

**Florida Board of Professional Engineers
Rules Committee Minutes
November 4, 2025 @ 8:30 am
FBPE Office
Via video conference**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Determination of Quorum, and Address Absences

Ms. Ramsey called the meeting to order. Ms. Sammons called roll call.

Committee Members Present:

Denise Ramsey, P.E., Chair
John Pistorino, P.E., S.I.
Brock Shrader, P.E.
James Gonzalez, Public Member

Attorney General's Office:

Lawrence Harris, Sr. Assistant Attorney General, Counsel to the Board

Staff Members Present:

Zana Raybon, Executive Director
John J. Rimes, III, Chief Prosecuting Attorney
Rebecca Sammons, Assistant Executive Director

2. Introduction of Guests and Announcements

Wendy Anderson, FEMC Investigator
Jaime Graham, P.E., FES
Angelina Fairchild, P.E., FES
Jaime Ghitelman, P.E., FES
Andrew Lovenstein, P.E., FSEA

3. Review/Open Rule 61G15- 20.0011 – Structural Engineering Recognition Program for Professional Engineers

Mr. Harris stated that Mr. Lovenstein has proposed additional changes to the rule, and Ms. Sammons has sent those changes to the committee members.

Mr. Lovenstein discussed the proposed changes.

Discussion followed.

Upon motion by Mr. Pistorino, seconded by Mr. Gonzalez, to propose the following rule amendment for the full board for action:

20.0011 - Engineering Recognition Program for Professional Engineers.

(1) Any professional engineer currently licensed in good standing in the state of Florida who desires Recognition as a Structural Engineer in Florida shall submit an application to the Board. The instructions and application Form FBPE/030 ([12/2504/23](#)), entitled, "FBPE Application for Recognition in the Florida Structural Engineer Recognition Program" is hereby incorporated by reference, copies of which may be obtained from the Board office at 2400 Mahan Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308; from the Board's website at FBPE.org/licensure/structuralengineering-recognition-program/ or at <https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-15465>. The Board shall recognize only those applicants who have completed the Application, including submission of required documentation, and who have demonstrated to the Board that they have:

(a) Passed the NCEES Structural I and Structural II exams taken prior to January 1, 2011, OR

(b) Prior to January 1, 2004, passed a 16-hour state-written examination equivalent in scope and content to the examination identified in paragraph (1)(a) above. For purposes of this rule, the board identifies the following examinations as equivalent in scope and content: the 16-hour Western States Structural Engineering examination, OR

(c) Passed the NCEES Structural II exam plus an 8-hour state-written structural examination prior to January 1, 2011. For purposes of this rule, the board will accept the following 8-hour examinations: 8-hour NCEES Civil: Structural Examination; 8-hour NCEES Architectural Engineering Examination; 8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic III Examination; or 8-hour Washington Structural Engineering III Examination, OR

(d) [Passed all 4 parts of the NCEES structural engineering examination after January 1, 2024; or](#)

~~(e)~~ Passed the NCEES 16-hour Structural Engineering examination (vertical and lateral) taken after January 1, 2011 [but before December 31, 2024](#); OR

~~(f)~~~~(e)~~ Has at least five (5) years of experience after licensure as a Professional Engineer in any jurisdiction(s) designing significant structural engineering projects. [Because the evaluation of structural engineering experience is a complex and subjective matter, the Board establishes that,](#) for purposes of this rule, "significant structural engineering projects" is defined as the design of complex structural components and structural systems of any of the following:

1. Buildings three stories or greater.
2. Risk Category III or IV buildings, as defined by Table 1604.5 RISK CATEGORY OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER STRUCTURES in the current Florida Building Code in effect at the time of application or equivalent classification in another jurisdiction.
3. Complex Vehicular Bridges.

[The above definitions are guidelines which shall be generally applicable absent extraordinary evidence and documentation from the applicant supporting a departure therefrom. Said documentation shall, at a minimum, require the testimony or affidavit](#)

of the Applicant as to the details and specifics of the project(s) the Applicant claims is “significant.”

