm *Magic of Landscaping – 5 hours* *Integrated Pest management for Insects in the Landscape – 2 hours* *Understanding the Tree Market – 2 hours* *Successful Compliance with Tree Ordinances – 2 hours*

Ms. Walter advised the board that the applications were from Cherry Lake Tree Farm, an approved provider. She stated that Successful Compliance with Tree

Ordinances was previously approved for four (4) hours and they were asking that the course be revised to two (2) credit hours.

MOTION: Ms Walter made a motion to approve the courses submitted by Cherry Lake Tree Farm.

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Florida Chamber's Environmental Network
Uniform Mitigation – 10 hours

Ms. Walter advised the board that based on the calculation that fifty (50) minutes equals an hour the board may want to round off the 9.75 hours to ten hours. Ms. Walter stated that the application did not include a detailed outline. She advised the board that this is why she asked that all of the information with the application be included on the agenda. She stated that this way the board could make a determination if the course was adequate to substantiate the credits.

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the course and round off the hours to ten (10) credit hours.

SECOND: Ms. Gillick seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Hoover Pumping Systems
Landscape Irrigation Landscape Architecture Law and Advanced Building Code – 2 hours

Ms. Walter advised the board that the course had been developed and would be eligible for consideration for the laws and rules credit and the advanced building code credit.

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the course submitted by Hoover Pumping Systems.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Paver Systems
Provider Application
The Pattern Language of Concrete Pavers – 1 hour

Ms. Walter advised the board that the provider and course applications were complete and she reviewed the course to make sure it was a course related to special paving and not a special paving advertising course.

Ms. Edwards stated that the provider needed to add a line for the licensee's license number on their certificate.

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the course contingent on the provider adding a line on the certificate for the licensee's license number.

SECOND: Ms. Marshall–Beasley seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Walter advised the board that it was discussed that the provider provide some back up information related to their companies or organizations. Ms. Walter stated that it was discussed at one time that the application would be amended to require them to provide some information related to their firm and the firms relationship to the practice of landscape architecture. She stated that the board may want to look at that in the future.

Mr. Davis asked if that could be done administratively without going through the rule process.

Ms. Edwards stated that a page of instructions may address that issue.

Ms. Estes stated that she was updating applications and if that was one of the applications the board would like changed she would make a note of it.

Ms. Estes stated that she would contact Ms. Walter to discuss the issue.

PSMJ Resources, Inc.

Winning Proposals & Presentations Bootcamp – 12 hours

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion that the application was complete and recommended approval of the course.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

University of Florida, Department of Landscape Architecture

Using Design/Build to Explore New Models in Urban Ecological Design – 1 hour

Water, One of the Greatest Resources: Why Be Concerned? – 1 hour

Designing Streetscapes and Landscaping for Security – 1 hour
When Sustainabilities and Beauty Collide: Rethinking Old Dichotomies – 1 hour

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the four (4) courses from the University of Florida.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

University of Florida/Florida Energy Extension Service
Preserving Wildlife Habitat in Residential Developments – 4 hours

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the course from the Florida Energy Extension Service.

SECOND: Ms. Marshall-Beasley seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Continuing Education Course Renewals

Cherry Lake Tree Farm
Florida Grades and Standards – 5 hours
New Varieties and Cultivars – 5 hours

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the two (2) course renewals for Cherry Lake Farm.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Red Vector.com

Basic concepts of Photogrammetry – 3 hours
Business Mangement Part I – 2 hours
Business Management Part II – 3 hours
Business Management Part III: Marketing and Financial Planning – 2 hours
Contracts for Professionals – 1 hour
Flood Mitigation & Special Flood Hazard Areas – 4 hours
General Project Management Part I – 2 hours
General Project Management Part II – 3 hours
GIS: The Very Basics – 1 hour
Landscape Architecture: Energy Saving Tips – 1 hour
Landscaping with Native Plants – 1 hour
Mitigating Urban Heat Islands – 1 hour

Motivating Employees – 2 hours
Renewable Energy Generation – 1 hour
Sustainable Design – A Premier – 2 hours
Understanding Subsurface Utility Engineering – 4 hours

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the Red Vector.com courses for renewal.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

University of Florida Cooperative Extension
South Miami-Dade Nursery Tour – 5 hours

Ms. Walter advised the board that she had received and reviewed a revised course application from the University of Florida Cooperative Extension. She stated that this was a previously approved course that includes a tour of nurseries in the South Miami-Dade area. Ms. Walter advised the board that the revised application requests approval for a new listing of nurseries that will be included on this years tour.

MOTION: Ms. Walter made a motion to approve the revisions to the University of Florida Cooperative Extension course.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ratification List

Ms. Gillick asked Ms. Chastain if the applicants had filled out the proper forms and if they had met all of the requirements.

