## State Architects Licensure Board September 9, 2021

3 4 5

6

1 2

## BOARD MEMBERS:

12

13

K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs Darryl R. Hamm, Vice President, Public Member William J. Bates, RA

Jonathan Burns, Deputy Attorney General, Office of Attorney General

14 Mary E. McClenaghan, RA 15 Aram Piligian Jr., RA Jerry K. Roller, RA, Secretary

16 17

## 18 BUREAU PERSONNEL:

19 20

21 C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel 22 Dean F. Picarella, Esquire, Senior Counsel 23 Ray Michalowski, Esquire, Senior Board Prosecutor Angela L. Solomon, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison

24 25 26

Amanda Li, Board Administrator

Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President

Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department of State

28 29 30

27

## ALSO PRESENT:

31 32 33

34

35

36

Amal Mahrouki, Director of Legislative Affairs, American Institute of Architects of Pennsylvania Jen Smeltz, Republican Executive Director, Senate Consumer Protection & Professional Licensure Committee

37 38 39

Matthew M. Haar, Esquire, Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP Stephen M. Swarney, JD, Executive Director, American

Institute of Architects Pennsylvania

41 42

40

43

44 45 46

47 48

49

50

State Architects Licensure Board
September 9, 2021

\* \* \*

The regularly scheduled meeting of the State

Architects Licensure Board was held on Thursday,

September 9, 2021. Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President,

called the meeting to order at 10:36 a.m.

K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, was not present at the commencement of the meeting.

11 \*\*\*

12 Roll Call

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

13 [President Leinbach acknowledged that Mr. Hamm is

14 present but having technical difficulties and

15 requested Mr. Roller to call the roll. A quorum was

16 noted to be present.]

17

18 | Meeting Instructions/Introduction of Attendees

19 | [Amanda Li, Board Administrator, provided instructions

20 to be followed during the virtual meeting.

Ms. Li noted the meeting was being recorded, and those who continued to participate were giving their

23 | consent to be recorded.

Ms. Li also provided an introduction of those in

25 | attendance.]

\* \* \* 1 Approval of minutes of the July 9, 2021 meeting 2 3 PRESIDENT LEINBACH: Our next order of business is the 4 5 approval of the minutes. Are there any 6 questions, comments, or clarifications 7 that are needed on those minutes? [The Board discussed corrections to the minutes.] PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 10 I am not seeing any other input. Would 11 somebody offer a motion to approve the 12 minutes as amended? MS. MCCLENAGHAN: 13 14 Motion. 15 MR. BATES: 16 Second. 17 PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 18 Any further discussion? If not, Mr. 19 Roller would you take a roll call vote 2.0 to approve the minutes? 2.1 2.2 Mr. Leinbach, yes; Mr. Hamm, yes; Mr. 2.3 Bates, yes; Mr. Burns, yes; Ms. McClenaghan, yes; Mr. Piligian, yes; Mr. 2.4 25 Roller, yes.

1 [The motion carried unanimously.]

3 Report of Prosecutorial Division

4 | [Angela B. Lucci Solomon, Esquire, Board Prosecution

5 Liaison, provided an update regarding cases per the

6 Board's request at the last meeting.

Ms. Solomon reported 25 open cases with none older than 2020. She noted the total overall open number of cases for the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs is 14,500. She mentioned that the Board has a very small amount of open cases because their licensees are very law-abiding and follow the rules.

Ms. Solomon also reported 68 closed files between January 1 and September 1. She noted 18 cases were closed with a warning letter and 3 resulting in fines, whether it was a citation or a consent agreement, and 10 of them were application cases. She explained that prosecution does not have a large role in application cases and usually defer those to the Board. She reported 37 cases were closed as not warranted, where there may not have been enough evidence, witness testimony, or jurisdiction to move forward.

Ms. Solomon addressed the process of moving cases through the system, where complaints are given a case

number, investigated, and reviewed to determine if the case is worth prosecuting. She noted that a case may take a year or two to be resolved because of the thorough investigation prior to making a decision on a case.

2.0

2.4

Ray Michalowski, Esquire, Senior Board

Prosecutor, informed the Board that they would see a

typical biennial bump in the number of cases because

of just finishing renewals and receiving reports of

reciprocals. He noted individuals are required to

report criminal convictions within 30 days. He noted

reciprocals are a large part of the Board's cases,

including CE and other types of cases.

Mr. Michalowski stated some of the smaller cases are closed to avoid the piling on aspect, but they do look for practice issues that occurred in other states and would bring those to the Board, generally in the form of a consent agreement. He noted smaller cases are just moved to that state and closed with a warning letter.

Mr. Michalowski addressed unlicensed practice in other states, where someone is essentially using Pennsylvania as a state to work out of but violate the laws in a number of sister states. He noted that Pennsylvania and other states close minor cases to

1 avoid piling on that can happen with multistate
2 licensure.