(g)(f) Been Certified as a Special Inspector of Threshold Buildings pursuant to Section 471.015(7), F.S. prior to February, 2016, or if so certified after February, 2016, sought certification based on principal practice in the area of structural engineering as defined in paragraphs 61G1535.003(1)(a) and (b), F.A.C. Certification as a Special Inspector (Limited) will not qualify an applicant for recognition.

(h)(g) The license(s) and/or registration(s) must not have been disciplined or otherwise acted against for a violation related to the field of structural engineering.

(2) Any Florida Licensed PE recognized by the Florida Board may be so indicated by using the designation “Florida Board Recognized Structural Engineer” or “FRSE.” A professional engineer who is recognized by the program may identify such recognition in her or his professional practice, including marketing and advertising materials.

(3) Recognition by the program is not required for a professional engineer to practice structural engineering.

(4) Upon submission of the Application, the Board will timely notify an applicant of any documentation and/or information that is required to complete the request.

(a) Upon request, it is the Applicant’s responsibility to supply additional documentation/information that will enable the Board to determine that Applicant has the appropriate experience designing significant structures.

(b) Examples of documentation/information required include: written proof of passage of examinations, verifications of out of state licensure, or for applicants by experience, a signed and sealed statement of experience describing the scope of applicant’s work on significant structural engineering projects.

(c) If an applicant fails to supply any requested documentation and/or information that is required to complete the request within one (1) year of notification, the request will be presented to the Board for review and decision on the request as submitted.

(5) ~~This rule shall be reviewed, and if necessary, repealed, modified, or renewed through the rulemaking process five years from the effective date.~~

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Harris asked the new SERC questions:

1. Will this rule likely have an adverse impact on economic growth, private sector job creation or employment, or private sector investment in excess of \$1 million in the aggregate within 5 years after the implementation of the rule;

No

2. Will this rule likely have an adverse impact on business competitiveness, including the ability of persons doing business in the state to compete with persons doing business in other states or domestic markets, productivity, or innovation in excess of \$1 million in the aggregate within 5 years after the implementation of the rule; or

No

3. Will this rule likely increase regulatory costs, including any transactional costs, in excess of \$1 million in the aggregate within 5 years after the implementation of the rule.

No

(b) A good faith estimate of the number of individuals and entities likely to be required to comply with the rule, together with a general description of the types of individuals likely to be affected by the rule.

The rule changes will affect all applicants for FRSE recognition in the future. Based on the prior year's data, there are approximately 130 applicants for recognition per year.

Will there be a cost to the agency, and to any other state and local government entities, to implement and enforce the proposed rule, and what is the anticipated effect on state or local revenues.

No

(c) Will there be any transactional costs incurred by individuals and entities, including local government entities, required to comply with the requirements of the rule. In answering this question, you have to consider all of the following elements. IF ANY ONE IS "YES" THEN THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS YES. IF each and every one is "NO," then the answer to this is "NO."

1. Filing fees.
2. Expenses to obtain a license.
3. Necessary equipment.
4. Installation, utilities for, and maintenance of necessary equipment.
5. Necessary operations or procedures.
6. Accounting, financial, information management, and other administrative processes.
7. Labor, based on relevant wages, salaries, and benefits.
8. Materials and supplies.
9. Capital expenditures, including financing costs.
10. Professional and technical services, including contracted services necessary to implement and maintain compliance.
11. Monitoring and reporting.
12. Qualifying and recurring education, training, and testing.
13. Travel.
14. Insurance and surety requirements.
15. A fair and reasonable allocation of administrative costs and other overhead.
16. Reduced sales or other revenue.

17. Other items suggested by the rules ombudsman in the Executive Office of the Governor or by any interested person, business organization, or business representative filing fees, the cost of obtaining a license, the cost of equipment required to be installed or used or procedures required to be employed in complying with the rule, additional operating costs incurred, the cost of monitoring and reporting, and any other costs necessary to comply with the rule.

