

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

March 7, 2012

Burbank, CA

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL – ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

President Marilyn Lyon called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Vice President Sheran Voigt called the roll.

Board Members Present

Marilyn Lyon, President

Sheran Voigt, Vice President

Jon Alan Baker

Iris Cochlan

Jeffrey Heller

Pasqual Gutierrez

Fermin Villegas

Hraztan Zeitlian (arrived at 9:50 a.m. and departed at 1:15 p.m.)

Board Members Absent

Michael Merino

Guests Present

Daniel Iacofano, Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG) Inc.

Greg Izor, Certified Access Specialist Institute (CASI)

Stephanie Landregan, Landscape Architects Technical Committee

Dave Wagner, California Council for Interior Design Certification

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer

Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer

Justin Sotelo, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit

Hattie Johnson, Enforcement Officer

Robert Carter, Architect Consultant

Don Chang, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs

Six members of the Board present constitute a quorum. There being seven present at the time of roll, a quorum was established.

B. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Ms. Lyon thanked Pasqual Gutierrez for his service as President and presented him with a gift of appreciation for his dedication. She announced that agenda item J, Examination Security, would be discussed during the strategic planning session. She introduced Daniel Iacofano of MIG, who will facilitate the review and update of the Board's Strategic Plan. She also announced that Jeanine Centuori, Undergraduate Chair, Woodbury University, School of Architecture, would be providing a presentation at 11:30 a.m.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

There was no public comment at this meeting.

D. APPROVE THE DECEMBER 7-8, 2011, BOARD MEETING MINUTES

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the December 7-8, 2011, Board Meeting Minutes.**

Iris Cochlan seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0.

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Doug McCauley stated that the June Board meeting will be held in Sacramento. He also stated that the locations for the September and December meetings would respectively be California State Polytechnic University Pomona and the Bay Area.

Mr. McCauley reported that the Board's Consumer Tips postcard was available and had been distributed to California city and county building departments, and it was prominently displayed at the Board's booth at the recent California Building Officials (CALBO) Annual Business Meeting. He stated the postcard is meant to be a concise version of the Board's *Consumer's Guide to Hiring and Architect*. Ms. Lyon asked if additional copies of the postcard could be obtained for distribution and whether some could be sent to her. Mr. McCauley responded that several thousand copies were printed for distribution and a supply would be sent.

Mr. McCauley reported that development has commenced on the new forms of the California Supplemental Examination (CSE). He also reported that the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) Practice Analysis survey is underway with information available on the respective websites of NCARB and the Board. He indicated that NCARB has a communications plan for reaching out to the various stakeholders and constituencies and encouraging participation in the survey. He further indicated the survey would inform and shape the Architect Registration Examination (ARE), the Intern Development Program (IDP) and drive the development of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accrediting criteria.

Mr. McCauley reported that he had attended the recent American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC) board meeting at which he had discussions with AIACC leadership about the Board's efforts to decommission the Comprehensive Intern Development Program (CIDP), the conversion of the CSE, and enhanced enforcement statistics. He also reported that the regulatory

package repealing CIDP has been submitted to the Office of Administrative Law and is awaiting their approval.

Mr. McCauley gave an overview of the Board's budget. He stated that included in the Board meeting packet were the budgetary reports prepared by the DCA Budget Office with input from Board staff that members had requested at the previous meeting. He further stated that there are still quite a number of restrictions with which the Board is contending. He stated that out-of-state travel, while not completely banned, is still not being approved by the control agencies without demonstrating a high level of criticality to the organizational mission. He also reported that there continue to be restrictions on in-state staff travel and purchasing. He further reported that, while there are no hiring restrictions currently in-place, the process has become more cumbersome and complicated due to layoffs at California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation that require the hiring of those applicants on the State Restrictions on Appointment list over those within DCA. He stated this has limited the available candidate pool for vacant positions.

Mr. McCauley reported that the overall fiscal climate is presently such that the state is facing a \$4 billion deficit at beginning of the 12/13 fiscal year. He stated the likely cause is due to lower than anticipated revenue. He also stated the 12/13 fiscal year budget is based in-part on tax increases that are on the ballot. He further stated that "trigger cuts" could take effect should those tax increases not come to fruition. He reported that the Board's fund condition is in a healthy state.