2.2

2.3

President Leinbach requested verification that

Pennsylvania is passing on continuing education

violations because Pennsylvania does not have a

continuing education requirement, even though someone

violated their license in another location.

Mr. Michalowski stated President Leinbach is correct, noting two Supreme Court cases in Pennsylvania, where a violation in another state cannot be made if there is no match or equivalent to a violation in Pennsylvania and is not actionable in Pennsylvania on a reciprocal basis. He stated a comparison or equivalent can be found in a lot of other cases, except for CE.

Mr. Michalowski explained that other boards do not ask prosecution to violate CE perpetrators in other states but ask prosecution to inform the Board administrator to make sure that they are included in a continuing education audit. He commented that not having CE is a sore point for the Board and is hoping it is resolved this session.

President Leinbach understood why prosecution does not pile on with the CE requirement, but he had seen a number of reciprocal actions from Nevada that

has disciplined a licensee in Pennsylvania and our 1 2 state has hit them with that reciprocal penalty 3 because of a violation of another state's requirement. 4 He commented that individuals who are not keeping up 5 their CE and lie about it is worthy of looking at 6 because even though Pennsylvania does not have the requirement, it is a measure of that state's standing of the licensee keeping up with the requirements, whether it is continuing education or any other 10 requirement.

Mr. Michalowski addressed the audit process and continuing professional education (CPE) violations, where individuals would be charged with violating both the CPE statute and with making a false statement to the Board.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

Mr. Michalowski reported that the largest number of practice-related cases for the Board is internet complaints, where someone improperly put something on social media that would imply that they are an architect but are not. He stated the individual would receive a cease and desist order, which gets them to take it down and is much quicker than going through the adjudicatory process.

Mr. Michalowski commented that prosecution could charge those with CE violations ethically and some

people would pay, but it would be inappropriate for them as attorneys. He also noted that some people would take it to an attorney, and the attorney would know Pennsylvania law because a lot of the defense counsel are former prosecutors and counsel from their own division and would lose with the hearing examiner.

Ms. Solomon informed that Board that she filed an order to show cause in one case in the past month, which and would be going to a hearing, a default motion, or a consent agreement.]

12 Report of Board Counsel

[C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided a Status of Cases Report for the Board's review. He noted nothing disciplinary as of August 21. He mentioned the hearing on the application case would be soon. He noted the latest on the application case is that there was a prehearing conference and would be reflected in the hearing.

Mr. Fritz stated the regulations would be discussed either before or after the hearing.

Mr. Fritz noted the legislative initiative for CE was resubmitted and started to move again. He mentioned currently awaiting administration's opinion and hoped to have additional information for the next

1 meeting.

Mr. Fritz noted placing General Revisions back on the agenda in anticipation of Act 41 and the seal and signature regulation starting to wrap up soon, so the Board can start to refocus back on the General Revisions. He mentioned the annex is the same one

approved at a meeting a few years ago.

8 Mr. Fritz referred to the seal and signature
9 regulation, noting a vote on the final annex and final
10 preamble would be necessary after Board discussion
11 with the goal of getting that completed by the end of
12 the year.]

13

14 Regulations/Statute

15 [C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted

16 regulations and the statute would be discussed after

17 | the hearing.]

18

19 | Applications

20 [C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted

21 three applications for discussion during Executive

22 | Session.]

23 \*\*\*

24 | [A Formal Hearing was held from 11:14 a.m. until

25 | 12:04 p.m. in the Matter of the Appeal of the

```
Provisional Denial of the Application to Reciprocal
1
2
   Licensure of Owen Carr, Case No. 21-41-011316.]
3
4
   [The Board recessed for lunch from 12:07 p.m. until
5
   12:37 p.m.]
                              * * *
6
7
   Regulations/Statue
   [Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President, referred to 16A-
   4121 regarding General Revisions. He suggested
10
   utilizing the new language "administered" by NCARB
11
   where it says "operated" by NCARB at § 9.2 under the
   Architectural Experience Program (AXP) for
12
13
   consistency.
14
        Mr. Fritz offered to make them both
15
   "administered."
        President Leinbach referred to § 9.41(a)(1)
16
17
   regarding a bachelor's degree, recommended including
18
   the word "Board" to approved MRA for it to read,
19
   "Board-approved MRA."
2.0
        President Leinbach referred to § 9.41(b)(3) and
21
   recommended "in addition to three years of AXP
22
   training" to read, "in addition to time required to
23
   complete AXP" because some may take three years and
24
   some may take five years, so it is AXP plus. He also
25
   suggested changing "for a total of six years" to read,
```

"For a combined minimum total of six years" to preserve the three years of experience that the act references but recognizes that AXP could take three years but may take five.

