
From: Nicole Dehlin-Grant
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2026 10:19 AM
To: CAB@DCA
Subject: Support for AB 1796 (Jackson) - Nicole Dehlin-Grant

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

February 20th, 2026
California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB). I have been working in interior design for 20+ years, primarily focusing on commercial office, public works, some healthcare, and some education. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant. I am an expert in code analysis as an interiors job captain and regularly submit to the city under another staff member's architectural stamp.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold NCIDQ certification and LEED GA certification and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope. Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of

Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

The current certification process and CID label is not usable, representative, or functional for code impacted professionals such as myself. We need to be Licensed Professionals like the peers in our profession – Architects, Engineers, and Landscape Architects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Nicole Dehlin-Grant, IIDA LEED GA

Senior Associate, Job Captain

She/Her/Hers

T: 310-586-6743

M: +1 310-486-0055

ndehlingrant@hlw.com

HLW International LLP

1437 4th Street, 4th Floor, Santa Monica, CA 90401

hlw

hlw.com | [linkedin](#) | [instagram](#)

The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please return it to the sender immediately and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system. If you have any questions concerning this message, please contact the sender.

February 23, 2026

California Architects Board

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105

Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 17 years, primarily focusing on hospitality. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold NCIDQ certification and have my Master's in Interior Architecture and Product Design at Kansas State University, which is an accredited CIDA degree, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline

collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Alexandra Milkovich, IIDA, NCIDQ

Senior Associate / Interior Design

amilkovich@hbg.design

HBG Design

401 W A Street, Suite 700

San Diego, CA 92101

(O) 619-858-7888 (D) 619-858-7838

www.hbg.design

From: Nathan Blair
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 3:45 PM
To: CAB@DCA
Subject: Public Comment: Support for AB 1796 (Jackson)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing Architect in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in architecture profession for 14 years, primarily focusing on hospitality design. In my daily work, I regularly work with interior designers on regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with other interior designers, other architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards and already hold NCIDQ certification. Like many designers across the state, they have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand over my current architectural practice, instead it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope as part of a collaborative process. I see this process similar to how engineers and architects work now.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Nathan Blair, AIA

Associate / Architecture
Registered Architect C-36123
nblair@hbg.design

HBG Design

401 W A Street, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92101

(O) 619-858-7888 (D) 619-858-7855

www.hbg.design

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

February 23, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 16 years, primarily focusing on healthcare, education, and public projects. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold an architecture degree and Certified Interior Designer Certification, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensures support accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Lechuga', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sergio Lechuga, CID, Assoc. IIDA
Director of Interior Design
HMC Architects

February 23, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 12 years across several sectors, including commercial office, education, civic, advanced manufacturing, and healthcare. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally have a CIDA-accredited Bachelor of Science in Interior Design, am NCIDQ certified, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Amanda Humphrey, IIDA, NCIDQ
Senior Project Manager
4770 Campus Drive, Suite 100
Newport Beach, CA 92660
T 949.851.3080
D 949.701.4659
AHumphrey@hhendy.com

February 24, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 5 years, primarily focusing on education, commercial offices & retail projects. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant, even working in-house at a contractor firm, further reiterating our importance and integration within the design process and community.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold an NCIDQ certification and a CIDA accredited degree from Louisiana State University, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards. It would also ensure that I, like many others moving here from out of state, am able to practice in this state long term, and build a successful career, further bolstering California's economy and design strength.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other

spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MO', with a stylized, cursive font.

Mary Oliver, NCIDQ, IIDA

Interior Designer

Devcon Construction

February 24, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act
Submitted Electronically

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I am writing in strong support of **AB 1796** (Corey Jackson), the **Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act**, and respectfully ask for your consideration to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified interior designers under the California Architect's Board (CAB).

I am a practicing interior designer in California with 15 years of experience. My primary focus is commercial life-science, public-sector, and laboratory projects in the Bay Area and San Diego. I take ownership of occupancy and egress planning based on the interior space plan. The way interior environments are programmed and configured directly affects occupant load calculations, travel distances, exiting widths, plumbing fixture counts, and accessibility compliance. I routinely prepare and respond to code analyses tied directly to how interior spaces are designed and used.

As an interior designer, my work goes far beyond aesthetic planning. I lead junior architects and designers on project teams in facilitating code review for hazardous chemical compliance, particularly in high-rise buildings. I also coordinate directly with fire marshals to determine safe and appropriate laboratory environments, and work through life safety considerations to ensure scientists and building occupants are protected.

Despite this level of responsibility for code-regulated work, interior design remains unlicensed in California. AB 1796 would establish a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals who meet defined education, experience, and examination standards. It would create accountability and clarity without expanding into architectural or structural engineering practice.

Many interior designers, including myself, already meet rigorous national standards and have years of experience operating within regulated environments. I personally hold a Master of Science in Interior design, NCIDQ certification and have completed necessary experience to be able to sit for the ARE to become a licensed Architect. However, rather than pursuing architectural licensure to perform work that is fundamentally interior in scope, I believe California can establish a clear and appropriate licensure pathway for

qualified interior designers who are already responsible for complex, code-regulated interior work.

I believe AB 1796 provides a pathway that appropriately aligns licensure with that scope of practice.