Jeffrey Heller asked what determines the downward trend in the Board's Fund Condition Report. Mr. McCauley explained that data in the report makes the assumption that all monies will be expended. He further explained that with the current restrictions in-place there is no possibility to expend all available monies. Ms. Lyon then asked what procedures exist to transfer funding between line items. Vickie Mayer explained that there are procedures available to transfer (redirect) funds between line items as needed provided there are funds available.

Hraztan Zeitlian asked whether examination costs have declined or increased since the conversion to the computer-delivered CSE format. Mr. McCauley explained that due to the elimination of expenses such as hotel rental, proctors, and CSE commissioners the examination costs have definitively declined. Mr. Zeitlian then asked if a report could be generated to indicate how much savings has been achieved. Mr. McCauley responded that such a report could be provided.

Mr. McCauley reported on Senate Bill (SB) 975, which is sponsored by the American Council of Engineering Companies, and would clarify that only professional boards authorized by the Legislature to issue licenses may require mandatory continuing education. He stated that SB 975 would mandate that such a requirement be in the respective practice act. He recommended the Board support SB 975. Jon Baker asked whether it would preclude special interest groups from going to the Legislature and imposing a continuing education requirement. Mr. McCauley responded that SB 975 would not preclude such an action by a special interest group provided the requirement was placed in the appropriate practice act. Mr. Baker then asked whether the legislation would preclude a special interest group from requiring a certificate in order for a professional to work on something that is of importance to that group from having such a requirement. Mr. McCauley clarified that should a requirement be made to possess or maintain a certification, SB 975 would require that the appropriate location for that regulation would be in the relevant practice act and not another body of law. He further clarified that the professional's license qualifies them to perform the related work and if there is a need for mandatory continuing education, then the most appropriate place for that requirement is

the applicable practice act. Mr. Heller then stated that essentially such requirements devalue the architect's license and also recommended the Board support the legislation.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that it appeared there is a distinction made within SB 975 whereby it would not apply to a private organization, like U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), who has established requirements for an individual to maintain their Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certificate. Mr. McCauley responded that conclusion was correct and furthermore there also appeared to be an exemption for contract requirements.

- **Sheran Voigt moved that the Board support SB 975.**

Jeffrey Heller seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. McCauley reported on Assembly Bill (AB) 1822 which is sponsored by the Board and seeks to modify the terms of the Board members. He stated that under the current term staggering over the next few years as many as five Board members could term out simultaneously. AB 1822 would resolve this issue.

- **Jon Baker moved that the Board support AB 1822.**

Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. McCauley reported on AB 2482 which would establish a DCA licensing board for interior designers, a practice act, and licensure requirements and exemptions. Mr. McCauley recommended the Board oppose the bill as it has similar bills in the past.

- **Sheran Voigt moved that the Board oppose AB 2482.**

Hraztan Zeitlian seconded the motion.

Mr. Gutierrez raised further discussion on the proposed legislation. He stated that in the design process today, the interior designer does have an impact on the health, safety, and welfare (HSW) of the public with regards to interior spaces. He further stated his concerns that the language of the legislation does not differentiate the use of the terms "interior design," "interior designer," or anything similar embedded within a service, an advertisement, or branding. He stated this could cause confusion for the consumer and require additional research to understand the difference between "interior designer" and "registered interior designer."

Mr. Heller stated that the Board should reinforce the message of opposition to the legislation. He opined that the legislation promotes an unnecessary expansion of government. He stated that when the matter of interior designers was previously reviewed there arose some confusion about overlapping practice issues which could occur between interior designers and architects. He further stated there could develop problems in the HSW mission because interior designers may expand into areas in which they lack the necessary expertise. Mr. McCauley stated that there are numerous issues

with the AB 2482 as written. He stated that chief among the issues is the consumer confusion created by having different classes of interior designer. He further stated that with the terms “Certified Interior Designer”, “Registered Interior Designer”, and “Exempt Interior Designer” a consumer would have significant difficulty in determining who they should hire for a design project.

Mr. Zeitlian stated that there is no HSW reason which warrants a specialty license in one area of architecture. He also stated that interior design is one of the services which architects provide and for which they have responsibility. He opined that requiring a license for interior design is more for prestige and/or entitlement than protection of the public. He further stated that there is no need to create an additional government bureaucracy. Mr. Gutierrez countered that there are practices (firms) who perform sophisticated interior design work which does involve a significant public HSW concern. He reiterated his concern that the legislation does not isolate the license for the soon to or would be interior designers from others who are practicing design. He also reiterated that this would create confusion for consumers. Mr. Heller asked Mr. McCauley to prepare a memorandum summarizing the Board’s concerns that were raised during the meeting and include AIACC’s concerns and position.