Mr. Roller commented that a number of people have AXP records that go beyond the minimum hours total and may not be complete, where somebody has 5,000 to 6,000 hours in an AXP record, and should be able to count some of that. He noted that the excess hours could count toward additional years of experience, not necessarily toward AXP. He noted AXP requires a minimum of 3,740, then it is roughly three years.

Mr. Piligian commented that the paragraph does not say the applicant has to complete the AXP training as written and only requires three years of training.

President Leinbach mentioned that Mr. Piligian's point is spot on and agreed with Mr. Roller but recommended leaving that at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Fritz will make the change of "three years" to "in addition to completion of AXP training" and change "for a total of six years" to "for a combined minimum total of six years."

Mr. Bates referred to § 9.41(c) regarding an associate's degree, where it may have been copied incorrectly from the bachelor's degree section under

1  $\S$  9.41(c)(3), "has completed at least six years of

- 2 practical experience in the practice of architecture
- 3 | in addition to the AXP. He suggested changing it to
- 4 be consistent to the one above. He also noted it says
- 5 | for a total of "six" years and should say "a minimum
- 6 total of nine."
- 7
- 8 [K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of
- 9 Professional and Occupational Affairs, entered the
- 10 meeting at 12:40 p.m.]
- 11 \*\*\*
- 12 [President Leinbach referred to § 9.41(d) and §
- $13 \mid 9.41(d)(1)$ , where an architect licensed by experience
- 14 is capitalized. He mentioned that there is no by
- 15 experience program at NCARB and suggested it be lower
- 16 case. He noted that has evolved with different
- 17 | terminology and nomenclature within NCARB over time.
- 18 Mr. Fritz informed new Board members that context
- 19 | in brackets would be deleted and underlined context is
- 20 an addition.
- 21 President Leinbach noted a typo in § 9.46(c)(4)
- 22 and suggested changing 9.46(a) to 9.46 (a).
- Mr. Roller referred to 9.46(a) and suggested
- 24 changing it to "may apply directly to the Board"
- 25 | instead of "may apply directly to NCARB." He

mentioned an issue with candidates applying directly to NCARB and the Board stopping that.

2.2

President Leinbach mentioned an issue with some individuals reviewing things at NCARB and acting as though they fully understood Pennsylvania regulations and statues. He noted that thought was the Board did not want to penalize the people who have a National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) degree because with the NAAB degree and completion or in the process of completing AXP, the individual can apply to sit for the exam.

President Leinbach commented that the question was whether the Board did not want them taking the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) until completion the AXP, which would create a wrinkle with the Integrated Path to Licensure (IPAL) candidates that start and do experience simultaneous with their education, their AXP was ongoing, and they can take exams.

Mr. Roller noted being fine with them taking those but having had issues where NCARB-approved individuals would not have technically been approved had they come through the application process.

President Leinbach referred to § 9.46(b), where candidates who do not have a NAAB-accredited degree

- 1 | must apply directly to the Pennsylvania Board, where
- 2 those who have not started out with the two critical
- 3 likes of the NCARB certificate have to come to
- 4 Pennsylvania to see if they will give a thumbs up as
- 5 | well. He noted it takes some administrative
- 6 responsibility off of Ms. Li and her staff for the
- 7 ones that are going to be slam dunks with a NAAB
- 8 degree and the AXP.
- 9 President Leinbach commented that it is making
- 10 the path a little easier for potential licensees by
- 11 taking a little bit of time out of the process to get
- 12 them to a license quicker if they are already down the
- 13 path of the NAAB and AXP.
- 14 Ms. McClenaghan referred to § 9.49a.(a) and
- 15 | suggested changing "six years' practical experience"
- 16 to "six years of practical experience."
- 17 Ms. McClenaghan referred to § 9.62(a)(2) and
- 18 recommended changing "shall to submit a portfolio" to
- 19 "shall submit a portfolio."
- 20 President Leinbach referred to § 9.62(a)(2), "a
- 21 letter of recommendation from each of the applicant's
- 22 employers/supervisors on the projects contained in the
- 23 portfolio." He suggested two letters accompany two
- 24 projects and five letters accompany five projects but
- 25 | may be the same person for all five if the individual

works for the same firm.

2.0

Mr. Roller commented that this is reciprocal, so somebody has a license and can practice independently. He noted that meeting an NCARB Certificate in Section 9(a) of the statute makes all that moot, where an NCARB Certificate is prima facie evidence of meeting the requirement and not needing to jump down to item (b), which would potentially take you to the regulation. He commented that rather than being redundant and creating a loophole or an impediment to let the act say what the act says.

President Leinbach referred to § 9.62(b) and suggested placing a comma before and after "exclusive of education time."

