

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING
JUNE 24, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Burrage, Chairman
Thomas Cavanaugh, Peter Coccaro, Mary Fleenor,
James McClary, Larry Sandles, Al Villalobos

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy Cole, Building Official
Suzy Russell, Permit Supervisor
Cheryl Kaye, Anthony Taveras, James Decker,
Allen Hogue, Alexander Gomez, Mitzi Lerner,
Bob Shites, Allen McNamara

CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Roll Call

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Meeting of March 28, 2008

- Mr. Sandles MOVED, Ms. Fleenor SECONDED approval of the March 28, 2008 minutes.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS

- Recording Secretary Smith swore in all participants.
- A. Investigative Hearing - Complaint Filed against Direct Heating & Cooling, Inc.
Anthony Arismendis Taveras, Qualifier
- Mr. Randy Cole, Building Official, announced Item B had been continued for 30 days as staff believed the issue could be resolved. He then stated staff desired to determine whether any charges would be brought before the Board with regard to Directing Heating & Cooling, Inc. (DHC), noting this was an investigative hearing only.
- Ms. Cheryl Kaye, 4086 LaCosta Island Court, testified a new air conditioning (A/C) system was installed in her home four years earlier by 4 Seasons Air Conditioning, stating DHC replaced the existing duct work on April 2, 2008, at a cost of \$5,455. She mentioned DHC had advised her replacement was urgent. She continued the DHC General Manager checked the air flow four weeks later, stating he informed her the air flow read 49.6 but should read 19.9. She contended the General Manager pressured her on a continuous basis to replace her A/C unit, indicating same was ineffective, over used, a fire hazard and drew excessive amps; however, the individual who performed the duct work replacement advised her the unit did not need to be replaced. She alleged DHC "strong armed" women. She explained she then advised both individuals of her intent to obtain a second opinion, at which time the General Manager became

upset and rude with her. She mentioned she noticed her spare house key was missing following one of DHC's visits to her home; thus, she had her locks changed at a cost of \$140.

- Mr. Cole questioned Ms. Kaye regarding the amount she had paid for replacement of an air filter.
- Ms. Kaye replied \$500. She explained DHC had continued to add charges, stating she had paid a total of \$6,955.
- Mr. Burrage inquired as to the result of the second opinion.
- Ms. Kaye replied Boyd Brothers informed her a larger unit was not needed as her current unit was in exceptional condition.
- Mr. Burrage confirmed she was satisfied with the second opinion, asking whether she reported the key theft to the police.
- Ms. Kaye replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Burrage inquired as to the status of the police investigation.
- Ms. Kaye replied she was advised to replace her locks; however, no charges were being brought against DHC.
- Mr. McClary asked Ms. Kaye why she had originally believed she required new ductwork.
- Ms. Kaye replied DHC contacted her with an offer of a free inspection, stating DHC advised her electric bill could be reduced by \$100 per month and air flow would increase if the ductwork was replaced. She mentioned her monthly electric bill had not been reduced as promised.
- Mr. McClary asked if Florida Power & Light (FPL) inspected the ductwork.
- Ms. Kaye replied affirmatively, stating FPL concluded the system was satisfactory.
- Mr. Coccaro confirmed subsequent inspections by companies other than DHC revealed no fire hazard.
- Mr. Villalobos questioned the size of the home.
- Ms. Kaye replied 2,200 square feet.
- Ms. Fleenor clarified the FPL inspection was done six months earlier, asking why Ms. Kaye had arranged for DHC's inspection.
- Ms. Kaye replied DHC contacted her regarding duct cleaning, stating she agreed to same the ductwork had not been cleaned for three years.
- Ms. Fleenor asked if FPL had advised her to have the ductwork cleaned.
- Ms. Kaye replied they had not; however, she felt she needed to do so for the safety of her family.
- Mr. McClary asked if the threat of a fire hazard had been explained.

