

PRIVATE INVESTIGATION, RECOVERY AND SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Jacksonville
June 10, 2010

Minutes

Attendees:

Alan Lamarche, Chairman
Tim O'Rourke, Vice Chairman
Johnnie Huneycutt
William LaDrew
Drew Levine
David Merrill
Leonard Miller
Kelli Moore
Patricia Schmitt
John Wurst

Division of Licensing Staff:

Constance N. Crawford
John V. McCarthy
Art Varnadore
Richard Jacobsen
Owen Norman
Terry Weaver
Debbie Barber
Celine Melton

Guests:

John P Belich, J. Belich & Associates, Inc., St Petersburg
Joe Raimondo, Absolute Recovery, Bunnell
Brian Taylor, A.I.R.
J.R. McClain, Classic Recovery, Auburndale
Melvin Reed, PI, Flagler
Michael Nesbitt, Melvin Reed Inv., Palm Coast
Galen D. Gingeary, Gingeary, Jacksonville
Robert A. Watkins, Fast Track Private Investigations, St. Johns County
R. Christine Watkins, Fast Track Private Investigations, St. Johns County
Glenn Lightsey, Lightsey Investigative Agency, St. Johns County
Roger Sulimirski, G4S Secure Solutions, Jacksonville
Len Rzepczynski, The Cimis Group, St. Augustine
K.C. Poulin, CIS/FASCO, Clearwater
Grady Snyder, Grady Snyder and Associates, Tampa
Rick Staly, American Eagle Sentry, Palm Coast
Steve White, Gold Leaf Security, Jacksonville
Jeff Balkcom, Gil Holdings, Jacksonville
Stephen Reeves, G.L.S., West Palm Beach
Richard Lettera, Plantation Security Inc., Tallahassee
Mark Puetz, CIS/FASCO, Clearwater
Dave Hariton, Advanced Intelligent Group, Daytona Beach & Jacksonville
Adam Clarke, CIS/FALI, Clearwater
Lee Cannon, Lee Cannon and Associates, Land O Lakes –Tampa
Steve Craig, SA Craig, P.A., Orlando
Burt Hodge, S.I.B., Tallahassee

Stephen Salyer, Salyer and Associates, Jacksonville
William Courtney, PI, Jacksonville
Ann Freeman, RCSS, Jacksonville
Rory McMahon, McMahon and Associates Detective Division, Ft. Lauderdale
Alex Krasnov, AK Security, Jacksonville
James Palu, AK Security, Jacksonville
Candace Flanagan, My Safe & Sound Home Incorporated, Palm Coast

Chairman Alan Lamarche called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone. He asked David Merrill to lead everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Lamarche introduced himself and asked the other Council members to introduce themselves, their companies, and the industries they represent.

Mr. Lamarche introduced Ms. Crawford, the Director for the Division of Licensing, and asked Ms. Crawford to introduce her staff.

Ms. Crawford introduced Debbie Barber, Administrative Assistant, and Celine Melton, Management Analyst, both of whom work in the Director's office. She then introduced John McCarthy, Assistant Director for the Division of Licensing, Art Varnadore, Chief of the Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement (BRE), who is in charge of all Regional Offices. Mr. Varnadore introduced Jake Jacobsen, Investigator Supervisor, Terry Weaver and Owen Norman, Investigation Specialists with the Jacksonville Regional Office.

Mr. Lamarche recognized Joe Taylor as a former council member and thanked him for his many contributions to the industry and to the Council.

Mr. Lamarche asked attendees to introduce themselves, provide the name of the agency they represent, location and the types of licenses held. He thanked everyone for taking time from their busy schedules to attend the meeting.

Comments by Chairman

Mr. Lamarche called for a reading of the March 18, 2010, meeting minutes.

MOTION by Ms. Patricia Schmitt: To approve and waive the reading of the prior meeting minutes and accept as approved.

Second: Mr. Leonard Miller

Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Lamarche explained the purpose of the Council. He advised that the Council has eleven members. Five represent the private security industry, three represent the private investigative industry, one represents the recovery industry, one member regularly contracts with a Class "A", "B", or "R" agency, and one is an active law enforcement officer. Their terms are for four years. The members of the Council hold non-paid positions; their only reimbursement is for expenses to meetings. Council meetings are held quarterly at various locations throughout the state. The Council's role is to listen to input from the industry and make recommendations to the Division of Licensing.