Establishing a Licensed Professional Interior Designer designation would improve clarity for authorities having jurisdiction, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-driven interior work are held to consistent professional standards.

Interior designers are deeply involved in life safety, accessibility, and hazardous compliance decisions that directly impact Californians every day. AB 1796 acknowledges that reality and provides a responsible regulatory framework.

I respectfully urge the California Architects Board to support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward. Thank you for your time and consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Holly Zahra". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "H" and a long horizontal flourish at the end.

Sincerely,
Holly Zahra, Assoc. AIA, NCIDQ
Senior Interior Designer
Sacramento, California

February 24, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 5+ years, primarily focusing on hospitality projects, multifamily housing, and commercial offices. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold a CIDA degree and NCIDQ certification, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jessica Burns

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I'm an NCIDQ-certified interior designer and project manager. I've been practicing in San Francisco for over 10 years, primarily focused on commercial office tenant improvement in the Bay Area and beyond. Currently, I co-manage an account for a national company with projects all over the US. Just in the last year I've been the primary design professional leading projects in 5 different California jurisdictions – San Francisco, East Palo Alto, Palo Alto, Berkeley, and Foster City. I coordinate closely with in-house and consultant engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant. I work closely with the signing architect on my projects but in a daily capacity, I am often referred to as “the architect” by contractors, engineers, and clients as a shorthand for describing my role on the job.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold an NCIDQ credential and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments – each and every one of my projects requires plan check review and I personally shepherd the project through submission, plan check meetings/negotiations with building officials, comment response, and ultimately approval. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope. For your reference, I am including a document at the end of this letter from the city of East Palo Alto as an example of the type of requirements many jurisdictions have, that expressly states that any *commercial* interior alteration of any kind is required to be stamped by a licensed design professional.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

Interior designers take seriously the opportunity to more equally join our architect colleagues as an engaged, mission-driven, and growing group of practicing licensed design professionals. I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Laura Taylor". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Laura Taylor, NCIDQ
Interior Designer, Project Manager
DLR Group, San Francisco



LICENSED PROFESSIONAL DESIGNER REQUIREMENTS

Plans Required to be Designed by an Architect or Engineer

Plans prepared for the following work shall be deemed as affecting the safety of a building or its occupants and shall be stamped and signed by a registered engineer or architect:

- New buildings and additions to existing buildings **(not complying with the CBC Conventional Frame Requirements in any respect).**
- Projects with interior or exterior structural alterations **(not complying with the CBC Conventional Frame Requirements in any respect).**
- Interior alteration of any commercial building.
- Storage racks over 8' in height or more than 400 pounds loaded.
- Remodeling projects with changes to fire rated corridors, fire rated occupancy separations and/or area separation walls.
- Alteration to any engineered element of construction.
- Any "Hazardous" occupancy.
- Any Assembly occupancies.
- Tanks and vessels.
- Machinery and equipment requiring anchoring or support per the CBC or ASCE-7.
- New roof mounted mechanical equipment exceeding 400 pounds or contiguous to a commercial occupancy.
- School and day care occupancies of any type.
- Hospital or Institutional occupancies of any type.
- Projects with S or F occupancies.
- Hotel, motel and apartment occupancies or any multifamily housing.
- Projects with mixed or multiple occupancies.
- Remodeling projects in a high-rise or mid-rise building.
- Lateral force resisting systems **(not complying with the CBC Conventional Frame Requirements in any respect).**
- Cripple walls exceeding 4' in height or adjacent to garage door openings **(not complying with the CBC Conventional Frame Requirements in any respect).**
- Any project deemed by the Chief Building Official to require professional design by an appropriately licensed California Registered Engineer or Architect.

Plans that Can be Prepared by an Unlicensed Person

Section 5537 and 5538 of the California Business & Professions Code (BPC) allows unlicensed person to prepare plans, drawings, and specifications for the following types of structures in accordance with the conventional framing requirements of Chapter 23 of the 2013 California Building Code.

- Single family dwelling no more than two stories in height.
- Multiple dwellings containing no more than four dwelling units and not more than two stories.
- Garages or other structures appurtenant to single family dwelling or multiple dwellings not more than two stories and basement in height.
- Agricultural and ranch buildings unless the Building Official deems that an undue risk to the public health, safety, or welfare is involved.
- Nonstructural store fronts, interior alterations or additions, fixtures, cabinet work, furniture, or other appliances or equipment.

Design Limitations for Professional

The following limitations for professionals are based on the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) and the Business and Professional Code (BPC).

- Unlicensed persons may not design any building or structure component that changes or affects the safety of any building, including but not limited to, structural or seismic components.

Architects

May design any building of any type except the structural portion of a hospital. (HSC section 15048 and BPC sections 5500.1 and 6737)

Civil Engineers

May design any building except hospitals and schools. (HSC section 39148, BPC sections 5537.5, 6731, 6735, and Education Code section 39148)

Structural Engineers

No limitations. May design any building of any type. (BPC sections 6637.1, 6731, and 6736)

Important Note:

A business license may be required if conducting business in the City, please contact the Planning Division at (650) 853-3189 for new licenses or the Finance Department 650-853-3100 for renewals (EPA Muni Code 5.04.030).

