STATE OF OHIO
STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF ARCHITECTS

OFFICE OF THE BOARD
77 S. HIGH STREET, 16th FLOOR
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43266-0303
TEL. 614-466-2316

BEFORE THE OHIO STATE BOARD
OF EXAMINERS OF ARCHITECTS

IN RE: KERRY W. ILLES 5000 Gateway Dr. Medina, OH 44256	: :	DATE: September 25, 1996
Cert. No. 4206	:	Certified Mail: P 348 812 575

ADJUDICATION ORDER

Pursuant to a meeting of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects, the above matter came before the Board on September 13, 1996, for consideration by the Board of the Hearing Examiner's Report and Recommendation. Members of the Board present were: John Spencer, Harold Rasmussen, Joseph Vetter, and Richard Kaplan. Merle Myers was present but abstained from voting.

ORDER OF THE BOARD

The Board conducted its review of the Hearing Examiner's Report and Recommendation, and took the following actions:

1. The Board approves the findings of fact set out in the Report and Recommendation;

2. The Board approves the conclusions of law set out in the Report and Recommendation;

3. The Board approves the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner to the extent that it reprimands Kerry W. Illes for his actions giving rise to the violation. However, the Board wishes to note that there was significant mitigation evidence in this matter, despite the presence of a technical violation. Specifically, Mr. Illes made a measured effort to control the architectural component of drawings being prepared by the design-builder's draftsman, and in doing so he believed he was meeting the requirements of the professional standards required by law. There was no evidence suggesting aggravating circumstances. To the contrary, the evidence demonstrated that Mr. Illes maintains a high standard of integrity in conducting his

professional practice. Mr. Illes acted on his own prior to the Board taking action, to put his long-time client on notice that architectural drawings would now have to be produced by the architectural firm and not by the builder's in-house draftsman, demonstrating that Mr. Illes has taken responsible steps to comply with Board rules with respect to improper use of his professional seal.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Adjudication Order of the Ohio State Board of Examiners of Architects is true and accurate as it appears in the journal of the Board of its proceedings on September 13, 1996.

This order may be appealed in accordance with Section 119.12 of the Ohio Revised Code by filing a Notice of Appeal with the Ohio State Board of Examiners of Architects, 77 South High Street, 16th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43266, and **also a copy** of that Notice of Appeal with the Court of Common Pleas in the county of the respondent's place of business, or in the county in which the respondent is a resident, or with the Court of Common Pleas in Franklin County, Ohio if not a resident of Ohio. Such Notice of Appeal shall contain the Order appealed from and the grounds of such an appeal. Such Notice of Appeal and copy shall be filed and must be delivered within fifteen (15) days after the mailing of this Adjudication Order.

BY ORDER OF THE BOARD,

William N. Wilcox
Executive Director

STATE OF OHIO
BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF ARCHITECTS

In re: Kerry W. Illes

Certificate No. 4206

Hearing Examiner:

Christopher B. McNeil, Esq.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Wednesday, August 21, 1996

For the Board: Attorney General Betty Montgomery, by Michael W. Gleespen, A.A.G., Business and Government Regulation Section, 26th Floor, 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3428. Telephone: 614 466-2980; Telecopier: 614 466-6090.

For the Certificate Holder: Kerry W. Illes, appearing *pro se*, Kerry W. Illes, Architect, 5000 Gateway Drive, Medina, Ohio 44256; Telephone: (Medina) 725-6262.

I. NATURE OF THE CASE

By a letter dated June 7, 1996, the State Board of Examiners of Architects (Board) gave written notice to Kerry W. Illes (Mr. Illes) that charges had been filed against Mr. Illes concerning professional architectural work attributed to Mr. Illes. In that notice Mr. Illes was advised he had the right pursuant to R.C. Chapter 119 (the Ohio Administrative Procedure Act) to a hearing relating to the charges. Thereafter Mr. Illes requested an adjudicatory hearing before the Board. The Board granted that request, set the matter for hearing, and appointed the undersigned to serve as its Hearing Examiner. An evidentiary hearing was held on August 14, 1996, at which time Board counsel advised that the Board determined to dismiss the charge that alleged Mr. Illes violated O.R.C. 4703.15(E) (aiding and abetting another

person not properly registered by sections 4703.01 to 4703.19 of the Revised Code). Mr. Illes advised that he had no objection to the dismissal of this charge, and thereafter the parties presented testimony and documentary evidence before the Hearing Examiner and three members of the Board. The evidentiary record is now closed and this report and recommendation is issued pursuant to R.C. 119.09.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED

The testimony of all witnesses and the contents of all exhibits, whether or not specifically referred to within this report, were thoroughly reviewed and considered by the Hearing Examiner prior to making the findings and recommendations shown below.

