



S T A T E O F C O N N E C T I C U T
D E P A R T M E N T O F C O N S U M E R P R O T E C T I O N

A R C H I T E C T U R A L L I C E N S I N G B O A R D
Tel. No. (860) 713-6145

May 4, 2010

State of Connecticut
Department of Consumer Protection
Occupational & Professional Licensing Division
165 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

The six hundred and ninety second meeting of the Architectural Licensing Board, held on March 5, 2010, was called to order by Acting Chairman Mr. Robert B. Hurd at 8:40 AM in Room No. 119 of the State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.

Board Members Present:

David H. Barkin
Carole W. Briggs
Robert B. Hurd
S. Edward Jeter

Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Chairman/Board Member
(participated by telephone conference call)

Board Members Not Present:

Lucille Trzcinski

Board Member

Others Present:

Robert M. Kuzmich
Linda Roberts
Steven J. Schwane
Bruce Bockstael
Michael Garner
Diane Harp Jones
Bruce Spiewak

Department of Consumer Protection
Department of Consumer Protection
Department of Consumer Protection
Department of Public Works
Architect License Applicant
AIA/CT
AIA/CT

Note: The administrative functions of the Boards, Commissions, and Councils are carried out by the Department of Consumer Protection, Occupational and Professional Licensing Division. For information, contact Richard M. Hurlburt, Director, at (860) 713-6135 or Fax (860)-706-1255.

Agency Website: www.ct.gov/dcp

Division E-Mail: occtrades@ct.gov

1. Old Business

1A. Submission of the minutes of the January 15, 2010 Architectural Licensing Board Meetings; for review and approval. Ms. Briggs and Mr. Barkin both noted the following correction on page four, sixth paragraph, second line; the word “son” should be “soon”. ***As such, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes as amended. (Briggs/Barkin) It is noted that Mr. Jeter abstained from the vote.***

1B. Continuation of discussion concerning Regulation changes regarding Electronic Seals and Signatures. Ms. Briggs noted that security, in general, was a concern of the Board regarding this topic. Mr. Bockstael addressed the Board noting that the *Department of Transportation (DOT)* was the catalyst for the *Department of Public Works (DPW)* becoming involved in the use of electronic signatures and seals. Mr. Pratt at the DOT has extensively researched this issue especially regarding maintaining the integrity of the electronic signature. The use of the method involves bonding and certification along with the use of a license similar to that of a PDF document as opposed to a scanned signature. Documents receive a numeric code in lieu of an actual signature.

Mr. Bockstael noted that DPW still require a stamp and seal on every document that they produce and will be maintaining this practice. They do allow the electronic transmission of documents in CD format. Their clients almost exclusively receive documents in format. Mr. Hurd raised the issue that for this Board to adapt the use of this method will require a change to the Statutes before the Regulation can be changed. The Board requested some direction from the DOT, specifically, from Mr. Pratt since he founded the use of this process for his agency. Mr. Bockstael believes that the use of this format for seals and signatures will become more and more prevalent especially if funding for projects is received from the Veteran’s Administration or other Federal Agencies.

Mr. Bockstael noted that the DOT made a presentation to the Professional Engineer’s and Land Surveyor’s Board regarding electronic seals and signatures. This Board would also like to request this same presentation from the DOT. Since Ms. Briggs will

not be in attendance at the Board's May 21, 2010 meeting, she suggested that they invite Mr. Pratt from the DOT to attend their July 16, 2010 meeting.

The subject of Building Information Modeling (B.I.M.) was also discussed by the Board. Mr. Bockstael gave the Board a handout regarding Wisconsin's use of BIM and he believes that the system makes good sense. He is seeing a greater frequency of construction documents required to be done with BIM. The push for the use of this system appears to be from the contractors at this point. Mr. Bockstael believes that his Department does not need statutory permission because this system is a delivery process.

Mr. Barkin asked exactly what the State is looking for by using this process. In response, Mr. Bockstael believes this delivery process will minimize errors and omissions because the building is "built" in a virtual sense. Ms. Briggs asked Mr. Huntsman if the adaptation of this system by the Board will require a statutory change. The current statutes talk about the use of seals on working drawings and specifications and not on three dimensional models. Ms. Briggs noted that the statutes are written in the two dimensional sense and will probably need to be modified to reflect the use of BIM.