Ms. Chastain stated that they had.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick made a motion to approve the following candidates on the ratification list.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Certificate of Authorization

Customs Landscapes, Inc., Font Designs, Inc; Land Designs Solutions, Inc., Volkert & Associates, Inc.

Temporary (Individual)

Gary Clower, Donald Hooten

Endorsement

Theresa Badurek, Jason Courtney, Paul Guariglia, Townsley Schwab

Exam

Raul Alvarez, Theresa Badurek, Felipe Diez, Robert A. Gustafson, Christopher Wrenn

Discussion

Letter from Deputy Secretary, Julie Baker, Regarding Trust Fund Sweep

Ms. Chastain advised the board that the Legislature determined that there would be a sweep. She stated that the December quarterly financial report reflects that one hundred and seventy one thousand dollars (\$ 171,000.00) was transferred out of the operating account for the sweep.

Ms. Chastain stated that there was certain criteria that was taken into account when the sweeps were considered. She stated that a profession had to be in a positive cash situation as of July 1, 2003, it excluded funds that were protected by statute and the sweep could not create a negative cash balance in the account and it excluded funds that had been collected through a special assessment. Ms. Chastain stated that thirty two thousand dollars (\$32,000.00) was taken out of the unlicensed activity account.

Ms. Chastain advised the board that this activity does not put their profession in a negative light.

Ms. Gillick stated that the sweep in dollars equates approximately 40% of the board's total revenue and she asked Ms. Chastain where the money goes.

Ms. Chastain advised the board that it is transferred to the working capital fund. She stated the sweep was done at the direction of the Legislature.

Ms. Gillick asked what the total dollar amount of the sweep was.

Ms. Chastain informed the board that the total was twenty five million dollars (\$25,000,000.00).

Ms. Chastain advised the board that she would have the quarterly financial reports on the agenda and she encouraged the board members to call her if they had any questions.

E-Mail from Hilton Meadows

Mr. Meadows was not present but he was represented by counsel Ms. Deborah Ousley.

Ms. Walter advised the board that she went to the Florida Building Commission last fall to seek their approval to include professional landscape architecture in the building code. She stated that Mr. Meadows brought up a concern in regards to the text that was approved by the Florida Building Commission. Ms. Walters stated that Mr. Meadows is running into issues related to interpretation by St. Johns County. She stated he was very concerned in regards to the draft that was going forward and how it specifically spoke about landscape drawings, landscape specifications and landscape data and that it would really limit the practice to planting plans only.

Ms. Walter stated that Ms. Ousley, Mr. Nam, and Meadows attended the March 3, 2004 Florida Building Commission meeting and were successful in getting the Florida Building Commission to revise the language in Section 104.2.2 Florida Statutes, for design professionals to be much broader in keeping with the statues and rules.

Ms. Ousley advised the board that she sent a letter to the Florida Building Commission with the proposed language.

Ms. Ousley advised the board that there is a situation in St. Johns County where Mr. Meadows had been submitting drawings to the County for seventeen (17) to twenty (20) years. She stated that he had one project recently that was approved and a new client came into the property and wanted minor changes and Mr. Meadows made the changes and all of his drawings were denied by the County because the County would not accept anything from a landscape architect. She stated that they would only accept landscape plans and landscape design.

Ms. Edwards stated that she had a copy of Ms. Ousley's letter and she asked if she was proposing additional language.

Ms. Ousley stated that the County is still not clear what constitutes landscape architecture within the existing definition. She stated that the County wants to know when a landscape architect submits site plans what may they include under that title.

Mr. Davis stated that the Counsel of Landscape Architecture Registration Boards has done an extensive survey of task analysis of Landscape Architecture of the body of knowledge and scope of practice. He stated that the Counsel of Landscape Architecture Registration Boards (CLARB) that they have a legally defensible scope of practice for Landscape Architecture. He stated that they have a clear definition of Landscape Architecture.

Ms. Ousley stated that it sounds like the sub categories for Landscape Architecture are listed on a national level. She advised the board that she would contact CLARB.

Ms. Ousley asked the board what the turn around time would be for a Declaratory Statement.

Ms. Chastain advised Ms. Ousley that the next meeting was scheduled for May 7, 2004. She advised the board that she sent the information to her on filing a Declaratory Statement.

Mr. Graham stated that he was not available for the May 7, 2004 meeting.

After discussion the board decided to keep the May 7, 2004 meeting date in Tampa.

New Business

Mr. Nam advised the board that he wanted to update them on the electronic sign and seal issue. He stated that the ASLA had been successful in getting that amendment on a bill that it was moving through the Legislative process.

MOTION: Ms. Gillick made a motion to adjourn.

SECOND: Mr. Graham seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.