- Ms. Kaye replied it had not, acknowledging she may have been gullible; however, she was not stupid. She clarified she simply believed what she had been told by DHC.
- Mr. Anthony Taveras announced he was the qualifying contractor for DHC. He noted he had not been involved with this particular job with the exception of pulling the permit.
- Mr. Sandles questioned Mr. Taveras' role in DHC.
- Mr. Taveras replied he was one of DHC's qualifiers.
- Mr. Sandles asked how much of the company Mr. Taveras owned.
- Mr. Taveras replied none.
- Mr. McClary asked who owned the company.
- Mr. Taveras replied Ms. Mitzi Lerner.
- Mr. Cole asked Mr. Taveras if he participated in the day to day activities of the company.
- Mr. Taveras replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Cole asked if Mr. Taveras worked in the field or the office.
- Mr. Taveras replied the field, stating he did not supervise every job; however, he testified he ensured adherence to the Building Code on all jobs for which he pulled a permit.
- Mr. Cole clarified Mr. Taveras was aware of the work being done at Ms. Kaye's home, asking who had provided the estimate to the homeowner.
- Mr. Taveras replied he did not know, stating he was not involved with estimates.
- Mr. Cole inquired who handled customer complaints.
- Mr. Taveras replied Ms. Lerner and her staff.
- Mr. Cole asked if Mr. Taveras had been aware of this complaint prior to receiving notice for this meeting.
- Mr. Taveras replied he had not.
- Mr. Burrage asked Mr. Taveras if he felt DHC had some obligation in this case after hearing Ms. Kaye's testimony.
- Mr. Taveras replied he believed this was an unfortunate accident, stating he was sorry Ms. Kaye was experiencing so much distress; however, he was only a third party and did not have much of an opinion.
- Ms. Fleenor countered a qualifier was not a third party nor was this an "accident."
- Mr. Taveras clarified he was a third party relating to this case, adding he had no personal knowledge of what transpired verbally between Ms. Kaye and the two individuals with whom she had contact.

- Ms. Fleenor asked Mr. Taveras if he had followed up once he was made aware of the complaint.
- Mr. Taveras replied he read the complaint and discussed the situation with Ms. Lerner, adding he could not reach a conclusion without being aware of the views of all involved parties. He stated he believed this was an issue between Ms. Kaye and DHC as opposed to between the customer and his license.
- Mr. Sandles pointed out Mr. Taveras was the qualifier for this company; thus, his license and livelihood was at risk. He clarified Mr. Taveras had allowed DHC to use his license; thus, he must be cautious as to the use of same.
- Mr. Cole confirmed Mr. Taveras recalled signing the permit application being discussed this date. He further confirmed the application had been completed by someone other than Mr. Taveras, who had signed the application as qualifier. He asked if Mr. Taveras had reviewed the permit application before signing off.
- Mr. Taveras replied affirmatively, explaining he checked what work would be performed; however, he did not review cost values of what customers were being charged.
- Mr. Cole clarified Mr. Taveras was aware of this particular job before it was started.
- Mr. Burrage stressed Mr. Taveras was responsible for the work performed under his license. He clarified that responsibility could not be delegated.
- Mr. Cole asked if there were other qualifiers.
- Mr. Taveras replied Ms. Lerner's spouse also held a license; however, he did not sign permit applications.
- Mr. McClary asked to hear from the owner of the company.
- Mr. James Decker, attorney for DHC, introduced Mr. Kevin Miller, the Field Manager who visited Ms. Kaye's home for a quality control inspection several weeks after it had been performed. He then introduced the individual who had actually performed the work at Ms. Kaye's home and Ms. Lerner, stating he would like all three to address the Board.
- Mr. Allen Hogue stated he resided at the subject location with Ms. Kaye, providing a brief review of the sequence of events outlined earlier by Ms. Kaye. He mentioned he subsequently learned of several complaints against DHC.
- Mr. Burrage asked why the complainants had not contacted 4 Seasons with regard to the possibility of a fire hazard as the system was still under warranty.
- Mr. Hogue replied he was unfamiliar with A/C systems, reiterating Ms. Kaye had been advised the unit could cause a fire. He mentioned the A/C unit had been replaced four years earlier; however, the ductwork had not.