Mr. Fritz addressed the annex for 16A-4111 regarding the digital signature and seal for final approval. He informed the Board of comments received from the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC) and changes to the annex that add a little more detail due to IRRC's concerns.

Mr. Fritz addressed IRRC's questions on electronic sound, symbol, or process, where it was determined change that to "electronic image" because the image would encompass the sound, symbol, or process.

- Mr. Fritz noted the word "design" was added in front of documents to keep it in line with the act.

  Mr. Fritz noted "adopted by person" was changed to "adopted by licensee or architect" per IRRC's recommendation.
- Mr. Roller questioned how someone could be an architect and not be a licensee, where they need to have a Pennsylvania seal and need to be a licensee in order to submit something to Pennsylvania.
  - President Leinbach commented that it implies that somebody other than an architect who is a licensee of some sort could potentially apply the seal if using both licensee and architect.
- Mr. Roller suggested changing it to "licensed architect."

10

11

12

13

16

17

- Mr. Fritz confirmed the change from "licensee or architect" to "licensed architect."
- Mr. Fritz noted IRRC suggested changing "seal" to
  "seal and signature" under the definitions of sole
  control and verification.
- 21 Mr. Fritz referred to § 9.141(a), noting the word 22 "identical" for clarity.
- Mr. Fritz referred to § 9.141(b)(2), noting the addition of the word "design" in three areas and the addition of "the seal and signature on the first page

of final or complete design documents may be impressed, stamped, or digital."

2.0

2.3

Ms. McClenaghan commented that it should be on every page.

President Leinbach further explained that every sheet of drawings gets a seal. He mentioned that jurisdictional requirements might say the first page of project specifications has a seal applied to it but not every page is a specification. He suggested striking "on the first page" to read "the seal and signature of final or complete design documents may be impressed, stamped, or digital."

President Leinbach commented that current regulations state only the first page, but there may be a jurisdiction that requires every sheet and for the specifications to be stamped.

Ms. McClenaghan referred to where it says facsimile or digital seals shall appear on all subsequent pages of plans and suggested changing it to "design documents" instead of "plans."

Mr. Fritz noted having questions on whether to change that because plans also is a term used throughout the act.

President Leinbach suggested utilizing "design documents" to be consistent.

Mr. Fritz confirmed the change from "pages of plans" to "design documents."

President Leinbach noted it would be consistent with what the changes are but not really change the intent, further explaining that "design documents" is a term under the practice of architecture in the act. He stated Mr. Fritz had reached out to him and he looked at it, noting the practice of architecture talks about design documents and the regulations speak more specifically of plans and models, which talks about drawings, and the umbrella of design documents catches all of that.

President Leinbach commented that the individual would still have to comply with the wishes and demands of the jurisdiction in which they are applying for building permits anyway, which vary amongst more than 1000 municipalities.]

19 [K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of 20 Professional and Occupational Affairs, exited the 21 meeting at 1:10 p.m.]

22 \*\*\*

23 [Mr. Fritz questioned whether the highlighted text was acceptable.

Mr. Roller noted the highlighted text to be

acceptable, stating this would address the
jurisdictions that state the first page has to be a
wet seal.

2.4

President Leinbach commented that it puts that original digital wet seal, raised seal on that first page to comply with the act and those requiring something more, then so be it.

Mr. Fritz referred to § 9.141(b)(4), noting the addition of "design" again and that § 9.141(b)(5) was changed from "documents" to "drawings, specifications, and other design documents to be consistent with the act."

Mr. Piligian questioned whether any consideration was given to when a digital seal is used to having the documents locked, where once a seal is put on with a password, it cannot be changed at all in a lot of the programs.

Mr. Fritz noted addressing that in the preamble, where a licensee using the digital seal is responsible for utilizing a security program to ensure that if any changes are made to a design document after the licensee affixes a digital seal, that validates the previous work.

President Leinbach commented that he and Mr. Hamm worked through this previously with a lengthy

```
1 electronic seal and signature document about six years
```

- 2 ago, where giving a specific definition depending on
- 3 | how Adobe does it versus Bluebeam does it versus
- 4 AutoCAD gets too far down into the weeds. He
- 5 | mentioned it is better to stay at the higher level
- 6 | because it is going to be biometrically locked in the
- 7 | future with an eye scan or thumbprint.
- 8 Mr. Fritz referred to § 9.141a.(a), where
- 9 drawings, specifications, and other design documents
- 10 that are signed using a digital signature must have an
- 11 electronic authentication.
- 12 Mr. Fritz would make the minor edits discussed
- 13 and requested Board approval of the final annex and
- 14 | preamble.]
- 15 PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
- 16 Would somebody make a motion to that
- 17 effect?
- 18 MR. BATES:
- 19 So moved.
- 20 MR. PILIGIAN:
- 21 Second.
- 22 PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
- Any discussion further on that? If not,
- Mr. Hamm would you please call the roll
- for approving that motion?