No. The fundamental requirements of the existing rule requirements are not being altered, the rule amendments simplify and streamline those existing requirements and add clarity regarding the newest Examination and the Applicant's ability to suggest alternative experience.

(f) will there be an impact on small businesses as defined by s. 288.703, and will there be an impact on small counties and small cities as defined in s. 120.52?

No

(e) will there be market impacts likely to result from compliance with the proposed rule, including:

1. Changes to customer charges for goods or services.
2. Changes to the market value of goods or services produced, provided, or sold.
3. Changes to costs resulting from the purchase of substitute or alternative goods or services.
4. The reasonable value of time to be spent by owners, officers, operators, and managers to understand and comply with the proposed rule, including, but not limited to, time to be spent completing required education, training, or testing.

No. The current rule requirements are not being significantly altered; the intent of the changes is to ensure Applicants and Board Reviewers have a clearer understanding of the type of experience that will lead to FRSE recognition.

(g) Is there any additional information that we should consider in determining whether or not to develop a SERC prior to moving forward with proposing this rule?

No

(h) In the statement or revised statement, whichever applies, a description of any regulatory alternatives submitted under paragraph (1)(a) and a statement adopting the alternative or a statement of the reasons for rejecting the alternative in favor of the proposed rule.

None received.

4. Review/Open on **61G15-20.011 – Board Approval of Continuing Education Providers** (sent back to committee from October 2025 board meeting)

Mr. Harris discussed the proposed rule. Discussion followed.

Upon motion by Mr. Pistorino, seconded by Mr. Shrader, to propose the following rule amendment to the full board for action:

61G15-22.011 Board Approval of Continuing Education Providers.

(1) In order to offer continuing education credit in Florida, a continuing education provider must be approved by either the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation OR the Florida Board of Professional Engineers. However, in order to offer Florida Laws and Rules CE courses, a continuing education provider must be approved by the FBPE.

(2) Persons or entities seeking FBPE approval as Applicants for continuing education providers (“Applicants”) status must: either

(a) Be registered as a continuing education provider with the Registered Continuing Education Program (RCEP) of the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC);

(b) Be registered as a continuing education provider with the or International Association for Continuing Education and Training (IACET) as of March 1, 2015; or

(c) Meet the requirements of subsection (32) of this rule, to demonstrate the education and/or the experience necessary to instruct professional engineers in the conduct of their practice.

~~(32) To demonstrate the education and/or the experience necessary to instruct professional engineers in the conduct of their practice for~~ In addition to those entities identified in subsection (2), the following persons or entities are eligible to be approved by the FBPE to offer continuing education credit courses to Florida Professional Engineers, an applicant for continuing education provider status must be one of the following:

(a) a regionally accredited educational institution;

(b) a commercial educator;

(c) a governmental agency;

(d) a state or national professional association whose primary purpose is to promote the profession of engineering;

(e) an engineer with a Florida license to practice engineering who is not under disciplinary restrictions pursuant to any order of the Board;

(f) a vendor with specific knowledge related to the licensee’s area of practice; or

(g) an engineering firm properly qualified as an engineering business organization by the Board pursuant to Section 471.023, F.S.

~~(43)~~ To allow the Board to evaluate an application for continuing education provider status, the applicant must submit the following:

(a) A completed Application For Continuing Education Provider New Provider Application, Form FBPE/007 (10/17/12/25), incorporated by reference herein, which may

be obtained from www.fbpe.org/licensure/application-process or at <https://www.flrules.org/gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref09327>.

(b) The name, address and telephone number of the prospective provider; and,

(c) Proof of registration as continuing education provider with ACEC or IACET, or if the applicant is not registered as a continuing education provider with ACEC or IACET, the applicant must submit the following:

1. A description of the type of courses or seminars the provider expects to conduct for credit;

2. A description of the applicant's professional credentials ~~staffing capability of the applicant;~~

3. A sample of intended course materials;

4. ~~A list of anticipated locations to conduct the courses;~~

5. ~~A complete course curriculum for each course the applicant intends to offer;~~

6. A description of the means the applicant will use to update the course in response to rule or law changes; ~~57.~~ A description of the means the applicant will use to evaluate the licensee's performance in the course; ~~and~~

(d) A fee of \$250. The following entities are exempt from payment of this fee:

(a) Educational Institutions teaching college level courses;

(b) Federal and State Governmental Agencies that establish rules, regulations, guidelines, or otherwise have an impact on the practice of engineering; and,

(c) State and National Engineering Professional Associations approved by the Board.

