

## **AGENDA**

### **Board of Architecture and Interior Design**

Hilton Pensacola Beach  
12 Via De Luna Drive  
Pensacola Beach, Florida 32561  
850.916.2999

**January 31, 2020**  
**General Business**  
**9:00 a.m.**

#### **Call to Order**

Mr. Jernigan, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. and a quorum established.

#### Members Present:

Steven Jernigan, Chair  
Miguel "Mike" Rodriguez  
Jonathan Toppe  
John Erhig  
Holly Dennis, Vice-Chair  
Aida Bao-Garciga  
Ivette O'Doski  
Dylan Rivers

#### Members Absent:

Timothy Nolen, excused  
Francisco "Frank" Costoya, unexcused

#### Others Present:

Robert Milne, Board Counsel  
David Minacci, Prosecuting Attorney  
Amanda "Mandie" Ackermann, Executive Director  
Terri McEwen, Government Analyst  
Vicki Long, AIA Florida  
David Roberts, Esq., Partner, Nortelus Roberts Group  
Wanda Gozdz, ASID South Florida Chapter  
Stanley Hoelle  
Myles Sampson  
Other Interested Parties

Court Reporter: Anchor Court Reporting, Kimberly A. Rogers, 229 South Baylen Street,  
Pensacola, Florida 32502

## Disciplinary Cases

DBPR vs. Stanley Paul Hoelle

Case Numbers 2017-057170 and 2018-022044

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, and Wirtz

*PCP Recommendation: \$6,000.00 fine plus \$1,987.50 costs, one year suspension, and two years probation*

Mr. Hoelle was present and sworn in by the court reporter. Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the review of the case based on his participation on the Probable Cause Panel.

The case was before the board based on a three count complaint of plans not sufficiently detailed, failing to exercise proper supervisory control, and misconduct. The respondent does not dispute the administrative complaint.

Motion: Mr. Rivers moved that the board finds that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto.

Second: Ms. O'Doski seconded them motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Rivers seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Hoelle provided information regarding the history of the case, an affidavit from the draftsman, and mitigating factors. After board discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the case be continued to allow Mr. Minacci and Mr. Hoelle an opportunity to enter a settlement stipulation outlining the board's concerns regarding his ability to provide responsible supervisory control.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion.

The board provided some direction and cautioned Mr. Hoelle regarding responsible supervisory control.

DBPR vs. E. Dean Bolaris

Case Number 2019-013432

PCP: Rodriguez, Shore, and Rivers

*PCP Recommendation: Suspension until compliance plus \$389.50 costs*

Mr. Bolaris was not present but provided a letter for the board's consideration. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a one count administrative complaint for failing to comply with a lawful order of the board. The administrative complaint was served by certified mail. Mr. Bolaris provided a letter stating that he mailed the prior fines and costs; however, the board office was not able to verify that the money had been received by the department.

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board finds that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto; and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Rivers seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board require compliance with the prior final order and costs of \$389.50.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Barry K. Webb and AQ Draw Design LLC

Case Numbers 2018-002190 and 2018-002192

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, and Wirtz

*PCP Recommendation: \$3,000.00 fine plus \$1,374.80 costs*

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the review of the case based on his participation on the Probable Cause Panel.

The case was before the board based on a two count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license and practicing architecture through a business entity without a certificate of authorization. The administrative complaint was hand served. The respondent has failed to respond to the administrative complaint.