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 10 years primarily focusing on commercial and hospitality design. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I am currently testing to take my NCIDQ exam and have my Bachelor's of Science in Interior Design from Wentworth Institute of Technology, an accredited CIDA, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Allie Pensabene

Interior Design

apensabene@hbg.design

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act. which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 9 years, primarily focusing on commercial offices / multifamily housing / public projects / hospitality. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold NCIDQ certification and a CIDA degree, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Taylor Kline, NCIDQ #407028
Interior Designer
Cell: 908-591-7680

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105

Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 2 years primarily focusing on hospitality. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold a Master of Interior Design degree from a CIDA accredited school, the Design Institute of San Diego, and I am working to take the NCIDQ exam this year, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings,

housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Bridget Galicia

Interior Designer

bgalicia@hbg.design

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for [2 years], primarily focusing [hospitality]. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold a Master of Interior Design degree from a CIDA accredited school, the Design Institute of San Diego, and I am working to take the NCIDQ exam this year, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Georgy Goodwin

Interior Designer

ggoodwin@hbg.design

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 8 years, primarily focusing on commercial offices and corporate environments. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold the NCIDQ certification as well as achieved WELL AP and LEED AP certifications, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Gabrielle Mote, IIDA, NCIDQ, LEED AP ID+C, WELL AP
Interior Designer
C 425.652.9795
Email gmote@asdnet.com

February 24, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer and project manager for Sutter Health in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 8+ years primarily focusing on acute care hospitals throughout the bay area for clients like Kaiser Permanente, Sutter Health, UCSF, Salinas Valley Medical Center, Marin Health and John Muir Health. Throughout my career, I have regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals like myself. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I've worked on safety-oriented spaces my whole career, including running projects for operating rooms, linear accelerators, sterile processing departments and emergency rooms. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Adam Newton

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing senior technical designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in architecture profession for 18 years, primarily focusing on hospitality design. In my daily work, I regularly work with interior designers on regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, and fire and life safety standards. I coordinate closely with other interior designers, other architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Like many designers across the state, they have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand over my current practice, instead it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope as part of a collaborative process.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mark Rojas, Associate

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act. which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 7.5 years, primarily focusing on hospitality, at an architecture and design firm. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, and fire and life safety standards. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold a CIDA degree and in pursuit of NCIDQ and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Megan Collier / Associate Interior Designer
401 West A St Suite 700 San Diego, CA 92101

From: Cary Bernstein
Date: February 24, 2026 at 4:55:22 PM PST
To: Tian Feng
Subject: Re: CAB Meeting 2.26.26 + AB 1796
Reply-To: Cary Bernstein

Hi Tian,

Per my email this morning, please find the analysis I prepared on February 24th, 2021 regarding BPC 5538 and the prohibition of work by non-licensed individuals. Attached, also, is a letter I wrote to Senator Richard Roth and Assemblyman Marc Berman in 2022 which underscores that IIDA does not have an argument based on the building code.

The principal reasons to reject AB 1769 are:

1. Conflict with BPC 5538, BPC 5537 and CBC Chapter 16.
2. No separate "Commercial Interior Design" title or license.
3. Irrelevant information in AB 1769 as published on 2.10.2026.

1. Conflict with BPC 5538, 5537 and CBC Chapter 16

The CBC determines building construction standards for public safety. BPC 5538 + 5537 stipulate who may, and who may not, be responsible for public safety with regard to structural and seismic design: the BPC does not stipulate these requirements independent of the necessary reference to the CBC.

AB 1769 does not recognize the necessary and interdependent relationships between the code and statute. The attached position paper addresses this relationship in detail. Many interior design components have structural and seismic requirements. This is evident in all construction types, where a change in occupancy may trigger structural or seismic requirements, where the weight of a fixture or finish may necessitate altering a building's structure, among other examples. In Type V construction, the integration of structure and finish is especially evident. There may also be conflicts with OSHPOD and other codes. Mark Paone can best speak to OSHPOD.

BPC 5538 and 5537 say that only licensed individuals may provide services for structural and seismic work. Clearly when BPC 5538 + 5537 were written, there was no intent to include individuals who have no education, experience, or examination in structural design. If interior designers are provided "licenses," there will be confusion about their relationship to 5538 + 5537. Granting a "license" to interior designers opens up administrative and enforcement problems along with public confusion and safety risks.

2. Rejection of a "Licensed Commercial Interior Designer" Title

No other design profession has a license specific to project type. There is no "commercial architect" license, no "commercial landscape architecture" license, no "commercial structural engineer" license. Many spaces have mixed uses and are not strictly commercial (i.e. live-work spaces). AIA California opposed this title in 2022. There will be much confusion by the public and building departments. Separately from this legislation, CAB might review the public handbook. See letter addressed to CAB and to your attention regarding this matter from AIA California, 2021.