Mr. Lamarche requested attendees to be recognized by the chair and to provide his/her name prior to addressing the Council in order to help move the meeting along.

Mr. Lamarche asked Ms. Crawford to proceed with comments on behalf of the Division of Licensing.

Comments by Division of Licensing – Constance N. Crawford, Division Director

2010 Legislative Session Update

Ms. Crawford gave a brief synopsis of legislative bills that did not pass but would have impacted Chapter 493 licensees.

HB 0301 / SB 0658 - A bill relating to Locksmith Services – included the creation of an advisory council requiring one of its members to have private investigative, private security, motor vehicle recovery, or law enforcement experience or expertise. Both bills died in committee.

HB 1359 / SB 2412 - A bill relating to detention by licensed security officers – authorizing certain security officers to detain persons suspected under specified conditions. The House bill was deferred in committee; the Senate bill died in committee.

SB 2402 - A bill creating the Board of Investigation, Security, and Recovery within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. It was withdrawn early in session.

HB 1445 / SB 0382 and similar SB 2348 – Although these bills were very similar to bills that were submitted by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services during the 2009 legislative session, they were introduced and sponsored independently by members of the House and Senate during the 2010 legislative session. The bills died in committee.

Ms. Crawford then gave an update on bills that were approved by the Governor:

HB 971 - A bill sponsored by Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, but pertinent to Chapter 493 in a few areas. Section 316.29545(3), exempts vehicles that are owned or leased by private investigators and private investigative agencies licensed under Chapter 493 from window-screening restrictions. Additionally, section 316.193 (13) 1. a. deletes the requirement for an agency engaged in immobilization of vehicles to have an “R” license. Governor Crist approved this bill on June 4, 2010.

SB 1158 - Exempts the Division of Licensing Trust Fund from fund shifts to the Budget Stabilization Fund and the General Revenue Fund. Ms. Crawford explained that the exemption does not authorize the Division to spend trust fund dollars without budgetary authority to do so. Trust Fund expenditures are still subject to legislative oversight, and the Division must still submit budget requests as part of the normal budgetary process each fiscal year. Governor Crist approved the bill on March 30, 2010, effective immediately. Ms Crawford thanked Marion Hammer, Executive Director for Unified Sportsmen of Florida, and all the FS493 industry members for their support.

DOL Budget Request

Ms. Crawford reported on the budget proposal that was submitted to the Legislature for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. The Legislature approved most of the Division’s requests despite the poor economy, loss of state revenue, and the budget deficit. The approved budget includes an allocation for 28 new full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. Of the 28, eight will be investigator positions, one for each of the Division’s Regional Offices.

In addition, the Division received the budget authority to continue its concealed weapon license application intake service at the Regional Offices, which includes funding for the temporary (OPS) employees who provide the service at the Regional Offices.

Status of Division of Licensing Workload

Director Crawford reported that as of the end of May the total population of licensees had reached almost 900,000. Ms. Crawford stated that in FY 03-04 the total of all new applications received was just at 65,000. This year through May, the Division has received approximately 202,000 new applications. Ms. Crawford indicated that renewal applications are remaining relatively steady: FY 08-09 129,000, FY 09-10 (through May 2010) 133,000.

Ms. Crawford said the Division is staying very busy and is doing a much better job handling the incoming work. This time a year ago, there were over 100,000 pending documents waiting to be reviewed and processed. The Division's current volume ranges between 15,000 - 20,000 a week.

Investigation of Security Officer Training Facilities

Ms. Crawford reported that the Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement (BRE) had recently undertaken investigations of several security officer schools and training facilities. She stated that some schools were found to be in compliance; however, some were not. Director Crawford said that the Division would soon be taking administrative action against these Class "DS" and Class "DI" licensees. She said that she fully anticipated that more such actions were likely as the investigations continue.

