

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**ARCHITECTURAL LICENSING BOARD**

**November 6, 2020**

The six hundred ninety second meeting of the Architectural Licensing Board, held on November 6, 2020, via ZOOM Webinar, was called to order by Mr. David Barkin at 9:04 AM.

**Board Members**

<b>Present:</b>	Laurann Asklof David H. Barkin	Board Member, Public Member Board Member, Chairman, Architect
	Angela D. Cahill Philip H. Cerrone Twig Holland	Board Member, Architect Board Member, Architect Board Member, Public Member

**Board Members**

**Not Present:** None

**Vacancies:** None

<b>DCP Staff Present:</b>	Robert M. Kuzmich, R.A. Janita Hamel	License & Applications Specialist Supervising Special Investigator, Investigations Division
---------------------------	---	---

<b>Others Present:</b>	Gina Calabro Manny Machado Carson R. Collier	AIA Connecticut AIA Connecticut A.R.E. candidate
------------------------	--	--

Note: The administrative functions of the Boards, Commissions, and Councils are carried out by the Department of Consumer Protection, Occupational and Professional Licensing Division, Richard M. Hurlburt, Director.

Agency Website: [www.ct.gov/dcp](http://www.ct.gov/dcp) E-Mail: [dcp.occupationalprofessional@ct.gov](mailto:dcp.occupationalprofessional@ct.gov)

**1. Review of minutes of the September 18, 2020 Architectural Licensing Board Meeting**

The Board voted, unanimously, to approve the September 18, 2020 minutes as written. (Cerrone/Asklof)

## **2. Comments or Concerns of any Person Present Today**

There were no comments or concerns addressed.

## **3. DCP Investigation Division Complaint Status Report**

Mr. Barkin shared the Complaint Status Report with the Board through the ZOOM shared screen platform. He noted earlier to Ms. Hamel to address her Information Technology (IT) Department concerning the issue of older complaint report codes showing “open current” when they should be noted as “open prior” to make the report accurate. Ms. Hamel clarified the exact wording of the coding with Mr. Barkin. She also noted older files that appear on the report and contacted the investigator of these to inquire why these reports show still show as open. Ms. Hamel provided more details on these reports to the Board.

Mr. Barkin had expected a representative from the Legal Department to be participating in today’s meeting because their comment is needed for the reports that show as being in this Department. He asked Mr. Kuzmich to be sure that a representative from the Legal Department will be present at the Board’s next meeting in January 2021. Ms. Cahill and Mr. Barkin expressed their thanks to Ms. Hamel for her diligence and hard work on the Board Complaint reports.

## **4. DCP Legal Division Items**

Mr. Barkin noted that a representative from the Legal Division is not present at today’s meeting. Therefore, no discussion was held.

## **5. Old Business**

### **5A. Update of proposed changes to Connecticut Statutes Chapter 390 – Architects.**

Continuation of discussion concerning licensed architects in Connecticut performing the work of Interior Designers; specifically, the logistics to be addressed by the Department relating to existing interior design certificates currently held by Connecticut licensed architects. It was confirmed at a previous Board meeting that this proposal is a statutory change.

There were no updates to discuss. Mr. Barkin, again, asked that a representative from the Legal Division be present at the Board’s next meeting in January 2021.

### **5B. Continuation of discussion Concerning Renewals of Corporate Practice Relative to Ownership Requirements.**

Sample Corporate Renewal Notice

Mr. Barkin noted that a sample of an actual corporate renewal was sent to the Board for their review prior to today's meeting. He stated the document noted the licensed individuals and ownership verification showing percent ownership. Mr. Barkin noted that the Board has now concluded their discussion on this matter. Further, this item will no longer be placed on future agendas.

5C. Application of Mr. Matthew Slightom to sit for the Architectural Registration Examination per **Sec. 20-289-3a.(2)** of the Regulations for Architect Licensure.

Report from Mr. Philip H. Cerrone regarding the review of this candidate's application.

Mr. Barkin shared Mr. Cerrone's report with the Board via the ZOOM shared screen platform. Mr. Cerrone briefly described the candidate's educational background. He also spoke with Mr. Slightom's work associates who had glowing recommendations for him noting that they do whatever they can to get him on their teams. Mr. Cerrone also reviewed projects Mr. Slightom has worked on and believes that the candidate is qualified to sit for the Architect Registration Examination. He further detailed Mr. Slightom's educational background for the Board at Mr. Barkin's request.

Mr. Barkin asked Ms. Cahill for her impression of the University of Hartford's architectural program at the time Mr. Slightom attended since she was teaching there also. She noted the program was a young program and that the curriculum was in line for that of an accredited degree since that was the school's future goal. She noted the program modeled that of an accredited degree.