3. Irrelevant Information Within AB 1769

AB 1769 has information that's irrelevant to public safety. There is no evidence that the regulation of interior design in other states is the regulation of "Commercial Interior Design" specifically. California has its own building codes and requirements for seismic design. Other states may not have the same building code requirements. The extent of services provided by an interior designer in other states does not apply to California.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I appreciate your and CAB's attention to this on-going issue.
Cary

CARY BERNSTEIN ARCHITECT FAIA, LEED AP
2325 Third Street Studio 341
San Francisco, CA 94107
T. 415.522.1907 W. cbstudio.com
AIACA ADVOCACY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AIACA BOARD OF DIRECTORS (EX)

Analysis and Interpretation of California Business and Professions Code **Section § 5538 Regarding Work by Non-Licensed Individuals**

INTRODUCTION

California Business and Professions Code Section 5538 is entitled *“Planning or Design Affecting Safety of Building or Its Occupants; Nonstructural Store Front (sic) or Interior Alterations or Additions Excepted.”* BPC 5538 outlines a specific scope of “nonstructural and nonseismic” work which may be furnished by non-licensed individuals. The statute clearly intends to prohibit non-licensed individuals from furnishing work that includes structural and/or seismic design required by the California Building Code. The scope of work referenced in 5538 generally covers new building interiors; interior alterations or additions; interior furnishings; and storefronts.

Across California, building departments have provided inconsistent interpretations of 5538 resulting in some jurisdictions permitting non-licensed individuals to file or obtain permits that entail seismic design. These inconsistencies have led to confusion among non-licensed design professionals, structural engineers, general contractors, and lay people about the work they believe they can provide without an architectural license. BPC 5538 is intended to enhance public safety by prohibiting non-licensed individuals from providing work which has seismic requirements. Inconsistent interpretations and enforcement of 5538, therefore, jeopardize public safety. Following the 1994 Northridge earthquake, studies by the California Seismic Safety Commission showed that building and interior failures resulting from inadequate seismic design and construction led to serious injury, building damage, environmental waste, loss of resiliency, and diminished economic recovery.

The root of inconsistent code interpretations stems from a gap in cross-referencing documents from two different sources: BPC 5538 and CBC Chapter 16, Earthquake Loads. The CBC stipulates the requirements for seismic design and the BPC stipulates that non-licensed individuals may not furnish work which requires seismic design. Related sections of the BPC relevant to this discussion include: 5500/5500.1 (Architect’s Practice Act), 5537 (Exempted Structures), 5537.1 (Structural Engineers), and 5537.2 (Licensed Contractors).

While most people understand that seismic design for a building’s primary structure would require a licensed professional, many people don’t understand, or aren’t aware of, the extent to which the building code has seismic design requirements for building interiors, alterations to exempted and non-exempted buildings, interior elements, and storefronts. When seismic design requirements in the building code are conformed with the restrictions of 5538, it’s clear that only an architect may furnish the majority of permit and construction documents for buildings. The coordination of structural engineering by non-licensed individuals is prohibited because consultant “coordination” is part of “furnishing” a design. Similarly, construction observation for work that includes seismic design is also limited to licensed individuals. Incorrect interpretations of 5538 by various building departments whereby non-licensed individuals are allowed to “attach” engineered structural or seismic design drawings to their building permit applications hasn’t helped alleviate confusion or risk.

Analysis and Interpretation of California Business and Professions Code § 5538 **Regarding Work by Non-Licensed Individuals**

0. PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS

In 1995, following the 1994 Northridge quake, the California Seismic Safety Commission wrote a report that was unsparing in its critique of the damaged buildings they surveyed. They concluded that greater scrutiny needed to be applied to work in general and specially to work beyond the primary building structure.

“The quality of design and construction must be improved. Poor quality in design, plan review, inspection, and construction were encountered over and over in the buildings damaged by the earthquake. California’s current system of building design and construction encourages individual gambles that add up to significant risks, both for those who own the buildings and for those who depend on them as employees, tenants, or customers. . . State law must make it explicit that all designs that involve safety must have a clear line of responsibility for quality control from design through construction.”

Cyclical updates to the building codes regularly increase seismic design requirements for buildings, building interiors, and building alterations, including storefronts. During permit review, however, greater scrutiny by building officials has been applied more to the primary structure’s seismic design and less to the seismic design of alterations, interiors or storefronts. Increased codes requirements have not been met with increased administration or enforcement. The CSSC also observed:

“Nonstructural elements receive less detailed architectural and engineering attention and less building-inspection effort to ensure conformance with code requirements than do structural elements.”

1. CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE (2019)- CHAPTER 16

Section 1613.1 stipulates the scope of building elements which must be designed to take seismic forces.

EARTHQUAKE LOADS

1613.1 Scope. Every structure, and portion thereof, including nonstructural components that are permanently attached to structures and their supports and attachments, shall be designed and constructed to resist the effects of earthquake motions in accordance with Chapters 11, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 of ASCE 7, as applicable. The seismic design category for a structure is permitted to be determined in accordance with Section 1613 or ASCE 7.

Exceptions:

- 1. Detached one- and two-family dwellings, assigned to Seismic Design Category A, B or C, or located where the mapped short-period spectral response acceleration, S_s , is less than 0.4g.*
- 2. The seismic force-resisting system of wood-frame buildings that conform to the provisions of Section 2308 are not required to be analyzed as specified in this section (OSHPD 1R, 2 & 5). Not permitted by OSHPD, see Section 2308.*
- 3. Agricultural storage structures intended only for incidental human occupancy.*
- 4. Structures that require special consideration of their response characteristics and environment that are not addressed by this code or ASCE 7 and for which other regulations provide seismic criteria, such as vehicular bridges, electrical transmission towers, hydraulic structures, buried utility lines and their appurtenances and nuclear reactors.*
- 5. References within ASCE 7 to Chapter 14 shall not apply, except as specifically required herein.*
- 6. (OSHPD 1R, 2 & 5) Seismic Design Category shall be in accordance with exception to Section*

This section clearly says that everything attached to a building must resist seismic forces. There are no exceptions for new building interiors; interior alterations or additions; interior furnishings; or storefronts. Therefore only architects who are licensed to design structures, and portions thereof, which take seismic forces may design new building interiors; interior alterations or additions; interior furnishings attached to the structure; or storefronts.