A. Documents Reviewed

1. Presented by the State

   a) Exhibit 1 (consisting of 7 pages) including Application for Plan Approval for the Wayne County Building Department, Building Permit, Truswal design drawings, and two oversized drawings bearing Kerry Illes' professional architect's seal.

2. Presented by Mr. Illes

   a) Exhibit A: Hand-written sketch entitled "Basement Floor Plan for Oak Valley School."

   b) Exhibit B: Letter dated May 6, 1996 from Mr. Illes to the Board.

   c) Exhibit C: Letter dated July 3, 1996 from Mr. Illes to the Board.

   d) Exhibit D: Letter dated June 21, 1996 from Roland Lindsay to the Board.

   e) Exhibit E: Letter (not dated) from Daniel R. Flory, Curry Lumber Company, to the Board.

   f) Exhibit F: Letter dated July 2, 1996 from Mr. Illes to the Board.

B. Summary of Testimony Presented

1. Examination by the State:

a) Testimony by Robert Wilson

Robert Wilson testified that he is employed by the Curry Lumber Company as a draftsman. Wilson's duties are to take information provided to him from salesmen and from Mr. Illes, and from that information use a computer assisted design (CAD) program to generate drawings of buildings. He explained that he produced the drawings that appear in the last two pages of State's Exhibit 1. State's Exhibit 1 reflects documents pertaining to what Wilson knew as the "Blue Ribbon" project, as it concerned a proposal for building a forty-foot by sixty-foot commercial warehouse for the Blue Ribbon Manufacturing Company.

Wilson explained that typically his job requires that he take information provided to him by Curry salesmen. Curry is a "design/build" company, and the salesmen take orders for the construction of new buildings. Wilson's duties are to draw the proposed buildings to scale, and to produce exterior views that will permit building crews to build the structures to the specifications provided by the customers through the salesmen. Included in this process would be input from Mr. Illes, who provided information concerning architectural specifications, such as typical section details, corner bracing details, truss connection details, and general notes. If, during the process of drawing the plans and specifications needed for the customer's order, Wilson has questions about architectural details, he would call Mr. Illes, or a salesman would call Mr. Illes and provide the information to Wilson.

Wilson said that the information contained in the data files used by the CAD program used by Curry came in part from Mr. Illes. Mr. Illes provided what Wilson referred to as "standard details," from which the post frame or pole buildings were built. He said that to the best of his recollection he did not speak with Mr. Illes before he began drafting the Blue Ribbon project. Wilson drew up the floorplan, door locations, elevations, and a preliminary set of notes, and used information provided by Mr. Illes for these and for drawings showing the typical walls and typical sections shown in the drawings in Exhibit 1. All of these were

done without Wilson consulting with or discussing the project with Mr. Illes. Wilson stated that Mr. Illes is not his supervisor at Curry and that Mr. Illes does not pay him, but that Curry does. As a standard practice, however, Wilson worked with Mr. Illes, and Mr. Illes tells Wilson what is needed in plans and specifications produced by Curry.

As it concerns the particular drawings prepared for the Blue Ribbon project, Wilson first stated he believed he had direct contact with Mr. Illes, although this contact was after Wilson had produced the site plan and floor plan found in Exhibit 1. He said he thought he may have added the electrical notes after speaking with Mr. Illes. He first testified that after preparing the initial drawing he spoke with Mr. Illes, who directed him to double-check the size of the header and the depths of the footing. Upon further reflection, Wilson testified that he was mistaken, that in fact he got most of his information not from Mr. Illes but from the salesman, Dave Canankamp. It was Wilson's understanding that Mr. Canankamp would be particularly careful to have "everything in its place." He did recall at least one telephone conversation he had with Mr. Illes, and that he was not aware of Mr. Illes making any changes to the final drawings Wilson prepared. He understands that the drawings were sealed by Mr. Illes and that thereafter the Wayne County building department issued a permit based on the drawings.