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board finds that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto; and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board impose a \$3,000.00 fine plus \$1,374.80 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Dustin Outten and Architects/Engineers at Work & Associates

Case Numbers 2019-004053 and 2019-004065

PCP: Rodriguez, Shore, and Rivers

*PCP Recommendation: \$5,500.00 fine plus \$1,012.10 costs*

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a three count

administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license, using the title architect without a license, and practicing architecture through a business entity without a certificate of authorization. Hand service of the administrative complaint was unsuccessful. Service was achieved through publication in the South Florida Business Journal. The respondent has failed to respond.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board finds that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto; and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board impose a \$5,500.00 fine plus \$1,012.10 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Maurice Brock

Case Numbers 2018-021678

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, Rivers, and Wirtz

*PCP Recommendation: \$3,000.00 plus \$2,734.50 costs*

Mr. Brock was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. An order to cease and desist was hand served to the respondent and he has failed to comply. The case was before the board based on a one count administrative complaint for practicing architecture without a license. The administrative complaint was hand served to the respondent. The respondent has failed to respond.

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board finds that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto; and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Ms. O'Doski seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board impose a \$3,000.00 fine plus \$2,734.50 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Rebel Design Group

Case Numbers 2018-021717

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, Wirtz, and Rivers

*PCP Recommendation: \$1,500.00 plus \$963.45 costs*

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was before the board based on a one count administrative complaint for offering architecture services through a business entity without a certificate of authorization.

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board finds that the administrative complaint was properly served upon the respondent and the respondent waived the right to dispute the material facts by failure to timely respond thereto; and that the board adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the administrative complaint.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board impose a \$1,500.00 fine plus \$963.45 costs to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

Second: Ms. O'Doski seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Robert A. Paulding

Case Number 2018-057761

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, and Wirtz

*PCP Recommendation: \$6,500.00 fine plus \$712.40 costs*

Mr. Paulding was not present but provided a letter requesting a second continuance.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board continue the case until the next meeting.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Miguel Jesus Fernandez and One DD Studio, LLC

Case Number 2017-053969 and 2017-053972

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, and Rivers

*PCP Recommendation: \$5,500.00 fine plus \$2,322.60 costs*

*Settlement Stipulation: \$3,500.00 fine*

The respondent was not present or represented by counsel. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the case based on their participation on the Probable Cause Panel. The case was based on unlicensed activity and the board entered a final order imposing a \$5,500.00 fine plus \$2,322.60 costs. Mr. Minacci requested that the board reconsider the final order based on some confusion regarding his conversation with Mr. Fernandez's attorney.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board reconsider the final order, vacate the prior final order and accept the settlement stipulation as presented to be paid within 30 days of the final order.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Settlement Stipulations - Cases marked with an asterisk reflect the Probable Cause Panel's Recommendation.

DBPR vs. Brian Scheuzger \*

Case Number 2019-004477

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, and Nolen

*PCP Recommendation: Reprimand plus \$615.00 costs*

DBPR vs. David Rosenthal \*

Case Number 2019-022544

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, and Nolen

*PCP Recommendation: Reprimand plus \$495.00 costs*

DBPR vs. Design Solution of South Florida, Inc. and Hector Ampuero \*

Case Numbers 2019-029722 and 2019-029726

PCP: Hall, Rodriguez, Shore, and Nolen

*PCP Recommendation: \$5,500.00 fine plus \$900.00 costs*

Mr. Rodriguez was recused from the review of the cases based on his participation on the Probable Cause Panel.

Motion: Mr. Rivers moved that the board approve the settlement stipulations as presented.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

DBPR vs. Frank Cunningham and Abney Building & Consulting

Case Numbers 2018-048641 and 2018-048654

PCP: Rodriguez, Shore, and Rivers

*PCP Recommendation: \$4,500.00 plus \$2,155.00 costs*

*Settlement Stipulation: \$2,000.00 plus \$2,155.00 costs*

The respondent provided a letter requesting a continuance. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Rivers were recused from the review of the cases based on his participation on the Probable Cause Panel.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board continue the review of the case until the next meeting.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes**

September 5, 2019 – Telephone Conference Call

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approved the meeting minutes as presented.