1

5

Mr. Leinbach, yes; Mr. Hamm, yes; Mr.

Bates, yes; Mr. Burns, yes; Ms.

4 McClenaghan, yes; Mr. Piligian, yes; Mr.

Roller, yes.

[The motion carried unanimously. The vote was to provisionally accept the annex and preamble to the digital seal and signature regulation as amended based on the discussion held today.]

10

11 [C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided

12 | an Act 41 update. He mentioned trying to get

13 engineers, landscape architects, and architects all

14 | finished at once. He noted engineering is done and

15 was sent to the Office of General Counsel (OGC) last

16 week. He would be matching the Board's Act 41 with

17 that one and received no comments from IRRC.

Mr. Fritz again noted the legislative initiative

19 for CE was resent and is back in the active category,

20 being viewed by multiple people.]

21 \*\*\*

22 Report of Board President

23 [Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President, noted House Bill

24 | 1258 regarding the Interior Designer Registration Act

25 | would be discussed later.

President Leinbach addressed the NAAB School invitation and suggested requesting their attendance for the October meeting. He asked Board members to provide specific topics or questions for the invite letter before the early part of next week, noting he would also ask the school for topics they would like to discuss.

2.3

Mr. Bates mentioned the subject of professional ethics, noting it would be interesting to hear NAAB comment on educational requirements.

Ms. McClenaghan suggested the topic of equity, diversity, and inclusion.

President Leinbach announced that the NCARB

Region 2 Student/Educator/Practitioner (SEP) Symposium

has been deferred to next year due to the situation

with COVID and the availability of meeting in person.

He noted Region 2 should be pushing some information

out on that. He believed the tentative plan is for

the afternoon of October 14.

President Leinbach noted the NCARB Pre-Board of Directors Teleconference is on Thursday, September 16, 2021, at noon and encouraged everyone to join the conference.

President Leinbach stated the PSI Services LLC (PSI) migration is in full force, and it is

- 1 | anticipated that it would take place by February 2022.
- 2 | He noted updates to the whiteboard to make that more
- 3 user friendly and some function in the calculator to
- 4 store more numbers. He mentioned there is a link
- 5 online for those who wish to try that.
- 6 President Leinbach informed the Board that online
- 7 testing issues are decreasing with overall technical
- 8 issues down to less than 1 or 2 percent. He noted
- 9 most issues occur during online exams with
- 10 connectivity issues of the users. He mentioned they
- 11 are seeming to get more engaged and use the 30-minute
- 12 | setup call, but NCARB continues to work to message
- 13 that and things are improving.
- 14 President Leinbach addressed PA Outreach, noting
- 15 | Ms. McClenaghan has offered to attend as a
- 16 representative from the Pennsylvania Board along with
- 17 | NCARB. He thanked Ms. McClenaghan and welcomed others
- 18 to join.
- 19 President Leinbach mentioned receiving responses
- 20 from the Analysis of Practice Survey, informing
- 21 everyone that it is their opportunity to have their
- 22 voices heard to speak to issues, such as the
- 23 importance of professional practice.
- 24 President Leinbach noted NCARB correspondence for
- 25 | the Board's review.

```
President Leinbach addressed NCARB Region 2

leadership. He mentioned having the option of a third

year in spite of what was approved at the annual

meeting. He noted that, in all likelihood, the whole

organization would open seats and allow individuals to

move through the region. He encouraged everyone to

keep an eye out around December for a notification

about a call for nominations when self-nominations are

typically done.]
```

- 10 | \* \* \*
- 11 Report of Board Administrator
- 12 [Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President, mentioned NCARB
- 13 Outreach and thanked Mr. Roller for getting the
- 14 newsletter out. He informed everyone that positive
- 15 comments were received.
- 16 Ms. Li noted including a PowerPoint with some
- 17 | slides regarding requirements that would be addressed
- 18 during the NCARB Outreach event.]
- 19 \*\*\*
- 20 Miscellaneous
- 21 [C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted
- 22 2022 meeting dates for Board approval.]
- 23 MR. HAMM:
- I would make a motion, Mr. President,
- 25 that we adopt the proposed 2022 dates as

1 provided.

2 MR. BATES:

6

9

10

3 Second.

4 PRESIDENT LEINBACH:

5 Any further discussion? Hearing none.

Mr. Hamm would you please call the roll?

Mr. Leinbach, abstain; Mr. Hamm, yes;

Mr. Bates, yes; Mr. Burns, yes; Ms.

McClenaghan, yes; Mr. Piligian, yes; Mr.

Roller, yes.

11 [The motion carried. Philip Leinbach abstained from

12 voting on the motion.]