Ms. Holland asked what it would take for Mr. Slightom to complete an accredited degree. Mr. Cerrone noted that it would most likely mean an additional two years of schooling. Mr. Barkin noted the choices the candidate has to do this at schools in Connecticut noting that it would not be an easy path while holding a full-time job. Ms. Holland noted the Mr. Slightom had a period of unemployment of approximately 1 ½ years noted in his record. She asked if going back to school was an option for the candidate? Mr. Cerrone did not pursue this question with the Mr. Slightom. It was also noted by Mr. Cerrone, in response to a question from Ms. Holland, that he did not ask Mr. Slightom whether he knew that the University of Hartford was not accredited at that time. Ms. Asklof stated that the issue of students not knowing the accreditation status of the schools they are attending was a matter discussed by the NCARB at some of the meetings she has attended. Ms. Asklof cited a personal example of this issue she encountered with her daughter on her daughter's educational path. Both Mr. Barkin and Ms. Cahill also gave examples of their own educational experiences in choosing schools.

Architectural Internship requirements prior to the NCARB standards was also discussed relative to Mr. Slightom's education and work experience. Ms. Asklof noted that if the legislature and the rules gives the candidate the option of not paying for additional schooling, then candidates may actually choose this option as a better option for them. The candidates are relying on the statutes and the laws that we have in order to satisfy their career requirements. She noted that we give candidates this option and they have a right to choose it. Ms. Holland still believes that people learn

things in school that they do not learn on the job. She noted that she believes that her vote will not be the “deal breaker”, therefore she remains comfortable in maintaining her consistent position being the lone vote not in approval.

After more discussion, the Board voted in favor of allowing Mr. Slightom to sit for the Architect Registration Examination. Motions as follows: Mr. Barkin, Ms. Cahill, and Ms. Asklof voted in favor; Ms. Holland voted in opposition; and Mr. Cerrone abstained from the vote.

Mr. Kuzmich will notify the NCARB of the Board's decision.

## **6. New Business**

6A. The following candidates have passed the Architect Registration Examination and are recommended by the Department of Consumer Protection for licensing as Architects in the State of Connecticut; the Board voted unanimously to approve the following individuals for licensing as architects in the State of Connecticut and offered their congratulations on achieving this professional milestone. (Holland/Cahill)

In addition, Ms. Cahill noted that she has first-hand experience regarding Mr. Collier’s work experience. She works with the candidate and the office is very proud of him and believes that he will be a great architect.

1. Augustus Chan
2. Carson R. Collier
3. John Holden

The Board voted to add the following candidate to today’s Meeting Agenda under Agenda Item 6A.

4. Kristin L. Irwin

6B. Applications for licensing by waiver of examination; the following individuals were approved under Section 21a-8 of the General Statutes by the Department of Consumer Protection for licensing as architects in the State of Connecticut on the basis of waiver of examination with an NCARB Certificate Record or by Direct Endorsement; the Board acknowledged the applications listed below. It was noted by the Board that the applications are listed for informational purposes.

1	Anderson, Jason T.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 130281)
2	Askey, Jennifer L.	Waiver of Examination; Pennsylvania	(NCARB File No. 113662)
3	Basler, Shawn C.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 114739)
4	Carrell, Joshua W.	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 843788)
5	Cavaluzzi, Peter D.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 104464)
6	Churchill, Erik S.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 502193)

7	Cook, Brigitte E.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 93507)
8	Corbeil, Adam G.	Waiver of Examination; Massachusetts	(NCARB File No. 798248)
9	Dangaran, Joseph P.	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 286274)
10	Dougherty, Brian P.	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 27748)
11	Dougherty, Megan	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 674855)
12	Dougherty, Mary E. O.	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 29129)
13	Fontaine, Michael J.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 714287)
14	Kim, Jong Hae	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 93649)
15	King, Daniel	Waiver of Examination; Pennsylvania	(NCARB File No. 57334)
16	Lichtenberger, Steven A.	Waiver of Examination; Arizona	(NCARB File No. 100454)
17	Linx, Michael E.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 210536)
18	Mayendia, Cristobal	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 90641)
19	McQuaid, Damon	Waiver of Examination; Massachusetts	(NCARB File No. 136719)
20	Mui, Jimmy Kun	Waiver of Examination; New York	Direct
21	Myers, Richard L.	Waiver of Examination; Texas	(NCARB File No. 74485)
22	Olliff, Donovan P.	Waiver of Examination; Texas	(NCARB File No. 71193)
23	Park, Harold	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 136247)
24	Park, Sung J.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 94596)
25	Pellegrino, Lee M.	Waiver of Examination; Pennsylvania	(NCARB File No. 73768)
26	Pitt, Robert B.	Waiver of Examination; Texas	(NCARB File No. 93007)
27	Pollack, David M.	Waiver of Examination; Massachusetts	(NCARB File No. 52242)
28	Rogers, William D.	Waiver of Examination; New York	Direct
29	Sanchez, Francisco G.	Waiver of Examination; Florida	(NCARB File No. 124673)
30	Siefering, Martin L.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 825992)
31	Ward, Mathew L.	Waiver of Examination; Massachusetts	(NCARB File No. 73756)
32	Williams, Joe	Waiver of Examination; Missouri	(NCARB File No. 105283)
33	Young, Jeffrey M.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 94492)
34	Zigomanis, Nickolas	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 154873)

6C. Applications for the Corporate Practice of Architecture; the Department approved the following applications under Section 21a-8 of the General Statutes; the Board acknowledged the applications listed below. It was noted by the Board that the applications are listed for informational purposes.