Second: Mr. Rivers seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

October 14, 2019 – Probable Cause Panel, Coral Gables, Florida

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board ratify the Probable Cause Panel minutes as presented.  
Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

October 15, 2019 – General Business, Coral Gables, Florida

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approve the meeting minutes as presented.  
Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

December 19, 2019 – Telephone Conference Call

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approve the meeting minutes as presented.  
Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

## **Ratification Lists**

### Licensure

*Architect licensed by NCARB Examination, Architect licensed by NCARB Exam Direct, Architect licensed by NCARB Endorsement, Architect license by State Endorsement, Architect licensed by Direct Endorsement, Architect Business by Corporation, Limited Liability Company, Partnership, and Fictitious Name, Interior Designer license by Endorsement, Interior Designer license by AR/ID Dual, Interior Design Business license by Corporation, Limited Liability Company, and Dual*

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the board ratify the licensure list as presented.  
Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Ehrig reported that Emily Anderson graduated from CityLab-Orlando through the IPAL program and was the second female licensee in the country.

### Continuing Education

*AHCA, Boss Construction School, and Larry Schneider*

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board ratify the continuing education list as presented.  
Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

## **Discussion and Correspondence**

Letter from Governor DeSantis

Mr. Milne reviewed the letter, advised the board how rule making processes would proceed moving forward, and provided proposed sunset language that could be considered during future rule making.

Excerpt from the letter: *“5. All agencies must include a sunset provision in all proposed or amended rules unless otherwise directed by applicable law. The sunset provision may not exceed five years unless otherwise required by existing statute. Rules may be renewed through the normal rulemaking process after the sunset period if it is determined the rule is still necessary, following the OFARR process outlined herein.”*

NCARB Region 3 Candidacy Letter – Miguel Rodriguez

For information purposes only.

Mr. Jernigan requested that himself, Mr. Rodriguez, Mr. Rivers, Ms. Ackermann, and Mr. Milne be approved the upcoming NCARB Region meeting in Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 5-7, 2020.

#### Facebook Disqualification Case

Mr. Milne reported that the Supreme Court of Florida considered an issue regarding the legal sufficiency of a motion to disqualify a trial judge on the basis of a Facebook “friendship”. Judges and attorneys are cautioned regarding “friendships” on Facebook, Instagram, social media, etc.

#### Rules Report

Rules Report fee rules effective 1/6/20

Mr. Milne reviewed the report.

#### Rule 61G1-14, Architecture Examination (Draft)

##### 61G1-14.001 Examination Designated, General Requirements

The prescribed licensure examinations for purposes of licensure as a registered architect under Chapter 481, Part I, F.S., are as follows:

(1) Applicants for initial licensure, pursuant to Section 481.209, F.S., or by endorsement, pursuant to Section 481.213(3)(a),

F.S., shall take and pass the examination prepared and administered by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) or have taken and passed a predecessor exam to the examination prepared and administered by the NCARB.

(2) Applicants for licensure by endorsement, pursuant to Section 481.213(3)(b), F.S., shall have taken and passed the examination prepared and administered by the NCARB or have taken and passed a predecessor exam to the examination prepared and administered by the NCARB.

(3) Applicants for licensure by endorsement, pursuant to Section 481.213(3)(c), F.S., shall have taken and passed one of the following examinations:

(a) The examination prepared and administered by the NCARB;

(b) A predecessor exam to the examination prepared and administered by the NCARB;

(c) A Canadian licensure examination accepted by the NCARB for certification as outlined in subsections 3.4 and 4.4 of the NCARB July 2013 Certification Guidelines, which are hereby incorporated by reference and available at

<http://www.ncarb.org/~media/Files/PDF/Special-Paper/handbook.pdf> or  
<http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-08068>, or

(d) The Examination for Architects in Canada (ExAC) as required for certification through the Mutual Recognition Agreement between the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards and the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities.

*Rulemaking Authority 455.217, 481.213(6) FS. Law Implemented 455.217(1)(b), (c), 481.209 FS. History—New 12-23-79, Amended 5-18-83, Formerly 21B-14.01, 21B-14.001, Amended 4-22-97, 3-8-04, 7-14-05, 4-11-17, amended.*

The board continued the review to the next meeting.