Wilson described his credentials, stating he had a degree in art, and had worked in the past as a draftsman for two architectural firms and an engineering firm, and had also served as a freelance draftsman. He acknowledged that he held no certificates or registrations to practice architecture.

b) Testimony of Kerry Illes

Mr. Illes testified that he has been a licensed architect for close to thirty years, that he has owned his own practice since 1970, and that his work is approximately seventy percent commercial and thirty percent residential. The commercial practice covers a range of structures, including churches, shopping centers, warehouses, and schools.

Before he signed and sealed the documents appearing in the last two pages of State's Exhibit 1, Mr. Illes personally reviewed the drawings. There were no other consultants or electrical contractors on the project, although Mr. Illes also had Julie Sipka, a licensed Ohio Architect working in his office, look over the plans, as the plans were presented to him by Curry. He described the business arrangement existing between Curry and his firm as being one founded on a working relationship that extended over the past ten years. In his opinion, the relationship between Curry and Mr. Illes' firm was one that gave Mr. Illes total supervisory control over the work of Curry's draftsman. As such, he saw no reason to believe there was any violation of his professional code when he signed and sealed the Blue Ribbon project drawings.

Mr. Illes testified that because he had total control and supervision over the work of Curry's draftsman, it would not be unusual for him to have no knowledge about the Blue Ribbon project drawings until he got the drawings prepared by Mr. Wilson. He admitted that the first time he actually saw the Blue Ribbon drawings was after he had given Dave Canankamp, Curry's salesman, some professional directions based on the information Canankamp provided to Mr. Illes. The building in question is, in Mr. Illes view, a relatively standard building which he described as being a post frame or pole building, of the type frequently used in farm building structures, with dimensions of forty by sixty feet. Because he believed he had total control over the Curry database, and because the details shown in the drawings are his work product, Mr. Illes concluded that he could lawfully seal these drawings. He acknowledged, however, that he had no input into site layout, elevations, panel size, roof slope, or door location, but stated that he would examine these components after the plans were delivered to him by Curry. On receipt of the plans, he probably made some changes, but he had no independent recollection of any specific conversation with Wilson after Curry delivered the plans to him. He testified that he did not speak with Wilson before the plans were delivered to his firm.

Mr. Illes described the working control he had over Wilson. He said Wilson takes direction from Mr. Illes and others in the Illes firm, but is not paid by the Illes firm, nor does

Wilson receive from Illes any of the benefits typically extended to employees by employers (such as the employer's share of social security taxes, workers' compensation coverage, and the like). There is no written contract setting out a job description between the Curry draftsman and the Illes firm, and there is no written agreement existing between Curry and the Illes firm in general. Rather, the principals of the two entities (Mr. Illes for the architectural firm and Daniel Flory for Curry) reached a business agreement through oral statements, bound by a handshake, as is customary in the practice in that location, according to Mr. Illes. Mr. Illes stated that he has done business with the Amish community on the same handshake basis, and believes he can rely on the handshake to bind Curry and to be bound by it himself.

Mr. Illes explained that many times architectural projects created for Curry will originate in the Illes office, but that the Blue Ribbon project was not one such project. It originated at Curry, using programs and data developed through the collaborative efforts of both Curry and the Illes firm. Mr. Illes developed the prototype for the post frame drawings, and believes that by affixing his seal to the drawings he was accepting full responsibility for the architectural components shown in the drawings. He offered that he believed he has prepared more post frame projects than any other firm in the state. On questions from members of the Board, he explained that the information he provided to Curry for its database and CAD was for a program used by Curry that was almost identical to the CAD program used by Illes. Illes gave Curry "everything that we have" with respect to the basic details of these buildings, so that Curry had as much data and specifications as Illes himself maintained, if not more. He noted, however, that there is no direct modem linking between the two firm CAD operations. He also stated the only way to determine whether the information he provided to Curry (in the form of standard details used by its draftsman) was the same now as when Mr. Illes first delivered it a year and a half ago, would be to examine the standard drawings for each such detail. He added that he does such an examination whenever he is presented with the drawings prepared by a Curry draftsman.