- Mr. Cole inquired if anyone who worked on the job was present.
- Mr. Alexander Gomez confirmed he installed the ductwork.
- Mr. Cole inquired if he was present at the initial visit.
- Mr. Gomez replied he was not.
- Mr. Cole asked who had contracted with Ms. Kaye for the job.
- Mr. Gomez replied he believed an individual named "Allen" had done so.
- Mr. Decker inquired as to the purpose of Mr. Gomez' first visit to the job site.
- Mr. Gomez replied to conduct installation of the ductwork, stating the job entailed two days.
- Mr. Decker asked if anyone had assisted Mr. Gomez with the job.
- Mr. Gomez replied affirmatively, noting the assistant did not have the same level of training.
- Mr. Decker asked if Mr. Miller visited the job site.
- Mr. Gomez replied he had not.
- Mr. Decker asked if Mr. Gomez spoke with Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Gomez replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Decker asked if any of those conversations involved upgrading aspects of her A/C system.
- Mr. Gomez replied they had not, stating their conversation was about a media filtration system, which Ms. Kaye decided to purchase and which was installed on the second day of the job.
- Mr. Decker inquired whether Mr. Gomez noticed any difference in performance of the system after the work was completed.
- Mr. Gomez replied affirmatively, stating Ms. Kaye advised him the humidity had dropped inside the home and the temperature was much cooler; however, he pointed out the job was half complete at that time.
- Mr. Decker inquired if Mr. Gomez saw or took the house key mentioned earlier by Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Gomez replied he had not.
- Mr. Cole asked Mr. Gomez if he had run any performance tests prior to commencement of the job.
- Mr. Gomez replied he had not.
- Mr. Cole asked if any such tests were run after the work was complete.
- Mr. Gomez replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Cole asked to what those test results were compared.

- Mr. Gomez replied the house was much cooler as evidenced by a thermometer placed at the A/C return site of the unit, stating he ensured the temperature dropped 20 to 22 degrees.
- Mr. Cole questioned Mr. Gomez' training and background in air conditioning.
- Mr. Gomez replied he had worked for several different A/C companies over the past seven years.
- Mr. Cole inquired if Mr. Gomez had any schooling or specific training.
- Mr. Gomez replied affirmatively through the ESCO Institute.
- Ms. Fleenor inquired why testing was not performed prior to the installation for comparison purposes.
- Mr. Gomez replied he had only conducted the installation.
- Mr. Cole asked if Mr. Gomez was paid hourly or on commission.
- Mr. Gomez replied hourly.
- Mr. Decker then asked Mr. Miller how long he had worked for DHC.
- Mr. Miller replied approximately 18 months.
- Mr. Decker confirmed Mr. Miller was part owner of DHC. He questioned the basis of Mr. Miller's first contact with Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Miller replied to perform a quality control check.
- Mr. Decker inquired when the quality control inspection took place in relation to installation of the ductwork.
- Mr. Miller replied within two weeks.
- Mr. Decker asked if any other DHC representative had accompanied Mr. Miller on the inspection visit.
- Mr. Miller replied Mr. Allen McNamara had been with him.
- Mr. Decker confirmed Mr. McNamara had "sold" the job to Ms. Kaye. He questioned Mr. Miller's intent with regard to the quality control inspection.
- Mr. Miller replied he wished to ensure favorable air flow and customer satisfaction.
- Mr. Decker asked if the inspection had been pre-arranged with Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Miller replied Mr. McNamara had done so.
- Mr. Decker confirmed Ms. Kaye had been at the home upon Mr. Miller's arrival. He then asked Mr. Miller to describe how he proceeded with the quality control inspection as well as his conversations with Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Miller explained he and Mr. McNamara conducted a check of both air flow and amps, stating they advised Ms. Kaye the ductwork had been installed satisfactorily and air flow was as favorable as possible. He noted Ms. Kaye questioned him on the quality of her A/C system, specifically whether it was the "best," to which Mr. McNamara

responded it was not. He stated Mr. McNamara then began to describe the best system available.