2. CALIFORNIA BPC SECTIONS 5537 + 5538, EXEMPTIONS FOR NON-LICENSED INDIVIDUALS

BPC 5537 provides exemptions based on building types consistent with CBC 1613.1. BPC 5538 provides exemptions from architectural licensing requirements for limited scopes of work. The 2016 CBC 1613.1 did not make an explicit connection to the exemptions in 5537 but the 2019 CBC 1613.1 makes the cross-reference with BPC 5537 explicit. The 2019 CBC is greatly improved.

§5537 Exemptions; Dwellings, Garages, Agricultural and Ranch Buildings; Supervision of Licensed Architect or Registered Engineer Required

- (a) *This chapter does not prohibit any person from preparing plans, drawings, or specifications for any of the following:*
- (1) *Single-family dwellings of woodframe construction not more than two stories and basement in height.*
 - (2) *Multiple dwellings containing no more than four dwelling units of woodframe construction not more than two stories and basement in height. However, this paragraph shall not be construed as allowing an unlicensed person to design multiple clusters of up to four dwelling units each to form apartment or condominium complexes where the total exceeds four units on any lawfully divided lot.*
 - (3) *Garages or other structures appurtenant to buildings described under subdivision (a), of woodframe construction not more than two stories and basement in height.*
 - (4) *Agricultural and ranch buildings of woodframe construction, unless the building official having jurisdiction deems that an undue risk to the public health, safety, or welfare is involved.*
- (b) *If any portion of any structure exempted by this section deviates from substantial compliance with conventional framing requirements for woodframe construction found in the most recent edition of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations or tables of limitation for woodframe construction, as defined by the applicable building code duly adopted by the local jurisdiction or the state, the building official having jurisdiction shall require the preparation of plans, drawings, specifications, or calculations for that portion by, or under the responsible control of, a licensed architect or registered engineer. The documents for that portion shall bear the stamp and signature of the licensee who is responsible for their preparation. Substantial compliance for purposes of this section is not intended to restrict the ability of the building officials to approve plans pursuant to existing law and is only intended to clarify the intent of Chapter 405 of the Statutes of 1985.*

(Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 184, Sec. 8. Effective January 1, 1997.)

§5538 Planning or Design Affecting Safety of Building or Its Occupants; Nonstructural Store Front (sic) or Interior Alterations or Additions

This chapter does not prohibit any person from furnishing either alone or with contractors, if required by Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 7000) of Division 3, labor and materials, with or without plans, drawings, specifications, instruments of service, or other data covering such labor and materials to be used for any of the following:

- (a) *For nonstructural or nonseismic storefronts, interior alterations or additions, fixtures, cabinetwork, furniture, or other appliances or equipment.*
- (b) *For any nonstructural or nonseismic work necessary to provide for their installation.*
- (c) *For any nonstructural or nonseismic alterations or additions to any building necessary to or attendant upon the installation of those storefronts, interior alterations or additions, fixtures, cabinetwork, furniture, appliances, or equipment, provided those alterations do not change or affect the structural system or safety of the building. (Amended by Stats. 1990, Ch. 396, Sec. 2.)*

3. COORDINATION OF SEISMIC DESIGN AND the DESIGN PROFESSIONAL IN RESPONSIBLE CHARGE

The only professional licensed to coordinate a structural engineer's seismic design with any other part of building design is an architect as outlined in BPC 5500 / 5500.1, the Architect's Practice Act. The coordination of technical and special consultants and construction observation are an architect's core responsibilities. A non-licensed person cannot be a design professional in responsible charge for designs with seismic requirements. In addition, non-licensed individuals may not rely on engineers or contractors to coordinate building design for them outside of the design of exempted structures and scopes. The scope and definitions of the professions are as follows:

a. ARCHITECTS - ARCHITECTURE

§5500.1 (a) The practice of architecture within the meaning and intent of this chapter is defined as offering or performing, or being in responsible control of, professional services which require the skills of an architect in the planning of sites, and the design, in whole or in part, of buildings, or groups of buildings and structures.

(b) Architects' professional services may include any or all of the following:

(1) Investigation, evaluation, consultation, and advice.

(2) Planning, schematic and preliminary studies, designs, working drawings, and specifications.

(3) Coordination of the work of technical and special consultants.

(4) Compliance with generally applicable codes and regulations, and assistance in the governmental review process.

(5) Technical assistance in the preparation of bid documents and agreements between clients and contractors.

(6) Contract administration.

(7) Construction observation.

(c) As a condition for licensure, architects shall demonstrate a basic level of competence in the professional services listed in subdivision (b) in examinations administered under this chapter.