2. Testimony presented by Mr. Illes

a) Mr. Illes

Mr. Illes added to his earlier testimony by stating he was disappointed by the action of the Board. He stated his conviction that by exercising complete control over the drafting specifications he provided to Curry, and by directing Mr. Wilson's work, he was in responsible charge of the Blue Ribbon project and should not have been charged with a violation of the professional code.

b) Daniel R. Flory

Daniel R. Flory testified that he is a vice president of Curry and is familiar with Mr. Illes and the work provided by Mr. Illes to Curry. He stated that Curry has an established business of constructing pole barns and similar buildings, and has been in business for 104 years. It currently builds about 300 buildings a year, counting only those projects having a cost of $4,000.00 or more.

In the past, that is, before the CAD program was developed through Mr. Illes' firm, Mr. Illes would take a salesman's drawing such as that offered as Exhibit A. Customers would provide Curry salesmen with information about desired door placements, lighting and the like, and then Mr. Illes would meet with the salesman to go over architectural details involved in the project. When Curry added a draftsman, Mr. Wilson, to the workforce, it routed the projects of the six sales people to him, and at any given time Flory expects that Wilson will be carrying a heavy load of CAD-based work. Flory expects Wilson to fully account for his time, and expects the CAD program to be a useful part of the company's operation.

Flory testified that until recent changes in the law, Curry would put its company logo, and not a professional seal, on plans and drawings submitted for building permits. He stated he was "scared" when the law changed, because a large part of Curry's business required such permits and it appeared the company logo would not be enough once the law went into effect. Now, with the CAD program created by a collaboration between Mr. Illes and Curry, he

expects Mr. Wilson to keep in compliance with standards set by building permit authorities. He added that if a particular project involves varying specifications from the existing CAD data files, and those changes call for structural changes or other changes that might affect the safety of the building being built, then Flory would expect Wilson to call Mr. Illes; otherwise if the customer seeks to change door placements, for example, such that the safety of the occupants would not be jeopardized, then Flory would expect Wilson to make the changes without consulting with Mr. Illes.

c) Edward S. Crider

Edward Crider testified that he has been a friend and professional colleague of Mr. Illes for forty years. Mr. Crider is a past member of the State Board of Architect Examiners, and served in that capacity for five years. He stated he is proud to be a consultant to Illes Architects, Inc., and acknowledged the letter he sent to the Board, now marked as Exhibit C. He gave unequivocal testimony about the integrity of Mr. Illes, and reiterated his view that Mr. Illes has always maintained a very professional approach to the practice of architecture.

At the conclusion of the testimony, Mr. Illes asked that the Board consider as evidence the substance of the letters shown as Exhibits B, C, D, E, and F. Exhibit B is a letter from Mr. Illes to Mr. Curry, President, Curry Lumber Company, dated May 6, 1996, in which Mr. Illes advised Mr. Curry that Illes Architects, Inc. "cannot be involved with any future projects for Curry Lumber Company, unless we prepare the complete set of drawings in our office."

Exhibit C is the letter referred to above in the testimony of Mr. Crider, offering his testimonial in support of Mr. Illes' integrity and his commitment to abide by the rules of the professional practice of architecture.

Exhibit D is a letter dated June 21, 1996, from Roland Lindsay to the Board, stating that Lindsay had contact with the office of Illes Architect in regard to the 40' by 60' commercial warehouse for Blue Ribbon Manufacturing Company.

Exhibit E is an undated letter from Daniel R. Flory, Vice President and Sales Manager for D.C. Curry Lumber and Building Co., in which Flory states that Curry has consulted with Mr. Illes on many design matters, working with Illes Architects over the past ten years. In the letter, Flory states that with respect to the project for Blue Ribbon Manufacturing Co., "Illes Architect was in charge of the design of said building from the start." Flory adds that "[w]e are proud to have Kerry W. Illes, Architects, as our architects. Their professional help is a must to us in our daily operation now and in the future."