Interactive Voice Response

The Legislature approved funding for an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system to help reduce the call volume related to concealed weapon (CW) application status calls. Unlike FS493, CW application and licensure status cannot be determined using the Division's website because of strict statutory confidentiality language. Those applicants and licensees will now be able to find out the status of their initial applications by using a unique tracking number assigned to each application; renewal applicants will use their license numbers. Ms. Crawford explained the system will also benefit Chapter 493 applicants/licensees by giving the caller access to commonly asked questions about the licensing process without having to speak to a customer service representative. She welcomed comments/suggestions on how to make this system more productive.

Class "D" Security Officer Curriculum

Ms. Crawford stated that the Class "DS" Security Officer Schools and Training Facilities curriculum guideline changes recommended by the PIRSAC go into effect July 1, 2010. In addition, a confirmation that the school/training facility's curriculum, revised exams and answer sheets need to be on file with the Division prior to that date. She further stated that a reminder 'Important Notice' would be mailed the following week.

Follow-up to Issues Raised at March 2010 PIRSAC Meeting

Immobilization and Class "R" Licensure

Ms. Crawford restated the information provided earlier regarding HB 971, sponsored by the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles. She explained that, in 2009, a

bill was passed requiring any person/company that operated an immobilization agency to obtain a Class "R" Recovery Agency license. During the 2010 legislative session, in HB 971, this section of law is repealed effective September 1, 2010.

Red Light Cameras

Ms. Crawford explained this issue has been resolved by the Legislature. The Division had received a complaint and additional correspondence asking whether a company that provides red light cameras at traffic intersections (American Traffic Solutions/ATS) is performing private investigation. Ms. Crawford stated the Department looked at the information obtained in the course of the investigation, and additional pertinent documents. After careful review and consideration, it was determined that the service being provided did not fall within the scope of Chapter 493, Florida Statutes. Ms. Crawford said the question has now been resolved by the legislature. HB 325 was approved by Governor Crist and becomes effective July 1, 2010, authorizing counties and municipalities to use cameras as traffic infraction detectors to identify motor vehicles that fail to stop at red lights. This bill stipulates that the use of such cameras does not require compliance under the regulatory provisions of Chapter 493.

Agency Name Approval

Ms. Crawford stated she reviewed the June 2009 meeting minutes where the concern regarding the Division's name approval process was first addressed. Ms. Crawford explained that she had met with the Division's management team in July 2009 and the procedure was revised and implemented in August 2009 to address the concerns voiced by the Council. Ms. Crawford stated that she relayed this to the PIRSAC in September 2009 and believed the matter resolved. At the March meeting, the Division learned that additional names had been approved that caused concern. Accordingly, as requested by the PIRSAC at the March 2010 meeting, the Division again reviewed the procedure. A copy of the revised name approval guideline was provided to the PIRSAC members. Ms. Crawford explained, in detail, the guidelines for name approval. She indicated that certain proposed names must be approved by Art Varnadore, Bureau Chief of Regulation and Enforcement.

Ms. Crawford explained that Section 493.6111(4), F.S., states "the department may not authorize the use of a name which is so similar to that of a public office or agency, or of that used by another licensee that the public may be confused or misled thereby." Ms. Crawford further explained that the Division must strike a balance between protecting the public and assuring that it does not unreasonably restrict competition or the availability of services requiring licensure. Ms. Crawford stated that she believes the Division's name approval procedure is better now. She requested that if a Council member comes across a name of concern that it be brought to her attention ASAP.

Ms. Crawford also stated that the Division would not rescind the approval of a licensed agency name. She indicated that the Division has received no complaints from the public or from a law enforcement agency indicating that an approved name was misleading. Ms. Crawford said if the Division receives such a complaint, it would not hesitate to deny or rescind approval if there is substantive evidence upon which to do so. She also explained some of the possible legal ramifications.

Mr. Lamarche stated that some of the concerns were voiced by associations and that agency name approval had been discussed a lot at the meetings. Mr. Lamarche said he is very pleased that the Division has taken positive action on this issue and it should be a help to all Chapter 493 industries.

Further discussion was held on sending additional names to the Division for review. Mr. Lamarche suggested adding the word "Enforcement" to the list of non-allowed terms. The Council was in agreement to request that the word "Enforcement" be added to the list.

Mr. Varnadore stated that since the last PIRSAC meeting, he has received twenty names for approval/disapproval; eighteen of the twenty names were disapproved because of the name or the words or combination of words therein. He believes the Division is on the right track as a result of tightening the parameters regarding agency name approval.