(Amended by Stats. 1996, Ch. 184, Sec. 1. Effective January 1, 1997.)

b. STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS

Structural engineers may not coordinate building or interior design unless the building or scope of work is entirely structural or exempt from licensure requirements. Structural engineers are not trained in the full scope of building design (CBC Chapters 1-15) such as the coordination of work by other consultants or designers, life-safety, fire-rated materials and assemblies (generally), or energy codes. It was not the intent of 5538 to allow structural engineers to provide architectural services.

§5537.1 A structural engineer, defined as a registered civil engineer who has been authorized to use the title structural engineer under the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 6700), insofar as he or she practices the profession for which he or she is registered, is exempt from the provisions of this chapter, except that a structural engineer may not use the title "architect," unless he or she holds a license as required in this chapter. (Amended by Stats. 1991, Ch. 566, Sec. 5.)

c. GENERAL CONTRACTORS

A general contractor's license is not a design professional's license. Therefore, a general contractor cannot provide services in lieu of a licensed design professional when an architectural license is required.

§5537.2 This chapter shall not be construed as authorizing a licensed contractor to perform design services beyond those described in Section 5537 or in Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 7000), unless those services are performed by or under the direct supervision of a person licensed to practice architecture under this chapter, or a professional or civil engineer licensed pursuant to Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 6700) of Division 3, insofar as the professional or civil engineer practices the profession for which he or she is registered under that chapter.

However, this section does not prohibit a licensed contractor from performing any of the services permitted by Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 7000) of Division 3 within the classification for which the license is issued. Those services may include the preparation of shop and field drawings for work which he or she has contracted or offered to perform, and designing systems and facilities which are necessary to the completion of contracting services which he or she has contracted or offered to perform. However, a licensed contractor may not use the title "architect," unless he or she holds a license as required in this chapter.

(Amended by Stats. 1985, Ch. 1327, Sec. 6.)

CARY BERNSTEIN ARCHITECT

30 March 2022

The Honorable Richard Roth

Chair, Senate Business, Professions and
Economic Development Committee
1021 O Street, Room 7510
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Marc Berman

Chair, Assembly Business, Professions and
Economic Development Committee
State Capitol, PO Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0024

Dear Senator Roth and Assemblyman Berman,

I am an architect in San Francisco and member of the AIA California Board of Directors. As part of my Board work, I am a member of the Advocacy Advisory Committee and the Public Safety Task Force and am involved in studies related to work by non-licensed individuals, including interior designers. I often attend meetings with CCIDC and the California Architects Board (CAB). On March 10th, I listened to the CCIDC Sunset Review hearing and related requests for an interior design practice act and was disturbed the arguments presented by CCIDC and IIDA representatives, most specifically the arguments that cited bias against women, LGBTQ and BIPOC communities. I am writing you today, on my own behalf, as a female architect, not on behalf of AIACA, about these red-herring arguments.

IIDA representatives asserted that not granting interior designers (or “commercial interior designers”) a practice act and licensure would exhibit bias against women, LGBTQ and BIPOC communities. This is not correct and is a cynical political ploy. Over 50% of architecture school students and 30% of the profession are women. Objection to an interior design practice act does not just come from straight white men. When architects and CCIDC have discussed our reasons for not supporting an interior design practice act, we cite the California Building Code (Chapter 16) and the Building and Professions Code (5500, 5538) which specifically preclude non-licensed individuals from furnishing work with structural and seismic values. A surprising amount of interior design must resist seismic forces to prevent the interior elements of a building (not just the elements that support a building) from failing during earthquakes. The BPC and the Building Code are objective and quantitative and are not based on gender, sexual orientation or race.

Neither CCIDC nor IIDA has presented a counterargument based on citations of the Building Code and/or BPC statute. Instead, interior designers present their own history (i.e. what they've done before) and opinions about their perceived capabilities. There is no causal relationship between their professional demographics and denial of a practice act: their claims of bias are unfounded and rife with political blackmail.

Other claims made by CCIDC and IIDA such as the cost of hiring an architect in addition to hiring an interior designer or the “surprise” of learning that an architect is required for a project are also baseless. There is no reason an interior designer cannot check with a building department to see whether an architect will be required for a project before they write their contract with a client: most building departments have their rules posted on their websites. Any surprises or “extra costs” are a result of poor planning by the interior designer, not a result of building departments changing their minds or withholding information about requirements.

There are strong reasons to protect consumers by limiting the scope of work and licensure for people who are not trained in structural design. Architects are trained in comprehensive building design and understand buildings as interconnected entities. Architects are not granted “specialty” architectural licenses for parts of buildings or for individual types of buildings for good reason. As such, licenses shouldn't be granted to people who only want to design the interior part of the building or commercial interiors instead of all interiors. The denial of an interior designer practice act does not exhibit bias against women, the LGBTQ and BIPOC communities – it's the right thing to do based on the building code.

Very Sincerely,



Cary Bernstein AIA, LEED AP



July 27, 2021

Tian Feng, FAIA
President, California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834-9673

RE: Request to Add Clarifying Language to CAB's Future *Building Official Information Guide*

Dear President Feng:

AIA California respectfully requests the California Architects Board (CAB) add additional clarifying language to CAB's *Building Official Information Guide* in order to avoid confusion with how Statute and Code work together when interpreting work allowed by non-licensed Individuals as established in the Business and Professions Code (BPC) §5538. This section reads as follows (emphasis added):

This chapter does not prohibit any person from furnishing either alone or with contractors, if required by Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 7000) of Division 3, labor and materials, with or without plans, drawings, specifications, instruments of service, or other data covering such labor and materials to be used for any of the following:

- (a) For ***nonstructural or nonseismic*** storefronts, interior alterations or additions, fixtures, cabinetwork, furniture, or other appliances or equipment.