- Mr. Cole interjected this was an investigative hearing of the Building Board, stating he did not wish Mr. Decker to guide the testimony. He clarified Mr. Decker may either testify himself or counsel his client appropriately.
- Mr. Decker countered he had no intention of leading the witness. He then reminded Mr. Miller of Ms. Kaye's testimony regarding a fire hazard, asking if there had been any discussion of same while Mr. Miller was present.
- Mr. Miller replied he had never mentioned the word "fire" in the 12 years he had worked in the A/C industry, adding he had never heard Mr. McNamara mention same to Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Decker asked if Mr. Miller was aware of anything related to a missing key.
- Mr. Miller replied he knew nothing with regard to a missing key.
- Mr. Cavanaugh asked on what basis it had been determined the ductwork was insufficient and should be replaced.
- Mr. Miller replied he was not involved in the initial approach to Ms. Kaye but rather became involved during the quality control inspection.
- Mr. Cavanaugh asserted the Board needed an answer to the question from a DHC representative.
- Mr. Villalobos clarified there had been no testimony with regard to improper installation of the ductwork but rather a question had been raised as to the judgments made at the beginning of this situation.
- Ms. Fleenor asked if Mr. McNamara was present.
- Mr. Decker replied Mr. McNamara had been fired from DHC.
- Ms. Lerner announced she was the owner of DHC, adding Mr. Taveras was her license holder along with Mr. Lerner. She asserted Mr. Taveras was involved in every job, stating he signed off on permits each day; however, DHC was a large company, rendering it impossible for any qualifier to visit 15 to 20 job sites per day. She testified the job at Ms. Kaye's home proceeded well and passed inspection. She stated DHC had not heard from Ms. Kaye until April 17, 2008, noting the work was performed on April 3 and 4, 2008. She asserted there had been no mention of a missing house key during those two days, adding she had not been contacted by law enforcement. She explained Mr. McNamara had been a sales representative for DHC for a very short period of time but had since been terminated during his 90 day probation period. She concluded she did not advocate, condone or approve of "strong arm sales" nor had she ever been sued or brought up on charges.

- Mr. McClary confirmed Mr. McNamara had been paid on a commission only basis. He opined the Board must hear from Mr. McNamara.
- Mr. Cavanaugh asked what criteria were used to determine a duct system was sized adequately.
- Ms. Lerner replied certain equipment and tests were available to determine same.
- Mr. Cavanaugh asked if any testing at Ms. Kaye's home had been documented.
- Ms. Lerner replied DHC did not retain any documentation beyond the invoice.
- Ms. Fleenor opined such documentation would have been useful.
- Ms. Lerner agreed, stating DHC would probably retain testing paperwork from this point forward.
- Mr. Cole questioned the number of people employed by DHC.
- Ms. Lerner replied 40.
- Mr. Cole asked how many employees were licensed by the State.
- Ms. Lerner replied two.
- Mr. Cole then called Mr. Taveras, asking if he had any knowledge of the job prior to receiving notice of this meeting.
- Mr. Taveras replied he had not.
- Mr. Cole questioned whether he had access to DHC's financial records.
- Mr. Taveras replied he did not.
- Mr. Cole asked how Mr. Taveras was compensated for his work for DHC.
- Mr. Taveras replied he was paid a monthly fee.
- Mr. Cole clarified this was a flat fee as opposed to being based on numbers of permits. He asked if Mr. Taveras worked on other jobs.
- Mr. Taveras replied he did, stating he performed A/C installations, for example.
- Mr. McClary clarified Mr. Taveras was paid a flat monthly fee for the use of his license and was an employee of DHC.
- Ms. Fleenor then commented Ms. Lerner had testified Mr. Taveras did have knowledge of the job.
- Mr. Taveras explained his knowledge was limited to signing a permit application for ductwork replacement.
- Ms. Fleenor inquired as to his involvement in the "after the fact" review.
- Mr. Taveras reiterated he had no further knowledge of the job until being noticed for this meeting.
- Ms. Lerner clarified the job came in on April 3, 2008, after a permit was pulled. She explained Mr. Taveras reviewed the permit application and knew the scope of the work, which was performed on April 3 and 4, 2008, and subsequently passed inspection 1

week later. She reiterated no one at DHC, including Mr. Taveras, was aware of any problem related to this job until receipt of the notice for this hearing other than the original telephone call regarding Ms. Kaye's house key and her allegation of being strong armed on price.