~~(54)~~ No engineer may conduct continuing education courses or seminars for credit upon the engineer's receipt of any disciplinary order from any professional regulatory board in any jurisdiction. Rather, the engineer must notify the Board office within ten (10) days of the engineer's receipt of any such order.

~~(65)~~ Should the Board determine that the provider has failed to provide appropriate continuing education services, it shall request that the Department of Business and Professional Regulation issue an order requiring the provider cease and desist from offering any continuing education courses and shall request that the Department revoke any approval of the provider granted by the Board.

~~(76)~~ No provider may allow an engineer to conduct any course or seminar offered by the provider if that engineer has been disciplined and has not been released from the terms of the final order in the disciplinary case. Upon receipt of notice that an instructor is under discipline, the provider shall, within seven (7) days, write to the Board office and confirm that the engineer is no longer conducting any course or seminar offered by the provider. For the purpose of this subsection, a letter of guidance or a reprimand shall not constitute "under discipline."

~~(87)~~ The Board retains the right and authority to audit and/or monitor programs and review records and course materials given by any provider approved pursuant to this rule. The Board shall request that the Department of Business and Professional Regulation revoke the approved status of the provider or reject individual programs given by a provider if the provider disseminated any false or misleading information in connection with the continuing education programs, or if the provider fails to conform

to and abide by the rules of the Board. Licensees will not lose credit for attending courses offered by approved providers that are later rejected or stopped by the Board.

~~(98)~~ Members of the Board of Professional Engineers or the Florida Engineers Management Corporation Board of Directors are prohibited from being a continuing education provider.

~~(109) The following entities providers shall be are approved as continuing education providers, and the Board shall accept their courses for do not need to apply for provider status to offer continuing education credit courses:~~

- ~~(d) Educational Institutions teaching college level courses;~~
- ~~(e) Federal and State Governmental Agencies that establish rules, regulations, guidelines, or otherwise have an impact on the practice of engineering; and,~~
- ~~(f) State and National Engineering Professional Associations approved by the Board.~~

~~Rulemaking Authority 455.213(6), 455.2179, 471.008, 471.017(3) FS. Law Implemented 455.213(6), 455.2179, 471.017(3) FS. History—New 9-16-01, Amended 9-4-02, 12-21-03, 8-8-05, 6-11-06, 1-29-07, 6-3-07, 8-10-09, 7-8-10, 2-18-16, 5-8-18, 5-3-20, 2-3-25, _____.~~

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Harris asked the new SERC questions.

1. Will this rule likely have an adverse impact on economic growth, private sector job creation or employment, or private sector investment in excess of \$1 million in the aggregate within 5 years after the implementation of the rule;

No

2. Will this rule likely have an adverse impact on business competitiveness, including the ability of persons doing business in the state to compete with persons doing business in other states or domestic markets, productivity, or innovation in excess of \$1 million in the aggregate within 5 years after the implementation of the rule; or

No

3. Will this rule likely increase regulatory costs, including any transactional costs, in excess of \$1 million in the aggregate within 5 years after the implementation of the rule.

No

(d) A good faith estimate of the number of individuals and entities likely to be required to comply with the rule, together with a general description of the types of individuals likely to be affected by the rule.

Per the licensing database, there are 77 Florida L&R providers that would be affected.

(e) Will there be a cost to the agency, and to any other state and local government entities, to implement and enforce the proposed rule, and what is the anticipated effect on state or local revenues.

No

(f) Will there be any transactional costs incurred by individuals and entities, including local government entities, required to comply with the requirements of the rule.