## Rule 61G1-23, Responsible Supervisory Control (Draft)

### 61G1-23.010 Responsible Supervising Control over Architectural or Interior Design Work.

The preparation of architectural or interior design work, defined in section 481.203(6)(8), F.S., must occur under the responsible supervising control of an architect or interior designer licensed in this State. Such control ensures that the required professional standard of care is applied, in order to safeguard the public from harm and confirm that the owner's needs and requirements as well as applicable codes and standards are met.

1. The person responsible for the exercise of responsible supervisory control over architectural or interior design work shall be the person who signs and seals the documents related to the work.
2. The responsible supervising control which is required of architects or interior designers prior to signing and sealing architectural or interior design documents, as that term is used in section 481.221 (6)(7), F.S., shall mean:
  - a. Direct contact between the architect or interior designer and his/her client.
    - i. The client shall have direct access at all times, during the preparation of all architectural or interior design work. Access shall begin with the start of the work and continue, without interruption until the work is completed or construction of the project is completed.
    - b. To avoid ambiguity, the architect or interior designer and their client should have a clear **written** agreement, describing in detail, the work to be done and all pertinent requirements such as, but not limited to time for performance and general expectations.
    - c. The architect or interior designer shall have direct participation in and detailed knowledge of the work, during its progress. Such involvement shall include, but not be limited to:
      - i. Direct preparation of research, investigations, designs or documents.
      - ii. Regular review and examination, with commentary on designs or documents while their preparation is progressing.
      - iii. Meetings with clients, at times appropriate to the progress of the work, for the review of project goals, requirements and expectations.
      - iv. Meetings with others, having authority over the work, such as: representatives of agencies having jurisdiction over the project, contractors, manufacturers, consultants, etc.

- v. Review, examination, modification, approval and adoption of work prepared by others and to be incorporated in the work.
  - vi. Review, comment on and revision, as necessary, of the various documents required for execution of the work.
3. An architect or interior designer must demonstrate that they are exercising responsible supervisory control over multiple projects through one of the requirements set forth by 481.225(1)(g), 481.2251(1)(o), and these rules.
  4. An architect or interior designer shall provide responsible supervising control personally or through direct employment of others who may themselves be themselves licensed or who are otherwise duly trained and knowledgeable.
  5. Indirect employment arrangements, such as independent contractors, may not provide responsible supervising control on behalf of a licensee, unless there is a specific written agreement governing those services, which details the duties and responsibilities of the architect or interior designer and the independent contractor with respect to responsible supervising control, as described in (2) above.
  6. When work prepared by an architect, falls within the definition of Interior Design in Section 481.203(8), the procedures of 61G1-23.010 shall be followed.
  7. When work that falls within the definition of Interior Design in Section 481.203(8) and prepared by a licensed interior designer is to be incorporated in the architect's work, the procedures of 61G1- 23.010(1)(c)(v) above, shall be followed.
  8. Notwithstanding the above provisions, an architect's or interior designer's duty to exercise responsible supervisory control over his/her work, is un-delegable.

61G1-23.015 Demonstrating the Application of Responsible Supervising Control over Architectural or Interior Design Work.

The Board may, as part of its investigation of a complaint against a licensee, require that an architect or interior designer provide evidence which demonstrates that the architect or interior designer has provided an appropriate level of Supervising Control over a project or projects.

1. Evidence demonstrating Responsible Supervising Control shall consist of project records, customary to architectural practice by an architect exercising the required professional standard of care, such as:
  - a. Written project agreements.
  - b. Records memorializing meetings between project participants.
  - c. Communications between project participants.
  - d. Documentation of research, or investigations conducted on behalf of the project.
  - e. Design sketches at various stages of development, indicating the progress of the project.
  - f. Notations memorializing reviews, corrections or revisions of documents prepared for the project.