- (b) For any ***nonstructural or nonseismic*** work necessary to provide for their installation.

The American Institute of Architects

AIA California
1931 H Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
T (916) 448-9082
F (916) 442-5346

www.aiacalifornia.org

(c) For any ***nonstructural or nonseismic*** alterations or additions to any building necessary to or attendant upon the installation of those storefronts, interior alterations or additions, fixtures, cabinetwork, furniture, appliances, or equipment, provided those alterations do not change or affect the structural system or safety of the building.

Why is this important to AIA California?

One of most important missions of the practice of architecture is to protect the health, welfare, and life safety of the public. AIA California believes the limitations included in current statute should be applied to protect the public.

Inconsistent Interpretations

Across California, Building Officials interpret BPC §5538 in different ways. AIA California believes the statute was written to have a singular meaning, and that the addition of clarifying language would support consistency throughout the state.

What does Statute say?

BPC §5538 does not establish what is or is not “nonstructural” or “nonseismic”. The California Building Code (CBC) does, however, specifically call out what building elements must be designed to address seismic forces. This includes nonstructural elements such as suspended ceilings and their supporting structures. There are exemptions written in this statute that are clearly stated, identifying only elements that do not experience seismic forces are eligible to be designed by non-licensed individuals.

As our understanding of seismic forces has grown since BPC §5538 was amended in 1991, the code requirements identifying what building elements must be designed for seismic forces has also grown. Section 1613 of the 2019 CBC is clear on what building elements must be designed to resist lateral forces. We note the language in Section 1613 also includes reference to nonstructural elements that must also be designed to resist the effects of earthquake motions. This code section reads as follows (emphasis added):

CBC SECTION 1613

EARTHQUAKE LOADS

16.13.1 Scope. Every structure, and portion thereof, including nonstructural components that are permanently attached to structures and their supports and attachments, shall be designed and constructed to resist the effects of earthquake motions in accordance with Chapters 11, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 of ASCE 7, as applicable. The seismic design category for a structure shall be determined in accordance with Section 1613A.

President Tian Feng, FAIA

Page 3

July 27, 2021

What language is AIA California specifically asking CAB to incorporate into their 2021 *Building Official Information Guide*?

We ask that the following statement (or similar) be added to the guide in locations that discuss what a non-licensed individual can and cannot do:

BPC §5538 states non-licensed individuals may not design any portions of a building if those elements experiences seismic forces, including nonstructural elements and their supports that are permanently attached to structures. CBC Section 1613 specifies what building elements do and do not experience seismic forces.

Thank you for considering this request in the interest of providing enhanced clarity and consistency for all California Building Officials. Please let me, or AIA California staff, know if you have any questions about this request, or if further discussion via a presentation to CAB would be helpful.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brett Dougherty". The signature is stylized with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Brett Dougherty, AIA LEED AP
President, AIA California

cc: Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer, California Architects Board



February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I am writing as a practicing commercial interior designer in California to respectfully request your support of **AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act**, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have worked in interior design for over 20 years, primarily in corporate commercial environments. In my daily practice, I design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe, compliant, and responsibly executed.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear and structured licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clearly articulated scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous professional standards. I personally hold the NCIDQ certification, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; rather, it would formally recognize and

regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined and appropriate scope.

A state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that professionals responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent statewide standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government facilities, housing, and commercial spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to both public and private projects.

I respectfully urge the California Architects Board to support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Karolina Glinka

CEO/Partner

Acting Design Director

Habitec Architecture and Interior Design

415.999.9629

kglinka@habitec.com

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing licensed Architect in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act. which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in design for 33 years, primarily focusing on religious, custom residential and commercial hospitality projects. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with Interior Designers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this discipline, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of our interior design colleagues already meet rigorous standards. I personally know interior designers who hold NCIDQ certification, a CIDA degree or other credentials, and like many designers across the state, they have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand their practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work they are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'aquintanar', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Alfredo Quintanar, AIA
(619) 459-8604
aquintanar@hbg.design

From: Kelly Birkel
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 6:27 PM
To: CAB@DCA
Subject: Public Comment: Support for AB 1796 (Jackson) - Kelly Birkel

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I am writing as a California-based hospitality interior designer with more than 20 years of experience practicing in complex, highly regulated environments. I respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which would establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

Throughout my career, I have led interior design and project management efforts on large-scale hospitality developments. My work extends well beyond aesthetics. On a daily basis, I am responsible for interior environments that must comply with California Building Code requirements, accessibility standards, fire and life safety regulations, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, consultants, and authorities having jurisdiction to ensure projects are safe, code-compliant, and permit-ready.

Despite the technical and regulatory nature of this work, interior design remains unlicensed under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear, structured licensure pathway under the CAB, with defined education, experience, examination requirements, and scope boundaries. It would bring clarity and accountability to a profession that is already deeply embedded in code-regulated construction.