Mr. Baker stated that when the matter of licensing interior designers was raised a few years ago at the national level an issue regarding the scope of work for an interior designer license versus an architect license arose and was unable to be resolved. Mr. Gutierrez added that interior designers presently could design the entire interior space of a building without any accountability. He further stated that the license would bring that accountability and help protect the consumer to some extent, however, not from the confusion he had mentioned earlier. Mr. Baker added that an argument given by interior designers for licensure has been that building departments will not accept the materials submitted and often require an architect to sign and stamp the work for interior space planning. He raised the question about whether the interior designers should be preparing that kind of work and whether the building departments are simply “catching it at the gate”? Mr. Zeitlian asked that if interior designers could define a scope of work for which they would be legitimately licensed, then what about other areas of design that would technically be architecture. He opined that there is not a legitimate licensure-level area of practice involved with interior design.

Mr. McCauley stated that the proposed legislation does not appear to respect the Sunset Review process because presently the private non-profit California Council for Interior Design Certification (which administers the Certified Interior Designers Law under the Business and Professions Code) is currently in the Sunset Review process. He also stated that there exists a counterpart process called the Sunrise process for new professions or vocations wishing to be regulated, which is also not being followed. He further stated the current arguments being made in-favor of the legislation were made during previous failed attempts without any substantive change. He stated that a key argument (building officials not accepting plans prepared by interior designers) was shown by Board surveys to be baseless. He further stated that even should the legislation pass, building departments have significant latitude and autonomy to determine what professions can submit plans for specific project types. He stated that another argument being made is how the building code defines registered design professional. He explained that the definition was previously part of an appendix to the International Building Code and therefore not mandatory. He further stated the last argument being made is that building officials will not accept interior designer plans because of liability. He added that the Government Code has specific provisions granting building officials immunity for liability. He then summarized that all the arguments being made in favor of registered interior designers were without merit.

Mr. Gutierrez suggested that in the Board's letter of opposition the statement of there being no documented public HSW issue should be removed. He opined that an argument could be made that such an issue does exist. Mr. McCauley responded by stating that none of the three states who license interior designers could point to documented harm that has occurred due to negligent practice by interior designers. Mr. Baker added that "at the end of the day" there needs to be clarity with regard to the level of service provided by the licensee (interior designer). Mr. Gutierrez replied that he believes it can be proved and a healthy argument could be made that interior design does have an impact on the HSW of an occupant.

The motion passed 8-0.

F. STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. Iacofano facilitated the review and update of the 2012 Strategic Plan. He stated that there were a couple of new features added to the Plan. He stated the first change was to add a "Recent Accomplishments" section which would document major milestones for the previous year. He then stated the second change was one made to the Action Plan that highlights objectives in blue for critical need and yellow for priority. He reviewed all of the changes noted to the 2012 Strategic Plan.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the 2012 Strategic Plan with minor changes.**

Jon Baker seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Iacofano continued with the next agenda item regarding the implementation of committee procedures and asked whether there were any questions or comments. Ms. Voigt stated that she had concerns about the term limits for committee members. She stated that with term limits there is the risk of losing the expertise of seasoned committee members. Ms. Lyon stated she would like to see the procedures streamlined so that the process does not consume significant staff resources to maintain. Fermin Villegas stated that he shared Ms. Voigt's concerns about the loss of institutional knowledge and that such knowledge is quite valuable. He also stated, however, that there is a need for a mechanism that allows for new committee members and their ideas to enrich the committees and keep them balanced. Ms. Cochlan stated that a limitation on the number of individuals who can sit on a committee would be an alternative. Mr. Baker stated that NCARB has a process whereby an NCARB committee chair evaluates their members' performance and makes recommendations to be considered by the incoming NCARB President for that year. Mr. Heller stated his opposition to limiting the term of a committee chair to one year. Mr. Zeitlian stated that he agreed with Mr. Villegas' position on keeping committees balanced and liked Mr. Baker's recommendation. He further stated, however, that there should be a definitive end to the term of committee leadership to allow others to share in the experience.