2. Evidence may be presented in any medium which can be readily reviewed by the Board and must be sufficient to demonstrate the application of Responsible Supervising Control across the duration of the Project timeline.
3. Initial-d-Determination of the sufficiency of evidence presented will be by the Board, or its Probable Cause Panel, as appropriate.

**61G1-23. ~~025~~ 020 Responsible Supervising Control for Documents for Exempt Buildings Which Require an Architect's or Interior Designer's Seal and Signature for Building Permit Purposes.**

The procedures set forth in Rule 61G1-23. ~~015~~ **10**, F.A.C., shall also be followed when an architect or interior designer is required by local building ordinance to sign and seal plans for buildings which unlicensed persons are authorized to design under the exceptions contained in Sections 481.229(1)(a)-(c), F.S.

**61G1-23. ~~030~~ 025 Standards for Architectural or Interior Design Supervision in Construction or Marketing Office.**

(1) An architectural or interior design office which is a construction or field office is ~~not~~ considered as offering architectural or interior design services to the public, and therefore, ~~does not need a separate architect assigned directly to~~ **such office must comply with the requirements of 61G1-23.010, above.**

(2) An architect or interior designer shall not be required to be assigned to a marketing office. A marketing office is defined as an office of an architectural or interior design firm wherein no production of drawings, specifications, reports or other professional work occurs and is intended solely for the purpose of advertising or marketing an architectural or interior design firm's services to the public. The client contact permitted as a marketing office by non-registered persons shall only include marketing a firm's qualifications and capabilities. No other professional activities shall be performed at this office.

(3) Any architect, interior designer or architectural or interior design firm can advertise in any medium, ~~including the telephone directory yellow pages~~, even if ~~an office is~~ **not** physically present in the area of the advertisement. Such advertisement or listing, however, shall not mislead the public into believing that the phone number and address given is capable of offering architectural or interior design services to the public if in fact the phone or address listed is not an architectural or interior design office and shall be clearly listed or designated as a marketing office only or a construction or field office, as applicable.

(4) All firms shall notify the Board of Architecture and Interior Design of the location of all marketing offices and the individuals who will be assigned to such office within sixty (60) days of such an assignment.

The board discussed concerns regarding responsible supervisory control over more than one physical location. After board discussion, the following motions were made.

- Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approve Rule 61G1-23 language as presented with modifications; 23.010(4) change may to shall; change 23.015(2) change media to medium; include the sunset review language; and promulgate the rule as stated.
- Second: Ms. Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Ehrig opposed.

## Statement of Estimated Regulation Cost

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the proposed rule language would not have an adverse impact on small business or be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity (including government) in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within 1 year after the implementation of the rule.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

## Minor Violation

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the proposed rule language would not constitute a minor violation.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

## Rule 61G1-22.003, Education Requirements for Interior Designers (Draft)

### **61G1-22.003 Education Requirements for Interior Designers.**

(1) Board review and approval of programs, schools, and colleges of interior design and courses of interior design study shall be based upon a review and inspection of the programs in interior design within the United States including those accredited by the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA), formerly known as the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER), and an evaluation of such programs, schools, and colleges in light of the definition of interior design found in Section 481.203(8), F.S.

(2) To meet the educational requirements of Section 481.209(2), F.S., an applicant must have completed at least three years in an interior design curriculum or be a graduate from an interior design program based on the Professional Standards established by the CIDA, with the exception of the CIDA requirement that a program seeking accreditation must demonstrate that it culminates in a minimum of a bachelor's degree. Course work involving practical applications such as studio, technical and graphic skills shall be completed in residence or delivered through alternate methods such as distance learning. The Professional Standards, effective July, 2011, are hereby incorporated by reference and can be obtained at <http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-02995> or <http://www.accredit-id.org/professional-standards>.