Mr. Barkin noted that this document delivery system is a paradigm shift for this Board that needs to be addressed. Ms. Briggs suggested that the Board further discuss this matter at their July 16, 2010 regular meeting. The Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Board will also be invited to this meeting. The Board discussed viewing and actual demonstration of the BIM process and as such, the possibility of holding the July Meeting off-site was discussed. Mr. Huntsman was asked by the Board to investigate what the statutory impact of incorporating this system would be. The possibility of holding a separate meeting in addition to the Board's regular meeting scheduled for July 16, 2010 was discussed as an option and will be determined in the future.

1C. Continuation of discussion concerning Design-Build. Mr. Spiewak raised this issue at a previous meeting. Several drafts of the Board's past discussions on this topic were distributed to the Board for their use. Ms. Briggs noted that she and the Board's former Council Neil Fishman struggled with developing a draft of the Board's position on this topic for several months and finally gave up noting that they could not write what people wanted which was a design-build entity, which was not an architectural firm, to offer design build services in the State of Connecticut. Their ultimate conclusion was that this matter was a contractual issue centering on the statutory requirement of a direct contractual relationship between the consumer and the entity offering architectural services.

Mr. Spiewak noted that two issues noted in the drafts; the offering of services and the providing of services. He is looking for a statement from this Board to clarify the Board's stance on this matter that can be offered to the public in the hopes of avoiding potential future complaints. Mr. Huntsman noted that trying to address all aspects of

this matter may not be possible and this area may in fact be a matter of “drawing lines” in the sense that judgments could be on a case-by case, ad-hoc type basis. Mr. Spiewak asked that this Board for an advisory opinion which may restate in an even clearer language the intent of the Statute to the point where if there is a clear or apparent violation, the same can be submitted for a ruling. Mr. Huntsman raised the issue of past complaints the Department and this Board may have encountered. It was noted that none have reached the Board for a ruling.

Ms. Briggs asked Mr. Huntsman if they could, together, make another attempt to craft a statement to help AIA/CT and public in general similar to what this Board did this past fall that clarified their position on the use of the title “Architect” without reinterpreting the statutes in any way what so ever. *Both Mr. Huntsman and Ms. Briggs agreed to work on a statement for Design-Build.*

2. New Business

2A. Letter from Mr. Michael Garner, dated February 17, 2010, concerning his request for an architect’s license in Connecticut. Mr. Garner is scheduled to appear before the Board today. Mr. Garner addressed the Board stating his professional background and highlights of his accomplishments in his career thus far. He is pursuing licensure in Connecticut. Mr. Hurd noted that the reason Mr. Garner does not fit the traditional statutory/regulatory mold is his lack of an accredited, professional degree in architecture.

It was also noted by Mr. Hurd that Mr. Garner falls just short of the ten year licensure requirement would allow him to apply for a license in Connecticut by direct endorsement. In lieu of this, the Board is exercising their regulatory option of considering this candidates overall background, in effect, as a broadly experienced architect review that the Board does on their own. As such, the Board is now considering allowing this candidate to sit for the Architect Registration Examination (A.R.E.) subsequent to their review of his credentials and upon their approval, accept the scores used when he acquired his license in the State of Colorado. *As such, Ms. Briggs motioned that a Board member step down to evaluate Mr. Garner’s portfolio of experience to determine he meets this Board qualifications for to sit for the A.R.E. Mr. Barkin seconded the motion.* Mr. Barkin volunteered to step down to review Mr. Garner’s candidate’s credentials and report back to the Board at their May 21, 2010.

2B. Request from AIA/CT dated January 22, 2010 concerning potential illegal use of the title “Architect”; for discussion by the Board. Ms. Jones addressed the Board regarding concerns she has about letters she received from the Department relative to complaints she filed with them. The complaints all stem from the potential illegal use of the title “architect” and she has grown frustrated in her efforts to stop this action and has asked the Board for advice on what else she can do. In response, Ms. Roberts stated that

although the Department sends out letter to respondents, they simply do not have the resources to follow up on the same due to a tremendous reduction in staff.

Mr. Hurd reiterated what Ms. Roberts stated earlier saying that if there is a persistent pattern of behavior on the part of a respondent, the Department will take the complaint to the next level. He asked Ms. Jones to try and rely on their efforts.