Mr. Lamarche and the Council complimented the Division on a job well done!

Mr. O'Rourke stated that he wanted to discuss an important issue - the use of Red Light Cameras. He indicated he is not in agreement with the way Ms. Crawford summarized the red light camera issue earlier in the meeting and wanted to go on record with his position. He said ATS is not strictly a camera installer; they go way beyond that. He has seen the letters from the complainant as well as from the State. He would like to highlight a couple of points. The letter states ATS simply installs and monitors cameras. Mr. O'Rourke stated he has researched this issue and they gather information, make assessments of violations, and run vehicle license plates through the DMV. Ms. Crawford asked if she could interject, stating that she understands Mr. O'Rourke's concerns, but that the issue regarding licensure under FS493 has been resolved by legislation in HB 325, which was signed by Governor Crist and will become effective July 1, 2010. Mr. O'Rourke replied that it was not just about investigators being upset about a company installing cameras. He stated he has read the law and has had several people tell him they are conducting an investigation, they are making an assessment, and they are making a judgment. He stated the company is making legal decisions and in his opinion and others, ATS is conducting investigations. Ms. Crawford again said she understands his position but that she respectfully disagrees. Mr. Lamarche remarked that because the legislature has passed a law exempting companies that install red-light cameras from licensure under Chapter 493, the meeting needs to move on.

Proposed Legislation

Ms. Crawford indicated that at the last PIRSAC meeting a motion was made stating, "In the future, for any bills that affect the licensees encompassing Chapter 493, that a copy of that bill or those bills (specifically referred to as clean up bills) be brought before the PIRSAC for review, discussion, and PIRSAC recommendations prior to it being submitted to the Legislature." Ms. Crawford explained that she would be happy to do this. She said she was surprised to hear from Assistant Director John McCarthy, who represented the Division at the March 2010 PIRSAC meeting, that some members of the Council were unaware of the proposed revisions. She said she had provided legislative updates at every PIRSAC meeting and, once known, the corresponding bill numbers. She told the PIRSAC members that for today's meeting, however, she had provided in their meeting packets a copy of 2010 HB 1445 (77 pages), which was not a Department bill but which included FS493 revisions found in the 2009 Department bill.

Mr. Lamarche explained that what was discussed at the last meeting was that the Council wants to have input into the bill before it is approved by the Commissioner. Ms. Crawford reminded PIRSAC members about the logistics involved in the way legislation is introduced, compiled, reviewed and finalized. Ms. Crawford explained that she reports to the Commissioner of Agriculture and any changes the Division recommends must be first approved by the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner. The recommendations are usually requested in August of each year for the following year's legislative session. Ms. Crawford explained this process involves all the various

Divisions within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the Department's Legislative Affairs Office, and the Commissioner's office. Given the complexity in the review and approval of proposed legislation, she stated it is not likely that any Department bill will have been reviewed and approved by the Commissioner prior to a September Council meeting. Ms. Crawford said based on her experience thus far, however, the final version of any *proposed* legislation would, in most circumstances, be available for the Council by the December meeting.

Ms. Crawford also reiterated that the way a bill looks at the beginning of session could end up dramatically different by the end of session. She stated that amendments can sometimes happen several times a day during session. She recommended that if anyone is concerned about a particular bill, to be sure to watch its progress during the legislative process.

In conclusion, Ms. Crawford indicated that she did not yet know whether the Department would request any legislation for the 2011 session. She stated that if a bill were to be introduced, she did not foresee any recommended changes to Chapter 493 other than those previously submitted by the Department in 2009.

Mr. Lamarche said he did not think the Council needed a copy of the whole bill, just what affects Chapter 493. There was discussion of proposed changes found in this year's bill and the effect those changes would have had on the industry. Council members, in general, expressed that they were unaware of many of these changes; some would have caused major changes to the industry. Ms. Crawford stressed the importance of all interested parties tracking these bills because of the potential impact the legislation may have on the regulated industries. Ms. Crawford stated that industry input during the legislative process can make a difference.