(a) The First-Professional Degree program of study available at a 3 year professional certificate or degree program, a 4 or 5 year professional degree program or a first-professional master's degree program in interior design, which meets the requirements of Section 481.209(2)(a), (b), (c), F.S., shall be based on an accumulation of not less than 120 semester, or equivalent, credit hours including a minimum of 30 semester, or equivalent, credit hours of diverse university-level liberal arts, sciences and humanities obtained at an institution which has been recognized by the appropriate regional or national institutional crediting body. The first-professional degree program curriculum shall conform to the Professional Standards with a minimum of 60 semester, or equivalent, credit hours in first-professional degree, or related coursework. Where applicable, those programs requiring in excess of these requirements shall, after fulfilling the minimum requirements, determine the type of additional studies to promote their individualized mission.

(b) The 2 year degree program which meets the requirements of Section 481.209(2)(d), F.S., shall include an accumulation of not less than 60 semester, or equivalent, credit hours including a minimum of 15 semester, or equivalent, credit hours of diverse post-secondary level liberal arts, sciences and humanities obtained at an institution which has been recognized by the appropriate regional or national

accrediting body. The 2 year degree program shall conform to the Professional Standards with a minimum of 45 semester, or equivalent, credit hours in interior design, or related course work. Where applicable, those programs requiring in excess of these requirements shall, after fulfilling the minimum requirements, determine the type of additional studies to promote their individualized mission.

(3) The evaluation of an applicant's transcript shall include a determination of whether such transcript is comparable to the above mentioned models. Equivalency of credit hours shall be determined by dividing quarter credit hours by 1.5 to convert to semester credit hours.

(4) Board-approved programs, schools, or colleges of interior design will be required to verify to the Board, in writing, every two years, that the current program of studies offered meets the minimum requirements of the applicable program(s) of studies as listed in Rule 61G1-22.003, F.A.C.

(5) Passage by the applicant of the NCDIQ (the National Council for Interior Design Qualification) Examination will be used by the Board in evaluating whether an applicant's institution(s) meets applicable education standards.

*Rulemaking Authority 481.203(8), 481.209(2), 481.2055 FS. Law Implemented 481.203(8), 481.209(2) FS. History—New 12-4-90, Amended 7-14-93, Formerly 21B-22.003, Amended 8-9-99, 7-30-07, 10-12-09, 10-20-13, amended*

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Mr. Rivers moved that the board approve the rule language as presented and notice to promulgate the rule.

Second: Mr. Ehrig seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board include the sunset language to rules on a case by case basis.

Second: Ms. Bao-Garciga seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### Statement of Estimated Regulatory Cost

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the proposed rule language would not have an adverse impact on small business or be likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity (including government) in excess of \$200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within 1 year after the implementation of the rule.

Second: Mr. Rivers seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### Minor Violation

Motion: Mr. Rivers moved that the proposed rule language would not constitute a minor violation.

Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### Rule 61G1-21, Continuing Education Interior Designers (Draft)

#### **61G1-21.001 Continuing Education for Interior Designers.**

(1) Each interior designer in Florida shall complete a minimum of 20 hours of continuing professional education per biennial period, 16 hours of health, safety, and welfare and 4 hours of optional credit or

health, safety, and welfare, as defined in subsection (2), below. This requirement shall be met through either:

(a) Programs approved by the Board or by automatic approved providers; The Interior Design Continuing Education Council (IDCEC), the National Council of Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ), The American Institute of Architects (AIA) as reflected in their Continuing Education System (CES), the National Council of Architecture Registration Boards (NCARB), the Construction Industry Licensing Board, the Building Code Administrators and Inspectors Board, and providers and courses that have been approved for architecture continuing education provided that a minimum of two (2) of the 20 required hours must be obtained by completing an approved provider's specialized or advanced course(s), approved by the Florida Building Commission, on the Florida Building Code, relating to the interior designer's respective area of practice; or

(b) Submission of proof of compliance with the continuing education requirements of another state in which the interior designer is licensed, provided that the requirements of the other state equal or exceed the completion of 20 hours in a two year period, be that the education build upon the basic knowledge of interior design. ~~and require that a minimum of two (2) of the 20 required hours be obtained by completing an approved provider's specialized or advanced course(s), approved by the board and Florida Building Commission, on the Florida Building Code, relating to the interior designer's respective area of practice.~~ A person initially licensed for less than 24 months prior to the end of a renewal cycle need not complete any continuing education as a condition of the first renewal.