In answering this question, you have to consider all of the following elements. IF ANY ONE IS "YES" THEN THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS YES. IF

each and every one is "NO," then the answer to this is "NO." 1. Filing fees.

18. Expenses to obtain a license.

19. Necessary equipment.

20. Installation, utilities for, and maintenance of necessary equipment.

21. Necessary operations or procedures.

22. Accounting, financial, information management, and other administrative processes.

23. Labor, based on relevant wages, salaries, and benefits.

24. Materials and supplies.

25. Capital expenditures, including financing costs.

26. Professional and technical services, including contracted services necessary to implement and maintain compliance.

27. Monitoring and reporting.

28. Qualifying and recurring education, training, and testing.

29. Travel.

30. Insurance and surety requirements.

31. A fair and reasonable allocation of administrative costs and other overhead.

32. Reduced sales or other revenue.

33. Other items suggested by the rules ombudsman in the Executive Office of the Governor or by any interested person, business organization, or business representative filing fees, the cost of obtaining a license, the cost of equipment required to be installed or used or procedures required to be employed in complying with the rule, additional operating costs incurred, the cost of monitoring and reporting, and any other costs necessary to comply with the rule.

No. The fundamental requirements are not being altered, the rule amendments simplify and streamline those existing requirements.

(f) will there be an impact on small businesses as defined by s. 288.703, and will there be an impact on small counties and small cities as defined in s. 120.52.

No

(g) will there be market impacts likely to result from compliance with the proposed rule, including:

5. Changes to customer charges for goods or services.
6. Changes to the market value of goods or services produced, provided, or sold.
7. Changes to costs resulting from the purchase of substitute or alternative goods or services.
8. The reasonable value of time to be spent by owners, officers, operators, and managers to understand and comply with the proposed rule, including, but not limited to, time to be spent completing required education, training, or testing.

No

(g) Is there any additional information that we should consider in determining whether or not to develop a SERC prior to moving forward with proposing this rule?

No

(h) In the statement or revised statement, whichever applies, a description of any regulatory alternatives submitted under paragraph (1)(a) and a statement adopting the alternative or a statement of the reasons for rejecting the alternative in favor of the proposed rule.

None received.

5. Review/Open Rule **Chapter 61G15-35 – Responsibility Rules of Professional Engineers providing Threshold Building Inspections** (proposed changes by Board Member Pistorino)

Mr. Pistorino discussed the proposed changes to the rule.

The committee members discussed creating a new category of Special Inspectors for existing threshold buildings, as proposed by Mr. Pistorino, to address the need for qualified professionals to evaluate the structural condition of buildings, particularly in recertification and milestone inspections. Mr. Pistorino explained that the current Special Inspector Limited category is insufficient for addressing significant structural issues, and the new category would allow engineers to assess the stability and safety of occupied buildings. Mr. Shrader supported the proposal, emphasizing its importance in protecting public health and safety. The committee acknowledged the need to navigate potential legal challenges and administrative procedures in implementing the new category.

The committee discussed proposed changes to special inspector categories, with Mr. Lovenstein and Mr. Pistorino expressing concerns about the current "SI Limited" category and its restrictions on inspections with substantial structural damage. They agreed that the

requirements for special inspectors differ significantly between new construction and existing buildings, leading to a proposal to create separate categories for SI-EB (Existing Building) and SINC (new construction). The discussion also touched on the need for grandfathering existing inspectors and the challenges of milestone inspections, with Mr. Pistorino emphasizing the importance of proper engineering judgment in making decisions about building occupancy and repairs.

The committee discussed creating a new designation for milestone inspections, which would require 3 years of design, 3 years of inspection, and 3 years of repair experience, totaling 9 years. The committee debated whether this would raise the bar too high, given that architects can currently perform similar work. The committee agreed to present this proposal to the full board in December for direction rather than making a final decision, as they needed more alignment on whether to revise the SI Limited category or create a new one.

6. Old Business

7. New Business

8. Adjourn