Lenny Miller asked if proposed legislation relating to Chapter 493 could be e-mailed to Council members. Ms. Crawford explained that she and the Council members need to be careful about having an unintended public meeting by the use of e-mail because it provides potential for discourse among the recipients -- and the minute there is discourse between two PIRSAC members -- by definition, a public meeting has been held... Holding a public meeting without proper notice is a violation of the *Government in the Sunshine* law. As far as whether the dissemination of material *only* can be done, she stated that she would ask her legal counsel for advice. Mr. Lamarche said there could be something in the e-mail saying this cannot be discussed prior to the meeting otherwise this is a violation of the law. Ms. Crawford reiterated that during the legislative process, proposed revisions can change constantly. She said she could e-mail Council members a proposed revision and in just a few minutes it could be changed again. She reiterated that if there is legislation one is concerned about, then that person should also track it, too.

Response to the Council's Motion Requesting Guidance Concerning Sleeping on Duty

Ms. Crawford addressed the second motion made by PIRSAC at the March meeting requesting guidance from the Division as to whether sleeping on duty is considered negligence and/or misconduct and to the standard position of the Division with regard to the punishment of such an offense.

Director Crawford stated, in summary, the Division does consider sleeping on duty to be misconduct. For a licensee with no previous disciplinary record, the guidelines set forth in administrative code would allow the Division to levy a \$100 administrative fine. This

amount would be increased, and the disciplinary sanction increased or decreased, depending on the aggravating and mitigating factors of a particular case.

Director Crawford distributed copies of the Division's response to members of the Council. Ms. Schmitt asked if the written opinions could be on Department letterhead. Ms. Crawford said yes and that the document would be made available via a link labeled as Compliance Guidelines on the main web page (www.mylicensesite.com) under the LEGAL INFORMATION heading. Responses to all future requests for statutory guidance or clarification will be published there. Moreover, Ms. Crawford said that she had asked the Division's Attorney Supervisor to review old opinions that have been issued by the Division. She said that if the information in those old opinions were still relevant and timely, those documents would be published as new entries on the Compliance Guidelines page.

Assistance from PIRSAC

Ms. Crawford stated that the Department will have a new Commissioner of Agriculture in 2011. She asked the Council members for their thoughts and ideas on the direction they would like to see the industries headed to in the next 5 to 10 years. What are the trends? For example, she recently received correspondence asking whether off-site video surveillance ("passive camera monitoring") where there is no interaction or expectation to interact with anyone other than to call 911 in the event of an emergency would fall under the purview of Chapter 493. In addition, new technology is being used: how will this affect the industries? Since Chapter 493 came into existence in the 1960's, there have been many revisions over the years, the writers of the law could not have envisioned how the language would apply to the technological world we live in today. Ms. Crawford asked the Council for their thoughts and visions for the future. Mr. Lamarche said this is an excellent opportunity, with a new Commissioner coming in - for the industries to let the new Commissioner know what direction and changes they would like to see in the future. Personally, he sees this as a challenge for the associations to come up with proposed legislation for PIRSAC to review, submit to the Division and to get the Commissioner's approval.

Ms. Crawford concluded her comments.

New Business

Mr. Poulin expressed his gratitude to Ms. Crawford and her staff for placing the guidelines on the website. He stated that it will provide the industries with much needed assistance in the performance of their regulated duties. He thanked the Division for the proactive mindset that has been taken on this issue. Mr. O'Rourke asked if the guidelines would be considered legal opinions. Ms. Crawford replied they should be considered compliance guidelines.

Mr. Poulin asked about the possibility of conducting background checks through the Division to see if an applicant has had disciplinary history taken. He stated that Texas already does this. Discussion was held on automating this information through a database. He said this would help the security industry, investigators and reposersors tremendously. Ms. Schmitt clarified that this would be utilized for all industries. Ms. Crawford asked if PIRSAC would like to move forward with this issue. The Council was favorable for a study to be done by the Division to see if this would be feasible.

Comments by Industry Associations

Private Investigation – Bert Hodge, Vice President, Florida Association of Licensed Investigators (FALI). Mr. Hodge stated that he is encouraged by what he has observed today between PIRSAC, the Division, and the various associations in attendance. He stated that FALI has a lobbyist but being able to interact with the associations and PIRSAC is invaluable to him. In order to track pending legislation, communication between all parties involved is very important. He commended all parties and emphasized that he would like to see this line of communication kept open.