(2) The initial and each succeeding biennial period, also known as "Renewal Cycle," shall mean a period of time consisting of two, 12-month years at the end of which the interior designer renews his/her license. The renewal cycle for an interior designer's license begins each odd-numbered year on March 1 and continues for two consecutive years until February 28 of the next odd-numbered year. At the time of licensure renewal, an interior designer will certify completion of 20 hours for the prior renewal cycle.

(3) The specified number of hours in specialized or advanced courses, approved by the Florida Building Commission, or any portion of the Florida Building Code, is zero (0).

*Rulemaking Authority 481.2055, 481.215 FS. Law Implemented 481.215(3), (4), (5) FS. History--New 11-29-90, Amended 9-2-92, Formerly 21B-21.001, Amended 5-4-97, 4-12-04, 12-13-04, 7-14-05, 3-20-16, amended\_\_\_\_\_.*

#### **61G1-24.001 Continuing Education for Architects.**

(1) Each architect in Florida shall complete a minimum of 24 hours of health, safety, and welfare continuing professional education per biennial period, as further defined in subsection (3), below. This requirement shall be met through either:

(a) Programs approved by the Board or by automatic approved providers; the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), the American Institute of Architects (AIA) (national level only) as reflected in the Continuing Education System(CES), the National Council of Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ), Construction Industry Licensing Board, Building Code Administrators and Inspectors Board, and providers that have been approved for interior design education provided that the requirements of the other state equal or exceed the completion of 24 hours in a two year period, be that the education build upon the basic knowledge of architecture, and require that a minimum of two (2) of the 24 required hours be obtained by completing specialized or advanced course(s), approved by the board and Florida Building Commission, on the Florida Building Code, relating to the architect's respective area of practice; or

(b) Submission of proof of compliance with the continuing education requirements of another state in

which the architect is licensed, provided that the requirements of the other state equal or exceed the completion of 24 hours in a two year period, be that the education build upon the basic knowledge of architecture and require that a minimum of two (2) of the 24 required hours be obtained by completing specialized or advanced course(s), approved by the board and Florida Building Commission, on the Florida Building Code, relating to the architect's respective area of practice.

(2) Architects licensed after February 28, 1995, will begin their first two-year reporting cycle on January 1 of the year that the architect is licensed if that year is an odd-numbered year or January 1 of the next odd-numbered year if the architect is licensed in an even-numbered year.

(3) A biennial period, also known as "Renewal Cycle," shall mean a period of time consisting of two, 12-month years at the end of which the architect renews his/her license. The renewal cycle for architecture license begins each odd-numbered year on March 1 and continues for two consecutive years until February 28 of the next odd-numbered year. A person initially licensed for less than 24 months prior to the end of a renewal cycle need not complete any continuing education as a condition of the first renewal.

(4) ~~The Reporting Cycle shall mean, a period of time consisting of two calendar years immediately prior to an architect's licensure renewal during which an architect will complete the 24 hours of continuing education. The reporting cycle shall begin January 1st of each odd numbered year and end on December 31st of the next even number year. At the time of licensure renewal, an architect will certify completion of 24 hours for the prior reporting renewal cycle.~~

(5) The specified number of hours in specialized or advanced courses, approved by the Florida Building Commission, or any portion of the Florida Building Code, is zero (0).