Ms. Voigt proposed that the procedures be returned to the task force with the comments of Board members for a retooling and streamlining. Mr. Gutierrez proposed the Board President create a new task force to revisit the issue rather than having the original task force re-examine the draft procedures. Ms. Lyon stated that she will create a task force to address the matter and bring the Board a recommendation for consideration.

Mr. Iacofanco continued with the next agenda item regarding the consolidation of the Professional Qualifications (PQ) and Examination Committees. Ms. Lyon stated that many of those who are appointed to the Examination Committee are also appointed to the PQ Committee (PQC). She also stated that the scope of work for the Examination Committee has diminished. She further stated that those Strategic Plan objectives assigned to the Examination Committee should now be reassigned to the PQC and the two committees be consolidated.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the consolidation of the Professional Qualifications and Examination Committees.**

Fermin Villegas seconded the motion.

The motion passed 8-0.

Ms. Lyon introduced Jeanine Centuori, Undergraduate Chair of Woodbury University School of Architecture, who gave a brief presentation regarding the Woodbury University architecture programs. Ms. Centuori stated that Woodbury has approximately 500 undergraduate architecture students and is presently working to have their graduate program (which has 60 students) accredited. She described in detail the various program requirements and options available to students attending Woodbury University.

G. CLOSED SESSION – DISCIPLINARY DECISIONS AND EXAM DEVELOPMENT ISSUES
[CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126(C)(1) AND (3)]

There was no closed session at this meeting.

H. WESTERN CONFERENCE OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (WCARB)

Mr. McCauley stated that the Joint Regional Meeting of WCARB with Region 3 would take place the week following the Board meeting. He stated that materials related to the meeting are included in the Board meeting packet.

Mr. Baker stated that one of the decisions NCARB made in the strategic planning process a few years ago was to focus more on the strategic as opposed to the “nuts and bolts” level. He stated there are five critical long-range strategic issues being studied, evaluated, and discussed. He further stated that these issues included continuing education, the long-range financial stability of NCARB, program subsidies, fees, better facilitation of reciprocity, and organizational agility.

Mr. McCauley presented the NCARB resolutions that will be considered at the forthcoming Annual Meeting in June. The Board was asked to provide a position on each resolution.

Resolution 2012-A..... Support
Bylaws Amendment – Voting Delegates

Resolution 2012-B..... Opposed
Bylaws Amendment – Voting at Meetings When Member Boards are Barred by State Law or Executive Order from Out of State Travel

Resolution 2012-C..... **Support**
Bylaws Amendment – Removal of Directors and Officers

Resolution 2012-D..... **Support**
Bylaws Amendment - Miscellaneous

Resolution 2012-E..... **Support**
Bylaws Amendment – Clarifying Board Approval of Committee Charges

Resolution 2012-F **Support**
Bylaws Amendment – Membership Dues

Resolution 2012-G **Support**
Bylaws Amendment – Changing “Regional Conferences” to “Regions”

Resolution 2012-H..... **Support**
Legislative Guidelines, Model Law and Model Regulations Amendment – Broadening Legislative Guide III to Include Misconduct in Connection with the ARE and IDP

Resolution 2012-I..... **Support**
Rules of Conduct and Legislative Guidelines, Model Law and Model Regulations Amendment – Broadening Model Regulation and the Rules of Conduct to Include Verification of Qualifications in Connection with the Intern Development Program

Resolution 2012-J..... **No Action**
Handbook for Interns and Architects Amendment – Addition of Canadian Education Evaluation Alternative

Resolution 2012-K **No Action**
Handbook for Interns and Architects Amendment – Correction of Canadian Intern Architect Program Reference

Resolution 2012-L..... **No Action**
Handbook for Interns and Architects Amendment – Correction of the Canadian Examination Requirement

Resolution 2012-M..... **No Action**
Handbook for Interns and Architects Amendment – Correction of Canadian Equivalency Requirement

- **Sheran Voigt moved to support the NCARB resolutions with the exception of Resolution 2012-B which the Board opposes.**

Iris Cochlan seconded the motion.

The motion passed 7-0 (Hraztan Zeitlian was not present at the time of the vote).