2C. 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 Connecticut. (Briggs/Barkin) Mr. Jeter abstained from the vote.*

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Joon-Hyun Baek | 5. Jenna M. McClure |
| 2. Angel P. Campos | 6. Ashleigh B. Ranney |
| 3. Cannon Chu | 7. Jaynab Rose |
| 4. Christopher Creighton | |

2D. Applications for licensing by waiver of examination; the following individuals are recommended 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 voted, unanimously, to approve the following individuals for licensing as architects in the State of Connecticut. (Briggs/Barkin) Mr. Jeter abstained from the vote.*

1.	Aughtry, Pascal A.	Waiver of Examination; Wyoming	(NCARB File No. 87630)
2.	Brown, Julie P.	Waiver of Examination; New Hampshire	(NCARB File No. 70177)
3.	Canciello, Salvatore J.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 84198)
4.	Cohen, Marc H.	Waiver of Examination; Ohio	(NCARB File No. 50139)
5.	Conte, Philip R.	Waiver of Examination; Delaware	(NCARB File No. 76933)
6.	Delegas, George	Waiver of Examination; New Hampshire	(NCARB File No. 54630)
7.	Feltoon, Alan J.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 31014)
8.	Ferri, Emilia F.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 86589)
9.	Fixler, David	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 52113)
10.	Fudo, Jill E.	Waiver of Examination; Missouri	(NCARB File No. 82381)
11.	Ham, Alexander C.	Waiver of Examination; New York	Direct
12.	Lachs, Stewart M.	Waiver of Examination; New York	Direct
13.	Libby, James H.	Waiver of Examination; Maine	(NCARB File No. 59949)
14.	Masse, Paul H.	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 37656)
15.	McKissick, III, Vern L.	Waiver of Examination; North Carolina	(NCARB File No. 60608)
16.	Meier, Timothy G.	Waiver of Examination; California	(NCARB File No. 63046)
17.	Morales, Christopher W.	Waiver of Examination; North Carolina	(NCARB File No. 81164)
18.	Olson, Reed Scott	Waiver of Examination; Idaho	(NCARB File No. 105533)
19.	Raith, Charles S.	Waiver of Examination; Kentucky	(NCARB File No. 26636)
20.	Ramanathan, Umayal	Waiver of Examination; Massachusetts	(NCARB File No. 57219)

21.	Ray, Frank A.	Waiver of Examination; Michigan	(NCARB File No. 41758)
22.	Rubinoff, Derek A.	Waiver of Examination; Massachusetts	(NCARB File No. 66858)
23.	Sample, Hilary	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 66090)
24.	Saxena, Chander M.	Waiver of Examination; Ohio	(NCARB File No. 42666)
25.	Stephenson, Robert A.	Waiver of Examination; New York	(NCARB File No. 86746)
26.	Weaver, James D.	Waiver of Examination; Texas	(NCARB File No. 35049)
27.	Westover, Todd M.	Waiver of Examination; Pennsylvania	(NCARB File No. 62875)

2E. Application for the Corporate Practice of Architecture; the Department has reviewed and recommends for approval the following application; *the Board voted, unanimously, to approve the following application for the Corporate Practice of Architecture in Connecticut. (Briggs/Barkin) Mr. Jeter abstained from the vote.*

N.E.E.D., Inc.
15 East Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830-5424

Sangmok Kim, CEO
Connecticut Lic. No. 11595

2F. Update from the Trade Practices Division regarding Complaints; a Department Representative is scheduled to address the Board. Ms. Linda Roberts gave the Board a complaint report in spreadsheet format indicating a synopsis of 2009-2010 showing alleged issues, found issues, the date the complaint was received, and the date it was closed. Mr. Spiewak asked if there was any way of indicating if the respondent has multiple complaints files against him. Ms. Roberts noted that usually the investigator will note this although each instance is logged in as its own complaint. Ms. Briggs noted that this type complaint format report is basically what she was looking for from the Department although it may need some minor adjustments.

2G. Update from Mr. Steven Schwane from the Consumer Protection’s Legal Division regarding any Board issues.

1. Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies – Filing Requirements for Maps; Mr. Schwane gave the Board the final version of the completed amendments as published in the Connecticut Law Journal.

2H. Any correspondence and/or business received in the interim.

1. It was noted that the Regional Meeting of NECARB is approaching and scheduled for March 26th and 27th in Boston, Massachusetts. Mr. Kuzmich is working on the Board Report for this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:16 AM. (Briggs/Barkin) The next regular meeting of the Architectural Licensing Board is scheduled for Friday, May 21, 2010 at 8:30 a.m.; State Office Building; Room 121; 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert M. Kuzmich, R.A.
Board Administrator