*Rulemaking Authority 481.2055, 481.215 FS. Law Implemented 481.215(3), (4), (5) FS. History--New 1-17-96, Amended 4-12-04, 12-13-04, 7-14-05, 11-21-12, 3-20-16.*

After board discussion, the following motions were made.

Motion: Ms. Bao-Garciga moved that the board approve the language as presented for Rules 61G1-21 and 61G1-24.

Second: Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion.

The board discussed the need for a Florida Building Code advanced course requirement.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the motion be amended to change the hours from zero to two.

Second: Ms. Dennis seconded the motion, it passed with Mr. Rodriguez opposed.

Motion: Mr. Ehrig moved that the motion be amended to change the architects rule to calendar years.

Second: Mr. Toppe seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Rodriguez moved that the board approve the amended language for Rules 61G1-21 and 61G1-24.

Second: Mr. Ehrig seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

## Reports

Board Chair – G. Steven Jernigan  
No report.

Executive Director’s Report – Amanda “Mandie” Ackermann  
Financials Ending September 30, 2019

- Operating Account
- Unlicensed Activity Account

Ms. Ackermann reported that Legislative Session began January 14, 2020, the new fee changes were effective with new applications published, and that the board was in good financial standing.

AIA Florida – Vicki Long

Ms. Long reported the death of Tom Lewis, FAIA. She reported that they were working with the Florida Building Commission on the implementation of HB1021 regarding the new way to adopt Tri-Annual updates. She reported that Mr. Panzarino is the new President, that the Design Award Program would be juried from Paris, and that the regional offices were working with national organization during restructure. They recently completed their Annual Legislative Week with the board proposing a line by line review of Chapter 481, Chapter 487, and Legislative Policies. She provided copies of their Annual Blue Print to the board that they provide to the Legislature during Session. They support affordable housing, they are tracking some climate resiliency bills that are primarily studies and are asking that architects be part of those task forces.

ASID – Dave Roberts

Mr. Roberts reported that he was representing the American Society of Interior Design and the International Interior Design Association. He reported that the deregulation bill was a priority of the Governor. Proposed bills would require passage of the NCIDQ to submit plans for building permits. He reported that Senator Albritton was working with the profession to allow for voluntarily registration for commercial interior design, maintain the title “registered interior designer”, maintain the profession with the board, and the interior design definition under design professional in the building code. He reported the House Bill is the same as last year. He reported briefly on the Occupational Sunset Bill.

Prosecuting Attorney’s Report – David K. Minacci  
Audit Report

Prosecutor’s Case List Licensed/Unlicensed Cases

Investigator’s Case List Licensed/Unlicensed Cases

Fines Chart – Summary

Fines Chart – Licensed

Fines Chart – Unlicensed

Billable Hours – September 2019

Billable Hours – October 2019

Billable Hours – November 2019

Results of the October 2019 Board Meeting  
For information purposes only.

### **Future Board Meeting Dates and Locations**

The board scheduled a telephone conference call February 28, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

A. April 16-17, 2020 – Cocoa Beach

April 16, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

April 17, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – General Business Meeting

Hilton Cocoa Beach, 1550 N Atlantic Avenue, Cocoa Beach, Florida 32931

(321) 799-0003

B. July 7-8, 2020 –Palm Beach, meeting in conjunction with Florida AIA

July 7, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

July 8, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – General Business Meeting

The Breakers Palm Beach, 1 S County Road, Palm Beach, Florida 33480

(561) 655-6611

C. October 22-23, 2020 – St. Petersburg

October 22, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – Probable Cause Panel Meeting

October 23, 2020, 9:00 a.m. - General Business Meeting

Hampton Inn & Suites St. Petersburg Downtown

(727) 892-9900

### **New Business**

Mr. Jernigan introduced Myles Sampson, intern architect with his office of Goodwyn, Mills, and Cawood, Inc.

### **Old Business**

No old business.

### **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned 1:20 p.m.