I. UPDATE AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE RELEASE OF CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION RESULTS

Ms. Lyon asked Justin Sotelo to present this agenda item. Mr. Sotelo stated that at their December 2011 meeting the Board voted to begin the release of CSE results at the test center immediately after a candidate completes their exam commencing on June 1, 2012. He also stated the Board had directed staff to work with the test vendor, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES), and develop a process for future item analysis that does not create an interruption or delay in the release of the CSE results to candidates. He reported that staff has met with the OPES to address both issues. He stated that meetings with OPES are ongoing to ensure the necessary programing and other tasks are being completed timely. He stated that commencing on June 1, 2012, when a candidate fails the CSE, they will receive a score report and another CSE application. He also stated that when candidates pass the CSE they will receive the congratulatory letter along with the Application for Licensure. He further stated that candidates will soon be notified about the change using all available methods (e.g., broadcast notification via the subscriber list, targeted mailings, and posting on the website) at the Board's disposal regarding the release of CSE results at test centers. He reported that OPES has confirmed that they will employ a different methodology for item analysis that will not impact the release of CSE results to candidates.

J. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON BOARD AND NCARB EXAMINATION SECURITY/CONFIDENTIALITY POLICIES, INCLUDING BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 123

Ms. Lyon asked Mr. Sotelo to present this agenda item. Mr. Sotelo stated that AIACC had asked this item be added to the Board's meeting agenda in order to address their concerns regarding the security and confidentiality policies and requirements of NCARB and the Board with respect to the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) and CSE. He also stated that in the meeting packet were the statements provided by AIACC conveying their concerns.

Ms. Voigt asked if there were any examples of how the NCARB and Board security agreements were hindering the mentoring of the profession. Mr. Baker stated that there are examples of how this is occurring. He also stated that interns are concerned whether they will be sanctioned because they spoke to their mentor regarding struggles they are having with the ARE. He stated that this issue is on the next NCARB Board meeting agenda for discussion and consideration. He opined that the candidate concern is an unintended consequence of the tightened examination security. He stated that there is a need for clarification to assist interns in determining what can be discussed with a mentor. Mr. Sotelo responded that the NCARB security agreement is very clear and says that interns cannot discuss exam content in any manner with anyone. Mr. McCauley stated that the CSE security agreement is based on law (Business and Professions Code section 123) and that while detailed it does clearly state it is a misdemeanor to engage in conduct which subverts or attempts to subvert a professional licensing exam. He further stated that in the past decade the Board has not taken any action based on a candidate speaking to their mentor regarding difficulties with the ARE. Ms. Lyon asked Mr. Baker to report to the Board at its next meeting about the discussion the NCARB Board had on the matter.

K. REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms. Lyon asked Mr. McCauley to present this agenda item. Mr. McCauley stated the first matter under this agenda item for the Board to discuss is regarding the Certified Accessibility Specialist Program which is administered by the Division of the State Architect (DSA). He stated that some certificate holders have formed an association known as the Certified Access Specialist Institute (CASI). He then introduced Greg Izor, Past-President of CASI and asked the Board members if they had any questions for him. Mr. McCauley then stated that some legal and practice issues have arisen as to how certified access specialist (CASp) services harmonize with the respective practice acts of engineers and architects. He stated the Mr. Izor was asked to present CASI's questions formally for the Board to consider and respond. He also stated that in the meeting packet are the prepared responses to those questions. He added that the responses were previously vetted by the Board's legal counsel, Don Chang, and one of the Board's architect consultants, Robert Carter.

Mr. Carter presented in order each question raised by CASI and its corresponding response by the Board. He explained and clarified the rationale behind each response. Mr. Izor commented with respect to the third question posed by CASI that while SB 262 (Chapter 872, Statutes 2003) created CASps and grants DSA disciplinary enforcement authority, the law precedes this requirement with "may" instead of "must" therefore DSA sees it as optional. He further stated that DSA has no enforcement program at this time. Mr. Izor then asked whether a complaint could be filed with the Board because a CASp is also licensed as an architect. Mr. Carter responded that if the basis of the complaint is related to CASp services there are no regulations in the Architects Practice Act (Act) which the Board could enforce. He further stated that it would be left for DSA to determine whether the services provided meet the standard established for CASp services. He further stated that if the subject of the complaint is an architect the Board may also review the matter to determine what provisions of the Act may be applicable. Mr. Heller commented that the Board was opposed to the creation of CASps in particular for the reason that there would be complaints against non-architect CASps that would ultimately lead to the related issue of which agency has the responsibility of regulating and enforcing the relevant law (or regulations). Mr. Izor then stated the position of CASI is to work with the California Commission on Disabled Access to promote making either DSA or some other agency responsible for handling complaints and discipline. He also stated the CASI is already receiving complaints because consumers do not know to which governmental agency they should file a complaint. He further stated that CASI does not have authority over those CASps who are not members.