13

14 | Public Session

15 | [Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President, requested an

16 update on House Bill 1258 regarding the Interior

17 Designer Registration Act.

18 Stephen M. Swarney, JD, Executive Director,

19 American Institute of Architects Pennsylvania, stated

20 the Interior Design Legislative Coalition

21 of Pennsylvania (IDLCPA) asked AIA specifically in a

22 | legislative meeting with a lot of staff and some

23 representatives for registration under the Attorney

24 General's Office with signing and sealing privileges.

25 Mr. Swarney commented that a section of the bill

that they offered, House Bill 1258, also includes a section that prohibits the ability of any local or code officials to send any plans for review by any other professionals. He noted AIA attended several meetings with them throughout the years.

Mr. Swarney commented that the group is claiming that AIA refuses to talk or meet with them, but Mr. Swarney personally found 63 emails and had several meetings. He noted AIA worked hard to provide the group with compromised language that satisfied some of their major issues over the years, including the fact that some adjoining states, particularly New York and New Jersey, had such registrations.

Mr. Swarney mentioned that the group is stating that they are not allowed to bid federal jobs, although they fail to produce any evidence of that. He believed AIA agreed to exactly what they asked for, which is a registration under the Attorney General's Office; however, AIA did strip out signing, sealing, and a few things like that but was part of the compromise.

Mr. Swarney noted that AIA has not heard back from them on that compromise, and it appears that AIA has not offered enough to satisfy IDLCPA because they now want something akin to what passed in North

Carolina.

Mr. Swarney commented that IDLCPA's testing has improved but testing still falls short on health, safety, and welfare issues and in code areas. He stated AIA continues to educate legislators in disparities and differences in education and testing and is very careful not to disparage the profession of interior design.

Amal Mahrouki, Director of Legislative Affairs,
American Institute of Architects Pennsylvania,
highlighted the fact that only 12 states allow signing
and sealing for interior designers. She noted
providing compromise language similar to New York and
New Jersey and is hoping that IDLCPA keep their good
faith request and honor their good faith effort when
they said they would compromise as well.

Mr. Swarney stated the American Institute of Architects (AIA) of Pennsylvania is also disappointed that there is no continuing education. He commented that it ties right back to this particular issue in this bill and cannot find anybody who disagrees with or opposes continuing education for the profession. He noted AIA wants to be a good partner and look for other ways to bring continuing education to Pennsylvania without compromising other positions.

President Leinbach announced receiving a memo for an upcoming Pre-Board of Directors call. He stated the NCARB Board of Directors are going to have an external engagement with the Council for Interior Design Qualification (CIDQ) at the September meeting.

2.3

President Leinbach noted already throwing some questions over there about the alphabet soup of the interior licensing professional organizations and associations relative to whether they are all pulling in the same direction and represent CIDQ equally.

President Leinbach commented that there are a lot of components out there with different goals in mind and is part of the problem. He noted being with CIDQ directly, which ties into a review of a two-year task force in reviewing the interior design educational requirements. He noted the committee does not exist this year, and the Board is taking that up directly and deciding where to go with that.

Mr. Hamm commented that in the many years of discussing continuing education, the initiative, and the legislature regarding interior designers, there is no progress or no better hope of delinking the two issues.

Mr. Swarney stated IDLCPA is in favor of continuing education when asked, but every time the

continuing education bill gets moving, it gets amendments to it that are directly related to some form of licensing for interior designers.

Mr. Swarney mentioned being surprised after coming so far in a compromise and giving IDLCPA everything they asked for in this particular bill, aside from the fact of continuing education, and not hearing back from them. He also noted addressing all of the points except for the signing and sealing, and there has been no compromise on their end.

Mr. Hamm questioned whether President Leinbach said NCARB does not have the Interiors Task Force.

President Leinbach noted there is no Interiors

Task Force and Jim Mickey may have been the last chair of that group. He mentioned they completed their assessment, and the report would be part of their discussion information.

President Leinbach stated they are supposed to be engaging with Thom Banks, the CEO of CIDQ, their president-elect, past president, and director, Erin Jennings. He mentioned there are no representatives from the other interior design alphabet soup organizations, but apparently, two of the groups are talking about merging into one.

Mr. Swarney requested verification of whether you

can fail all of the health, safety, and welfare part
of the NCIDQ Exam and still pass. He also requested
information as to whether or not the Governor and the
department is in support of this bill.

2.4

Ms. Mahrouki stated the Governor's Office and Attorney General's Office do not have a problem with it, which was said at a meeting with the IDLCPA and House Consumer Affairs Committee.

Mr. Swarney commented that no other state certifies and allows interior designers to sign and seal without other professionals looking at the documents, and Pennsylvania would be the only state in the country that does that if House Bill 1258 passes as it sits.