- Mr. Cole requested clarification of the timeline of events.
- Ms. Lerner reviewed her file as follows: clean and check, April 2, 2008, \$49.95; job sold, scheduled for and completed, April 3 and 4, 2008; County inspection passed, May 20, 2008; quality control, April 16, 2008; first complaint received in reference to being strong armed and the missing house key, April 17, 2008. She clarified no complaint was received on April 3 or 4, 2008. She noted her Customer Service Manager (CSM) documented all conversations with each customer, providing a brief review of the initial conversation with Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Burrage asked how Ms. Lerner handled complaints.
- Mr. Lerner explained her process, stating she spoke to everyone involved before responding to the customer.
- Mr. Villalobos asked if all DHC's salesmen were paid on a commission basis only.
- Ms. Lerner replied she did not employ salesmen but rather technicians, stating some were on salary while estimators were paid through commission. She stated Mr. Taveras was an employee of the company, adding he was a lead installer and did not work for any other company. She clarified Mr. Taveras received a monthly payment for the use of his license but was also on their payroll.
- Mr. Villalobos commented much damage could be done in a 90 day probation period, expressing frustration Mr. McNamara was not available for questioning.
- Ms. Lerner stated she checked references and required drug screening, adding two to three months was necessary to determine the real value of an employee.
- Mr. Cole interjected he had just been advised Mr. McNamara was on his way and would be pleased to testify.
- Ms. Kaye clarified she had not filed her complaint with DHC until April 17, 2008, as she had no issues with the company until that time.
- Mr. Bob Shites testified Ms. Kaye's complaint about strong arm tactics was common for DHC.
- Mr. McClary inquired whether there was an accepted technique for determining ductwork was sufficient.
- Mr. Shites replied affirmatively, explaining the gauge system.
- Mr. Burrage inquired whether Mr. Shites could explain the elements necessary to cause a fire.

- Mr. Shites replied the heat strip or undersized wire could cause a fire; however, that was rare, adding he had never seen a fire unless paperwork had been left inside the unit.
- Mr. Cavanaugh inquired whether it was typical for a consumer to replace the existing ductwork.
- Mr. Shites replied if the system was undersized, it would ice up rather than burn up; however, it would have to be largely undersized to work improperly.
- Mr. Coccaro inquired whether it would be a fire hazard if the unit drew too many amps.
- Mr. Shites replied the breaker should take care of that situation.
- Mr. McNamara attested he sold the system to Ms. Kaye.
- Mr. Cole confirmed Mr. McNamara had been terminated by DHC.
- Mr. McNamara testified as to the type and size of unit installed at Ms. Kaye's residence and to the readings on the unit when it was inspected, explaining insufficient air flow through the system could have been a result of undersized ductwork.
- Mr. Cavanaugh inquired whether the ductwork installed was incompatible with the original unit.
- Mr. McNamara replied it would work, albeit not efficiently.
- Discussion ensued regarding air flow through the ductwork.
- Ms. Fleenor questioned what an infinity system was.
- Mr. McNamara replied the Infinity System was made by Carrier.
- Discussion ensued regarding the likelihood of cost savings with the new equipment.
- Mr. Cole inquired if there were problems with the existing air handler.
- Mr. McNamara replied the equipment was working properly.
- Mr. Cole asked if he attempted to sell Ms. Kaye a different unit.
- Mr. McNamara replied they had discussed replacing her unit for efficiency and dependability reasons, adding a system which had operated for four years with inadequate ductwork could have been damaged.
- Mr. Villalobos questioned his remarks regarding a fire.
- Mr. McNamara replied he did not believe he ever mentioned a fire.
- Mr. Cole asked how long he worked for DHC.
- Mr. McNamara replied four months.
- Mr. Cole inquired if Mr. McNamara was familiar with the workings of the company.
- Mr. McNamara replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Cole inquired if he was aware of Mr. Taveras' duties.
- Mr. McNamara replied Mr. Taveras was a technician.
- Mr. Cole inquired if the company had a warehouse.