Mr. Baker stated he would expect that should a CASp related complaint arise against an architect (who is authorized to provide such services without the CASp certificate) that the Board would have jurisdiction and the complaint would be filed with the Board and not a different agency. Mr. Chang stated that the situation Mr. Baker was describing would be a matter of joint jurisdiction between the Board and DSA. He also stated that with the joint jurisdiction, the Board would have jurisdiction to the extent the individual practiced architecture and DSA would have jurisdiction to the extent the individual acted as a CASp. Mr. Baker stated it does not make sense to break down the issues in a complaint between those over which the Board has jurisdiction and those it does not and which would be under the purview of another agency. Mr. Chang clarified that if the individual is a CASp then the relevant law states DSA has the jurisdiction for such complaints. He also stated that if the individual were an architect and not a CASp, then the jurisdiction would lay solely with the Board. He further stated that the CASp certificate grants certain protections to the property owner with regard to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) lawsuits. He stated that such protections do not

exist for the owner should an architect provide those same services as they cannot issue a CASp inspection report certification. Mr. Baker asked if this was in the law. Mr. Chang responded in the affirmative.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the response letter to CASI.**

Fermin Villegas seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0 (Jon Baker and Hraztan Zeitlian were not present at the time of the vote).

Mr. McCauley reported on the next agenda item related to planning departments and unlicensed practice issues. He stated that based on previous discussions with CALBO it was believed they would co-author the letter with the Board to the planning departments regarding unlicensed practice issues related to non-exempt projects. He stated that at their board meeting, CALBO opted not to co-author the letter. He reported that Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists has the letter on the agenda for their meeting the next day and may decide to co-author with the Board.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the letter to California planning departments regarding unlicensed practice issues related to non-exempt projects.**

Jon Baker seconded the motion.

Mr. Gutierrez suggested a minor correction be made to the letter related to the impact of such situations on consumers. He suggested replacing the term “construction costs” in the first paragraph on page three of the letter with “costs” for better accuracy since construction would not yet have begun.

- **Sheran Voigt amended her motion to approve the letter to California planning departments regarding unlicensed practice issues related to non-exempt projects with the edit proposed by Mr. Gutierrez.**

Jon Baker seconded the amended motion.

The motion passed 7-0 (Hraztan Zeitlian was not present at the time of the vote).

L. UPDATE ON JANUARY 23-24, 2012, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. McCauley reported that there has been an interest over the past three to four years of having the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) review and accredit the two University of California (UC) extension programs at UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles. He stated that the two unique programs are separate and distinct from the accredited programs found at the main campuses. He further stated that in the past the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) had been performing like an accrediting organization, however, as a small licensing and regulatory body it did

not make sense to continue functioning in this capacity. He advised that the LATC has requested LAAB consider accrediting the two extension programs in California.

Mr. McCauley also reported that the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) is undergoing a revision and transition to a computer-delivered format. Ms. Landregan added that the new LARE will not be using hand or computer aided drawing, but instead will use a “drag and drop” approach. She stated the new LARE would also use a different methodology to access the competencies previously tested using drawn vignettes by employing multiple-choice questions. She also stated there are concerns that have arisen regarding the transition plan to the new LARE. She said in particular the concerns relate to candidates who have not successfully completed section D under the current LARE format. She stated these candidates could possibly lose credit for previously completed divisions. She reported that the first administration of the new LARE will commence in September for sections 1 and 2 and then follow with the first administrations of sections 3 and 4 in December.

Ms. Landregan reported that the LAAB received approval from the Board of the American Society of Landscape Architects to consider non-degree granting programs provided they meet the same requirements. She stated this would allow LAAB to consider accrediting the two UC extension programs.

Mr. McCauley reported that LATC will be convening its task force on the exempt area of practice. He stated that LATC will be studying the exempt areas of other states, and examining the national certification program and other variables that influence the exempt area of practice.

M. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE

The Board reviewed the schedule including the forthcoming meeting dates.

N. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.