Recovery – Jamie Blackburn addressed a technology and database issue. He stated there is a need for a central database for reporting repossessions; that no uniformity exists between the counties and/or law enforcement. Mr. Blackburn explained how the database would be a tremendous tool for the recovery industry. Mr. Varnadore asked Mr. Blackburn if he was suggesting that the industry not contact the local law enforcement. Mr. Blackburn replied he was suggesting that when they do contact law enforcement, a log needs to be housed in one central location. Mr. Varnadore stated this could be helpful to the Division, as well. Mr. Lamarche asked if this could be included in proposed legislation for Chapter 493 requiring law enforcement agencies to add the needed information to a database within so many hours or days. Further discussion was held. Ms. Crawford suggested that Mr. Blackburn contact the Division and set up a time to talk about the logistics and try to determine the best placement of this issue. Ms. Crawford said she certainly sees the advantage; it is a matter of how to get it implemented.

Security - K.C. Poulin, President, FASCO congratulated the private investigators and specifically, FALI, for getting its bill passed. He stated that three associations worked very closely with the Presidents Council this year on legislative issues and they were able to stop things moving through the legislative process. Mr. Poulin thanked the other associations on behalf of FASCO for working with them.

Comments from Public/Industry

Drew Levine announced that the Wackenhut Corporation legally became G4S Secure Solutions (USA), Inc., on June 1, 2010. The name change is part of a global initiative to have their organizations recognized under one name. Mr. Levine stated that he was a 22-year Wackenhut employee and understands the need for a global brand especially in the future. He stated the company has 620,000 employees encompassing 110 countries worldwide, which is a large organization by any standard. He said The Wackenhut Corporation has operated as such since 1954. In 2002, they were acquired by Group 4 Falck, and in 2004 merged with Securicor, creating G4S. Under G4S, they continued to operate under the Wackenhut name until June 1, 2010. He explained that while the decision to change its name to G4S Secure Solutions (USA), Inc., was to have uniformity across the globe, it certainly has a deeper impact to the long-term Wackenhut employees and to its customers and stakeholders, as well as this group. He said it is an emotional journey for everyone; he is proud of his background with Wackenhut and looks forward to a long future with the new company.

Mr. Levine reported that he attended the National Association of Security Companies (NASCO) meeting in DC late last month. He discussed sleeping on duty and the ramifications that it has on all companies that provide security. He believes that it is important for all companies to address this issue uniformly but that there are ways to help prevent this from happening. One way is to encourage healthy eating habits such

as limiting the consumption of sugars, etc. Mr. Levine said he believes all companies should work together to further professionalism in the industries they represent.

Mr. Lamarche asked Mr. Levine if it was imperative for agency owners and the industries to increase training standards, stating that he believes it will be the only way to survive in the future. Mr. Levine replied with regard to training requirements - California, Texas, Florida, and New Jersey - are in the forefront. He agrees that the industry needs to keep the baseline and standards up.

Ms. Schmitt stated that she has been on the Council for about seven years; she has one more year to go. She said it is frustrating to hear her competition complain about the Division and the industry when they have never attended a PIRSAC meeting. She explained that they have the same opportunity to voice their concerns and be heard like everyone else but they have to take the time and make the effort to do so. It doesn't matter whether it is related to the private investigation industry, recovery industry or security industry - their voice will be heard. It may not happen after one or two meetings but if they have conviction and are consistent in getting something changed, it can make a difference. She stated she has seen a lot of changes in her seven years on the Council. For example, a security officer, with the help of associations, was successful in changing the caliber of firearms that all security officers can carry. Ms Schmitt stated there are a lot of things that still can be done as an industry; she has been in the industry for over twenty-five years, starting as a security officer, and working her way up. She believes it is imperative that the industry take a leadership role in educating and professionalizing the industry or they are going to be looking in the rear-view mirror rather than facing the future head on. Ms. Schmitt commended the Division of Licensing for its support in issuing guidelines for sleeping on duty.

Mr. Levine stated that he would like to host next year's PIRSAC meeting in the G4S Secure Solutions (USA), Inc., new building.

Next Meeting Location

September 16, 2010
9:00 AM
Embassy Suites Hotel – Fort Lauderdale
1100 SE 17th Street
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(954) 527-2700

Meeting adjourned.