Exhibit F is a copy of a letter dated July 2, 1996 from Mr. Illes to the Board through its Executive Director, in which Mr. Illes states that he was not aware of being in violation of any rules or regulations regarding the practice of architecture. Mr. Illes states that it has been his understanding that "as long as an architect has control and direction of a project . . . he or she may seal the drawings and assume the responsibility for their adequacy." He states he has not ever "stamped drawings for someone who walks through our front door." He stated that with respect to projects for the Curry Lumber Company, he had "total control over the 'Blue Ribbon Manufacturing Co.' drawings before, during, and after the preparation" and added that "I however did not personally draw them." He also submitted letters from Curry and Blue Ribbon (Exhibits E and D, respectively), and closed by stating he did not feel any action (by the Board) should be imposed.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Kerry W. Illes is authorized under Certificate No. 4206 to practice professional architecture in Ohio.

2. Mr. Illes maintains his professional practice in Medina, Ohio, doing business as Kerry W. Illes, Architect, 5000 Gateway Drive, Medina, Ohio 44256.

3. Drawings and specifications shown on the last two pages of State's Exhibit 1 bear Mr. Illes' inked, embossed professional seal, and on the second to last page the drawing bears Mr. Illes' signature. Mr. Illes was not the author of these drawings and specifications. The drawings and specifications were made by Robert Wilson, who is not a licensed architect, and

who is an employee of D.C. Curry Lumber and Building Co., d/b/a The Curry Lumber Company. When Mr. Illes placed his seal on these drawings and specifications, he knew he was not the author of the drawings. Mr. Wilson prepared substantially all of the drawings and specifications found in these pages, without first discussing the project with Mr. Illes. Mr. Wilson prepared the drawings using information provided to him by a salesman for Curry Lumber Company and using detail information provided to Curry by Mr. Illes. Approximately one and a half years earlier, Mr. Illes provided the Curry Lumber Company with detail specifications, using a CAD program owned by Mr. Illes' firm that was substantially the same as a CAD program owned and used by Curry. Other than controlling the detail specifications he so delivered to Curry, Mr. Illes was not directly involved in preparing the drawings for the Blue Ribbon project first submitted to Mr. Illes by Mr. Wilson. Further, Mr. Illes was not aware that the drawings were being prepared until they were presented to him for his signature. When he placed his seal on the drawings and specifications, Mr. Illes was not in responsible charge of their preparation. The drawings and specifications were the work product of a draftsman who is and was an employee of D.C. Curry Lumber and Building Co., doing business as The Curry Lumber Company, of Wooster, Ohio.

The State has thus sustained its burden to prove the allegation in its June 7, 1996 notice of opportunity for hearing, that Mr. Illes placed his architectural seal on documents over which he did not have direct professional knowledge and direct supervisory control.

4. When he sealed the drawings and specifications for the Blue Ribbon project, Mr. Illes had indirect but not direct supervisory control over the work. His relationship with the author was not one that permitted him any direct control over the work or the worker. The worker, Mr. Wilson, was in the employment of the company that had retained the professional architectural services offered by Mr. Illes' firm. Mr. Illes produced, a year and a half beforehand, components in the form of data files which could be used by the CAD programs of the Illes Architect, Inc. firm and the Curry Lumber Company. Curry employees then had access to these data files, and could alter them. Such alteration could escape detection unless, in reading the plans and specifications created by the Curry draftsman, Mr. Illes or someone

from his office detected the changes in the course of his or her professional review of the work product. While this is one form of indirect control, it does not constitute direct control by the architect over the preparation of the architectural work product. The same is true with respect to Mr. Illes' control over the worker. The testimony from Mr. Wilson was that he was employed by Curry, and not by Mr. Illes. While Mr. Illes no doubt could exercise indirect control over Mr. Wilson, through the collaborative process he and Mr. Wilson described, there was no direct control by Mr. Illes or Mr. Illes' firm over the work of Mr. Wilson.

5. The evidence establishes that work prepared by Mr. Wilson is not work prepared by Mr. Illes' consultant; to the contrary, Mr. Illes served as Curry's consultant. The evidence further establishes that Mr. Wilson is not a registered professional architect or engineer, nor does he hold any other professional registration in this or any other state.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Under the provisions of R.C. 4703.15 and 4703.151, the State Board of Examiners of Architects has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties of this action. In the exercise of that jurisdiction, the Board has the authority to take action against the certificate of qualifications to practice architecture held by Kerry W. Illes, Certificate No. 4206.