1. Ikon 5 Architects LLC  
864 Mapleton Rd Ste 100  
Princeton, Nj 08540-9595  
Charles Maira  
Connecticut Lic. No. 11726
2. Merriman Pitt / Anderson Inc  
208 W 4<sup>th</sup> St Ste 3a  
Austin, Tx 78701  
Robert B. Pitt  
Connecticut Lic. No. 14703

The following items were added by vote of the Board to today's Meeting Agenda (Cerrone/Holland):

6D. Minority Designation as considered by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) relative to firms practicing architecture.

Mr. Barkin stated that architectural or architectural/engineering corporations have required stock ownership percentages. An issue recently came up pertaining to correct

share ownership to be considered an architectural practice and also be considered a minority business enterprise by DAS. His question is that the statutes address share ownership. The firm has a management agreement which does not address share ownership and says that the manager has controlling interest of management decisions but is not an architect. Therefore, because of this agreement, they are designated a minority firm. He questions if this is in conflict with architectural statutes?

This situation came before Mr. Barkin in his professional capacity with DAS where a firm being considered by DAS that presented themselves as a minority architectural firm with the shareholder who meets the requirements of corporate practice and is not a minority or a woman.

The Board noted that the key consideration is voting stock. Mr. Barkin noted that they may not be a conflict in this situation although he believes the intention for a minority architectural practice would imply minority architects. Mr. Barkin is looking for guidance and not necessarily from this Board and perhaps DCS should seek clarification about this.

It was decided that this matter should be on the Board's agenda going forward and have the Department's Legal Division be a part of this discussion. Further, Ms. Asklof suggested that perhaps the DCP Legal Department should speak with the DAS Legal Department regarding this issue. She also noted that she believes that DCP should not be doing the research on this matter but instead ask this question of the DAS people and have them provide an answer. After more detailed discussion, Mr. Barkin asked that a representative from the Department attend the Board's next meeting to continue this discussion and take the same forward.

In summary, Mr. Barkin's question to the Board and requesting input from the Department of Consumer Protection is as follows:

The Department of Consumer Protection (DCP) statutes for Architectural Corporations or Limited Liability Companies define a minimum of 67% ownership by licensed professionals. Can a firm, considered by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) statutes as a Minority Business Entity (MBE) or Minority Business Entity (MBE) / Women Business Entity (WBE), where the classification as an MBE / WBE requires a majority interest and the majority party is not a professional, still be considered a minority firm?

Secondly, are these two completely separate issues and non-conflicting

6E. Discussion of Digital Signatures and the need for DCP to consider common language for all the professions.

Mr. Barkin, Ms. Cahill, and Mr. Cerrone recently attended a meeting with AIA/CT regarding digital signatures. The Board is trying to assist the AIA/CT in providing guidance to their members on this matter. Mr. Barkin noted that Architects, Professional Engineers, and Landscape Architects all have their own individual requirements. He noted that this has the potential, in the future, to create confusion for

Building Officials who rely on the Architect's Board statutes for guidance when reviewing documents for compliance with the signature.

Mr. Barkin is suggesting that this issue be brought to the Department's attention with the proposal that there be common language. Ne noted that the architect's language is based on Model Law from the NCARB. He believes that the Engineers are following the requirements of the Department of Transportation who have had requirements for digital signatures in place for quite some time.

Mr. Barkin asked the Board if they want to pursue this matter noting his concern for the Building Officials and giving them clear direction when they review documents. Mr. Cerrone noted that this item should be kept on the Board's agenda and see what transpires going forward to determine if the matter stays on the agenda. He believes the Board is in position of being on the outside of this matter and observing what happens with other committees.

Mr. Barkin suggested having a discussion with the other licensing Boards on this matter. In conclusion, the matter will be paced on the Board's agenda for their January 2021 meeting.

#### **7. Comments or Concerns of any Person Present Today.**

1. Mr. Cerrone noted that Ms. Calabro from AIA/CT has asked for a copy of the Board's Complaint report as discussed at today's meeting. Mr. Barkin agreed that this can be done and asked Mr. Kuzmich to accommodate her request.
2. The Board acknowledged the meeting dates established for the calendar year 2021. It was noted that dates do not conflict with the AIA Convention being held in June of 2021. Mr. Barkin is not sure if the dates conflict with either or both the NCARB National and Regional Meetings. Mr. Cerrone and Ms. Cahill determined that there is no conflict with NCARB's meeting dates.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 AM. (Barkin/Cahill) The next regular meeting of the Architectural Licensing Board is scheduled for Friday, January 15, 2021 at 9:00 AM; location to be determined.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert M. Kuzmich, R.A.  
Board Administrator

Upcoming Architectural Licensing Board Meeting Dates for the Calendar Year 2021:

1. January 15, 2021
2. March 19, 2021
3. May 21, 2021
4. July 16, 2021
5. September 17, 2021
6. November 19, 2021

All meetings will take place at 450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, CT at 9:00 AM unless otherwise noted.