Mr. Swarney stated Pennsylvania is rarely number one on something like this, especially when it clearly is not a good path to take without oversight of a licensing-type board to review that profession and did not believe Pennsylvania had any interest in being the only state that does it like this.

President Leinbach requested clarification when stating the department supports it and whether they are talking about the Attorney General's Office, not the Department of State or BPOA.

Ms. Mahrouki noted that to be correct.

1 Mr. Piligian questioned whether there was an 2 update on the length of repose in Pennsylvania.

3 Ms. Mahrouki stated Senator Laughlin introduced 4 Senate Bill 833, which was referred to the Senate 5 Judiciary Committee. She noted forming a full platoon 6 of support to talk about that bill. She stated the bill would reduce the statute of repose from 12 years to 6 years in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. mentioned that the bill just dropped a couple of weeks 10 ago, and AIA is doing their due diligence and 11 scheduling meetings with all members of the Senate 12 Judiciary Committee.

President Leinbach thanked Mr. Swarney and Ms.
Mahrouki for their time and patience.]

15 \*\*\*

[Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at 1:54 p.m. the Board entered into Executive Session with C. William Fritz II, Esquire, Board Counsel, for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations. The Board returned to open session at 3:07 p.m.]

22 \*\*\*

[K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, reentered the meeting during Executive Session.]

33 \* \* \* 1 2 MOTIONS 3 MR. FRITZ: The Board met in Executive Session and 4 5 conducted quasi-judicial deliberation in 6 the following matters: The Board would entertain a motion to provisionally deny 8 the Application for Reciprocal Licensure 9 of Chad Peterson. 10 PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 11 Is there a motion? 12 MS. MCCLENAGHAN: I'll make a motion. 13 14 PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 15 Is there a second? MR. BATES: 16 17 Second. PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 18 19 Any discussion? Hearing none. Mr. Hamm 20 would you please call the roll? 21 22 Mr. Leinbach, yes; Commissioner Johnson, 2.3 aye; Mr. Hamm, no; Mr. Bates, yes; Mr. 2.4 Burns, yes; Ms. McClenaghan, yes; Mr. 25 Piligian, yes; Mr. Roller, no.

```
34
   [The motion carried.
                          Darryl Hamm and Jerry Roller
1
2
   opposed the motion.
3
                               * * *
   MR. FRITZ:
4
5
                  The Board would entertain a motion to
 6
                  provisionally approve the Application
                  for ARE approval for Justin Lockman
                  contingent upon Mr. Lockman providing
8
9
                  additional information requested of him
10
                  by the committee members.
11
   MS. MCCLENAGHAN:
                  I'll make a motion.
12
   PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
13
                  Is there a second?
14
15
   MR. PILIGIAN:
16
                  I second.
17
   PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
18
                  Any discussion? Hearing none. Mr. Hamm
19
                  would you please take roll call votes?
2.0
2.1
                  Mr. Leinbach, yes; Commissioner Johnson,
2.2
                  aye; Mr. Hamm, yes; Mr. Bates, yes; Mr.
2.3
                  Burns, yes; Ms. McClenaghan, yes; Mr.
24
                  Piligian, yes; Mr. Roller, yes.
25
    [The motion carried unanimously.]
```

35 \* \* \* 1 2 MR. FRITZ: 3 The Board would entertain a motion to approve the Reciprocal Licensing 4 5 Application of Wayne Spears. 6 PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 7 Is there a motion? MS. MCCLENAGHAN: 9 I'll motion. 10 MR. BATES: 11 Second. 12 PRESIDENT LEINBACH: 13 Is there any discussion? Hearing none. 14 Mr. Hamm would you please call roll? 15 Mr. Leinbach, yes; Commissioner Johnson, 16 17 yes; Mr. Hamm, yes; Mr. Bates, yes; Mr. 18 Burns, yes; Ms. McClenaghan, yes; Mr. 19 Piligian, yes; Mr. Roller, yes. 20 [The motion carried unanimously.] \* \* \* 21 22 MR. FRITZ: 2.3 There is no need for the Board to vote 2.4 at this time on the Appeal of the 25 Provisional Denial of Owen Carr.

Board will be waiting on the submission of post-hearing briefs in that matter, which will then be placed on the next agenda for the next Board meeting for the Board to deliberate at that time.

\* \* \*

7 Report of Commissioner

2.0

2.1

[K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, addressed the status of wall certificates. He noted moving toward a resolution at the end of this month regarding wall certificates. He stated, once the details were finalized, the detail would be promoted, not just on the Board website but also communicating those to the professional associations.

President Leinbach asked Commissioner Johnson to provide information concerning the reappointment status of Ms. McClenaghan, filling his term that expires in just over a month, and the public member seat.