2. In conformity with the provisions of R.C. Chapters 119 and 4703, the Board provided adequate notice to Mr. Illes upon determining that it proposed to take action against his certificate of qualifications to practice architecture in Ohio. Upon receipt of this notice, Mr. Illes made a timely application for hearing, and the Board provided for a hearing in the manner required by law.

3. Under Ohio law, an architect must maintain sufficient control over the preparation of architectural drawings and specifications prior to affixing his professional seal so as to conform

to minimum professional standards. The requirements for such knowledge are shown in rules promulgated by the Board, at Ohio Administrative Code Section 4703-3-01(D), which state:

> THE ARCHITECT SHALL IMPRINT HIS SEAL ONLY IF HE WAS THE AUTHOR OF SUCH DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OTHER CONTRACT DOCUMENTS OR WAS IN RESPONSIBLE CHARGE OF THEIR PREPARATION.

In addition to the requirement that the architect must either have been the author of the drawings or in responsible charge of their preparation, an architect must restrict the sealing of drawings and the like to those over which the architect has both professional knowledge and direct supervisory control. The rule is set out at Ohio Administrative Code Section 4703-3-07(E)(1) (Code of conduct, professional conduct), which provides:

> AN ARCHITECT SHALL NOT SIGN OR SEAL DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS, REPORTS OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL WORK FOR WHICH HE OR SHE DOES NOT HAVE DIRECT PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND DIRECT SUPERVISORY CONTROL; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT IN THE CASE OF THE PORTIONS OF SUCH PROFESSIONAL WORK PREPARED BY THE ARCHITECT'S CONSULTANTS, REGISTERED UNDER THIS OR ANOTHER PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION LAW OF THIS JURISDICTION, THE ARCHITECT MAY SIGN OR SEAL THAT PORTION OF THE PROFESSIONAL WORK IF THE ARCHITECT HAS REVIEWED SUCH PORTION, HAS COORDINATED ITS PREPARATION, AND INTENDS TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS ADEQUACY.

Where the evidence shows that Mr. Illes was not the author of the plans and drawings bearing his seal which were submitted to the Wayne County Building Department, was not in responsible charge of their preparation, and did not have direct professional knowledge and did not have direct supervisory control over the author of the documents he sealed, and where Mr. Illes did not rely upon the work of an architect's consultant who was registered under the architect registration laws of this state or any other state, there has been shown evidence sufficient to sustain a finding under O.A.C. 4703-3-01(D) and 4703-3-07(E)(1) that the Board may take action against Mr. Illes' certificate of qualifications to practice architecture under Certificate No. 4206.

RECOMMENDATION

The evidence supports a finding that Mr. Illes has acted in a manner that is inconsistent with the standards of professional conduct found in Ohio Revised Code Chapter 4703 and Ohio Administrative Code Chapter 4703. Evidence has been presented that is sufficient to warrant the decision to issue a reprimand to Mr. Illes, or to deny the renewal of, to revoke, or to suspend the certificate issued to Mr. Illes. Evidence in mitigation includes the clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Illes made a measured effort to control the architectural component of the drawings being prepared by Curry's draftsman, and in doing so he believed he was meeting the requirements of the professional standards required by law. There was no evidence presented suggesting aggravating circumstances. To the contrary, the evidence, particularly that of the compelling testimony of former Board Member Crider, suggests that Mr. Illes maintains a high standard of integrity in conducting his professional practice. Mr. Illes, to his credit, acted on his own prior to the Board taking action, to put his long-time client on notice that architectural drawings would now have to be produced by the architectural firm and not by Curry's in-house draftsman, showing that Mr. Illes has taken responsible steps to comply with Board rules with respect to improper use of a professional seal.

Christopher B. McNeil, Esq.
Hearing Examiner for the State Board
of Examiners of Architects
Frantz Road, Suite 101
Dublin, Ohio 43017
Telephone: (614) 764-0681
Telecopier: (614) 764-0774