It is also important to address an issue that affects many of us in practice: the title "interior designer" is currently used interchangeably by interior decorators, home stagers, and individuals who may not have formal education, code training, or technical experience in regulated environments. While decorative services have value, they are fundamentally different from professional interior design practice. Those of us who have spent decades studying building codes, accessibility standards, fire and life safety regulations, contract documentation, and construction administration have invested significant time, education, and professional rigor into a highly technical discipline. The lack of distinction between decorative services and code-regulated professional practice creates confusion for clients, building officials, and the public. Establishing licensure would provide a clear and respectful distinction between professional interior designers and unregulated decorative services.

Like many experienced designers in this state, I hold a CIDA-accredited degree and have spent decades working in permitted, high-liability environments. Licensure would not blur the line between architecture and interior design. Rather, it would formally recognize the work we are already legally performing within a clearly defined and limited scope of practice.

In my practice, I routinely produce interior construction documents, coordinate life safety compliance, and guide projects through plan check. A state license would improve collaboration with building officials and project teams by establishing consistent standards and regulatory oversight. It would also allow qualified designers, within defined scope limitations, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations—streamlining project delivery while strengthening public protection.

Interior designers contribute directly to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. From hospitality properties and public assembly spaces to commercial interiors, our decisions affect how Californians safely experience and occupy space every day. Establishing licensure supports public safety, accountability, professional standards, and clarity in the marketplace.

I respectfully urge the California Architects Board to support AB 1796 and help advance this important legislation.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Kelly Birkel
Interior Design
kbirkel@hbg.design

HBG Design
401 W A Street, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92101

(O) 619-858-7888

www.hbg.design

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

From: Sally Midgley
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 7:41 PM
To: CAB@DCA
Subject: Public Comment: Support for AB 1796 (Jackson) - Habitec Architecture and Interior Design

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I am new to the interior design industry, having finished my schooling last year. I am currently a Junior Designer at a commercial firm that specializes in workplace design. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of my peers already meet rigorous standards. I personally am working toward my NCIDQ certification. My goal is to become a licensed designer. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sally Midgley

Sally Midgley *Junior Designer* e: smidgley@habitec.com

Habitec Architecture & Interior Design

2290 North 1st Street, Suite 304, San Jose, CA 95131

o: 408.977.0606 | f: 408.298.4245 | www.habitec.com



Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

February 25, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 5 years, primarily focusing on Aviation, Commercial offices, Retail banking, and Hospitality. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold NCIDQ certification, a CIDA degree (SCAD, MFA), and LEED AP ID+C certification, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

You Li, NCIDQ, LEED AP
Interior Designer
+1 949.260.8536 Direct
+1 949.863.9434 Main

Gensler
4675 MacArthur Court
Suite 100
Newport Beach, California 92660
USA

From: Quinn Ochoa
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2026 6:29 AM
To: CAB@DCA
Subject: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Warning: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing interior designer in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act. which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in interior design for 7 years, primarily focusing on healthcare/ commercial offices. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with architects, engineers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this work, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of us already meet rigorous standards. I personally hold NCIDQ certification / a CIDA degree, and like many designers across the state, I have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand our practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work we are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built

environment. Many of us work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Quynh Ochoa, Designer

949.260.8508 Direct

949.863.9434 Office

Gensler

4675 MacArthur Court

Suite 100

Newport Beach, California 92660

US

February 26, 2026

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: AB 1796 (Jackson) – Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act

Dear Members of the California Architects Board,

I'm writing as a practicing licensed Architect in California to respectfully ask for your support of AB 1796 (Jackson), the Licensed Professional Interior Design Practice Act, which proposes to establish a formal licensure pathway for qualified professional interior designers under the California Architects Board (CAB).

I have been working in design for 17 years, primarily focusing on commercial and residential projects. In my daily work, I regularly design regulated interior spaces that must comply with building codes, accessibility requirements, fire and life safety standards, and local permitting processes. I coordinate closely with Interior Designers, contractors, and building officials to ensure our projects are safe and compliant.

Despite the technical and code-driven nature of this discipline, interior design is not formally licensed or regulated under California's Business and Professions Code. AB 1796 would create a clear licensure pathway under the California Architects Board for qualified professionals. It would establish defined education, experience, and examination requirements, along with clear scope boundaries and regulatory oversight.

Many of our interior design colleagues already meet rigorous standards. I personally know interior designers who hold NCIDQ certification, a CIDA degree or other credentials, and like many designers across the state, they have years of hands-on experience working in complex, permitted environments. Licensure would not expand their practice into architecture or engineering; it would simply recognize and regulate the work they are already legally performing within a defined scope.

Having a state license would improve accountability and clarity with authorities having jurisdiction. It would allow qualified designers, within a clearly defined scope of practice, to stamp and submit permit drawings for interior alterations. This would streamline collaboration, strengthen public protection, and ensure that those responsible for code-regulated interior work are held to consistent standards.

Interior designers contribute meaningfully to the safety, accessibility, and functionality of the built environment. Many work in hospitals, schools, government buildings, housing, and other spaces used daily by millions of Californians. Establishing licensure supports accountability, professional standards, and equitable access to public and private projects.

I respectfully ask that the California Architects Board support AB 1796 and help move this important effort forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Brett Milkovich, RA
Principal | Safdie Rabines Architects
(619) 297-6153
brett@safdierabines.com