- Mr. McNamara replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Cole inquired whether ductwork had to be purchased for a specific job.
- Mr. McNamara replied occasionally.
- Mr. Cole inquired if items were stocked at the warehouse.
- Mr. McNamara responded items purchased in bulk could be purchased at a discount.
- Mr. Cole inquired if he received a sales commission.
- Mr. McNamara replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Burrage inquired if Mr. McNamara typically drove around with a complete system in his company vehicle.
- Mr. McNamara replied in the negative.
- Mr. Cole inquired if Mr. McNamara would like to make any additional statements.
- Mr. McNamara replied he was familiar with the situation and could answer any questions.
- Ms. Fleenor inquired if the customer was offered an incentive to purchase the equipment at a discount due to a cancelled job.
- Mr. McNamara responded affirmatively.
- Mr. Cole stated Mr. Miller had been identified as the General Manager, adding it was alleged he pressured the customer to purchase a larger air conditioning unit. He questioned whether Mr. McNamara was present at the time of the sale.
- Mr. McNamara replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Cole asked how he felt about the need for a larger unit.
- Mr. McNamara replied no work was required.
- Mr. Cole inquired as to the average payback time for a customer to recover the cost of a larger unit.
- Mr. McNamara confirmed it would be a number of years.
- Ms. Lerner stated she did not discuss the company's qualifier with all of her employees, expressing concern Mr. Shites had testified in relation to this matter since her company had filed a complaint against him.
- Ms. Kaye attested Mr. McNamara had sold them a new unit when he worked for Four Seasons, questioning why he did not recommend replacing the ductwork at that time. She stated she was told Mr. McNamara was paid on commission and was required to meet a quota, adding she was later advised he had been terminated.
- Mr. McNamara reiterated he was paid on a commission; however, he could not answer a question regarding percentages.
- Mr. Cole inquired as to the number of cleaning jobs scheduled each day.
- Mr. McNamara replied four or five per day.

- Mr. Cole inquired how many times the cleaning job resulted in additional work being needed.
- Mr. McNamara replied two or three jobs out of five.
- Mr. Cole reiterated this was an investigative hearing, adding if there were charges to be made in this case, the owner would be notified and the case would be scheduled to be heard by the Board.
- Mr. Burrage opined it was not clear who was at fault.
- Mr. McClary recommended obtaining an opinion from the City Attorney.
- Mr. Steven Turcott testified he was a dealer who sold many of the same products sold by DHC; therefore, they interacted at times, asserting several complaints against DHC had been filed with Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR). He explained an undercover investigation had been initiated; however, as of this date, the State had not issued an opinion. He opined there had been a blurring of the lines between sales and service, adding service technicians who had worked for DHC had indicated they were accustomed to receiving commissions. He opined if individuals were offered large sales commissions, they were more likely to pressure consumers. He then stated if Ms. Kaye had no energy savings on a \$6,600 investment, it was an indication the original ductwork operated efficiently, attesting if the air conditioner's motor was to burn out, it would not catch fire; therefore, giving people that information would be to solicit a sale. He then concluded the owner of Four Seasons would likely want to testify since the installation of a system by his company had been called into question. He opined the witness was truthful in saying she was told the unit could catch fire.
- Mr. Cavanaugh suggested the Board be provided with the test data used to determine new ductwork was necessary.
- Mr. Cole advised it was not possible to force the contractor to defend themselves.
- Mr. McClary voiced concern third and fourth parties were commenting on the integrity of DHC.
- Mr. Burrage opined that testimony was necessary to address the complaint, adding after Mr. Cole had reviewed the minutes, he would decide what course of action to take.
- Ms. Lerner attested DHC was a licensed and bonded telemarketer and was allowed to solicit their own clientele. She then asserted this hearing was a "witch hunt" against her company, adding her competitors used the same sales techniques. She stated a warranty had to be signed and included in the file, adding when rules changed, the company attempted to comply. She explained supplies were purchased in bulk and

stored in a warehouse; however, there was a restocking fee when merchandise was returned.

- Ms. Fleenor questioned the warranty being on the invoice.
 - Ms. Lerner clarified the warranty would be for equipment rather than ductwork.
 - Ms. Fleenor pointed out there was no warranty on Ms. Kaye's invoice.
 - Ms. Lerner explained the warranty disclosure was hand written on the invoice when there was a sale.
 - Mr. Cavanaugh suggested testing the air quantities coming out of the outlets and whether the system performed within accepted criteria.
 - Mr. McClary suggested an independent agent, such as FPL, conduct the test.
 - Mr. Coccaro MOVED, Mr. Villalobos SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- B. Violation - Hiring an Unlicensed Subcontractor by Frasier Contracting, Inc.
Darryl Lloyd Riley, Qualifier

ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting Adjourned: 11:40 a.m.

John Burrage, Chairman

Karen Smith, Recording Secretary