Commissioner Johnson stated all three have been communicated to the Governor's Office, where they are working on reappointment and addressing the professional member vacancy. He mentioned that public member appointments are a bit of a unicorn, but they

are working diligently to try to field some candidates for those public members.

Commissioner Johnson reported a resolution on the professional members within the next several weeks.

President Leinbach asked Commissioner Johnson to provide a summary of the potential set up of an engagement with the interiors community and to explain some of the logistics with regard to the internal workings of the department.

Commissioner Johnson commented that it is within this Board's province and authority to allow for public discussion with respect to all matters that relate to the regulated community. He stated the Department of State and the bureau actually have an existing process, where advocates for licensure can communicate directly to the administration in what is known as a Sunrise Application.

Application is a document that can be shared with perspective advocates or those seeking adoption of a license. He noted the Sunrise Application is essentially an organization's or individual's opportunity to discuss the public protection afforded by licensure; what the impact of licensure would be upon the existing regulated community and the public

at large; and to provide some high-level discussion around the regulated community with respect to training, experience, and education.

Application is then submitted to the proper state and undergoes a few different levels of internal evaluation by the legal, policy, and program areas. He noted recommendations are then provided to the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the information is then forwarded to the Governor's Office and that position is then adopted with respect to either adoption of that new licensure class or expansion of an existing licensure class.

Commissioner Johnson stated the Sunrise document then helps inform any public discussion, whether with either of the professional licensure committees in either chamber of the General Assembly or with respect to any discussion that may take place, either in the public meeting of the state Board or any particular legislative group.

Commissioner Johnson informed the Board that the department has not received any requests for a Sunrise Application or received any communications for or against licensure with respect to completing such an application.

Commissioner Johnson commented that the Board's ability to hold public informational sessions is certainly within this Board's ambit.

2.0

2.1

President Leinbach commented that it is the feeling of the Board to pursue that engagement in the future and would relish that opportunity as a Board to have engagement with the interiors community with the help of Mr. Fritz and Ms. Li.

Commissioner Johnson stated the disaster declaration would end on September 30, 2021, and many temporary regulatory suspensions that were enacted to mediate the effects of the pandemic will be expiring. He informed everyone that the physical presence waiver will also be expiring requiring most boards to meet in person beginning October 1, 2021, at 2601 North Third Street in Harrisburg.

Commissioner Johnson noted that all of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines for public health and safety would be observed.

Commissioner Johnson mentioned that physical travel has been reinstated to the pre-COVID two-member policy that existed before COVID but encouraged members to participate virtually if available. He requested anyone submitting travel requests to submit

```
those early due to staffing shortages. He noted the
1
2
   two-member restriction would be lifted for regional
3
   and national conferences that offer both an in-person
4
   and virtual component.
5
        President Leinbach thanked Commissioner Johnson
6
   for sharing the update.]
                              * * *
   [Philip M. Leinbach, RA, President, noted the Board
   would be selecting officers for 2022 at the next
10
   meeting and encouraged everyone to give some thought
11
   as to who they want to see in the roles of president,
   vice president, and secretary of the Board.]
12
13
                              * * *
14
   Adjournment
15
   PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
16
                  Is there a motion to adjourn?
17
   MR. ROLLER:
                  So moved.
18
19
   PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
20
                  Second?
21
   MR. BATES:
22
                  Second.
2.3
   PRESIDENT LEINBACH:
2.4
                  Thank you all for your time and patience
25
                  today.
```

41 1 [The motion carried unanimously.] 2 3 [There being no further business, the State Architects 4 Licensure Board Meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.] \* \* \* 5 6 CERTIFICATE 8 9 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary 10 minutes of the State Architects Licensure Board 11 meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my 12 supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize 13 the substance of the State Architects Licensure Board 14 meeting. 15 16 17 18 Samantha Sabatini, 19 Minute Clerk 20 Sargent's Court Reporting 21 Service, Inc. 22 2.3 2.4 25

26

		STATE ARCHITECTS LICENSURE BOARD	
		REFERENCE INDEX	
		September 9, 2021	
	TIME	AGENDA	
	0:36	Official Call to Order	
1	0:36	Roll Call	
	0:36	Meeting Instructions/Introduction of Attendees	
	0:41	Approval of Minutes	
	0:44	Report of Prosecutorial Division	
1	0:58	Report of Board Counsel	
	1:02	Applications	
	1:14	Formal Hearing - Owen Carr	
1	2:07 2:37	Lunch Return to Open Session	
	2:37	Regulations/Statute	
	1:20	Report of Board President	
	1:30	Report of Board Administrator	
	1:36	Public Session	
	1:54 3:07	Executive Session Return to Open Session	
	3:07	Motions	
	3:15	Report of Commissioner	
	3:23	Adjournment	