

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

June 10, 2015

San Diego, CA

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

Board President Jon Alan Baker called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and Board Secretary, Tian Feng, called roll.

Board Members Present

Jon Alan Baker, President
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice President
Tian Feng, Secretary
Denise Campos (arrived at 10:43 a.m.)
Sylvia Kwan
Ebony Lewis
Matthew McGuinness
Nilza Serrano
Barry Williams

Guests Present

Steve Altman
Andrew Bowden, Vice Chair, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
Carmen Cave, Center for Public Interest Law (CPIL), University of San Diego (USD)
Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)
Julianne D'Angelo Fellmeth, Administrative Director, CPIL, USD
Julia Flauas, Student Director, South, AIACC
Lou Galiano, Television Specialist, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Deborah Gerard, Partner, Gruen Associates
Mitra Kanaani, Professor of Architecture, NewSchool of Architecture and Design (NewSchool)
Daniel López-Pérez, Assistant Professor of Architecture, USD

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Marcus Reinhardt, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, LATC
Justin Sotelo, Program Manager, Administration/Enforcement
Mel Knox, Administration Analyst
Robert Carter, Architect Consultant
Rebecca Bon, Staff Counsel, DCA

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

B. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Mr. Baker 1) reminded the Board and public that the meeting is webcast; 2) announced that agenda items may be discussed out of order to accommodate the schedules of guest speakers; 3) announced that Assistant Professor, Daniel López-Pérez, of the Architecture Program at USD will give a presentation to the Board; 4) recognized LATC member, Andrew Bowden is in attendance; 5) advised the Board that all motions and seconds shall be repeated for the record, and votes on all motions shall be taken by roll-call; 6) noted that votes will be taken on National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) resolutions under Agenda Item F; 7) expressed appreciation for the Administration's decision to allow more Board members to attend NCARB annual meetings; and 8) announced that Anne Smith, a candidate for NCARB Secretary, is no longer competing for the position.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION FOR ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

D. APPROVE MARCH 12, 2015 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Baker asked for comments concerning the March 12, 2015, Board Meeting Minutes.

- **Barry Williams moved to approve the March 12, 2015, Board Meeting Minutes.**

Sylvia Kwan seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Campos was absent at time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Doug McCauley thanked USD's Department of Art, Architecture, & Art History for hosting, and acknowledged that the Board is meeting for the first time at a non-National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)-accredited school of architecture. He reminded the Board of the importance of respecting diverse pathways that allow candidates to enter the profession.

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board that the next meetings are scheduled for September 10, 2015 in San Francisco, and December 10, 2015 in Sacramento. He noted that the December meeting was originally scheduled to be a two-day session, but will instead be a one-day meeting because the Board adopted a two-year Strategic Plan.

Mr. McCauley updated the Board on the enterprise-wide enforcement case management and licensing system called BreZE. He relayed a message from DCA regarding BreZE. The message stated that, after Release 2 is completed, DCA will work with the Release 3 boards and bureaus with the California Technology Agency in preparing a project plan for the remaining

boards and bureaus. According to the message, prior to beginning work on Release 3, DCA will perform a formal cost benefit analysis after Release 2 is completed. It stated that part of this formal evaluation will include a gap analysis of all existing BreZE functionality as delivered at the completion of Release 2, to the Release 3 boards and bureaus' business needs and current systems' functionality. The message also indicated that the cost benefit analysis/feasibility study will determine the strategy taken; and, if contractors are brought on board, a mix of contractors and state staff, or just state staff will be implementing Release 3. The message concluded by anticipating the development of the Release 3 project plan to begin in Mid-2016.

Mr. McCauley reported that the state Legislature and Administration is close to adopting a budget for the upcoming fiscal year. He reminded that, as a consequence of savings in the Board's examination program and sound fiscal stewardship of resources, the Board's negative budget change proposal to reduce the Board's spending authority by \$300,000 is expected to be reflected in the budget.

Mr. McCauley reported that a required review of the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) is complete. He explained what the review entailed, and concluded that the Board's examination is consistent with national standards. Mr. McCauley advised the next step in the process will be to conduct a linkage study. He also reported it is time for the Board to renew its contract with NCARB for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE).

Mr. McCauley directed the Board's attention to the number of enforcement citations and explained that continuing education (CE) audits are largely responsible for the current increase.

Mr. McCauley reminded the Board of the strategic planning objective to review its fee methodology in the spirit of ensuring that fees are reasonable. He also updated the Board on the state of its budget, and supplied the Board with a Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-15 Expenditure Report. As he reviewed line items, Mr. McCauley informed that zero funds are allocated for out-of-state travel expenses in the current fiscal climate, and noted that Board members are able to travel to NCARB meetings only because NCARB is willing to fund its member boards' efforts to participate. Mr. Baker recalled that NCARB will provide funds for a board's Executive Officer and two Board members to attend annual meetings.

Mr. Baker asked why there appeared to be a difference of approximately \$250,000 between the actual expenditure for staff Salary & Wages line item in FY 2013-14 and what is budgeted for FY 2014-15. Vickie Mayer explained that increases in wages that are sometimes automatic (e.g., health benefits, costs for insurance) may cause fluctuations in the budget amount. Mr. McCauley noted that simply having a vacancy in staff would cause the Board to be under budget. Mr. Baker also asked about the Exam Expenses category of line items, to which Mr. McCauley explained that some line items are no longer relevant since the change in CSE format. Ms. Mayer suggested providing the prior year's budget amount along with expenditures for future budget reports. She also stated that the Board has authority to transfer funds from one line item to another, so long as the bottom-line remains intact. Mr. McCauley then reviewed the Board's fund condition report, which he characterized as positive.

Mr. McCauley provided a status update on the Sunset Review process. He spoke about the results of the March 18, 2015 hearing, informed that the Board's responses to questions at the hearing were well-received, and asked the Board to ratify its written responses to issues identified in the Sunset Review Background Paper that were submitted to the Legislature.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to ratify the Board’s written responses to the issues identified in the Sunset Review Background Paper that were submitted to the Legislature on April 16, 2015.**

Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Campos was absent at time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. McCauley updated the Board on legislative items, which he advised that adopting a formal position on them is not necessary unless, however, the Board feels otherwise. He reported that the Board’s sunset bill, Assembly Bill (AB) 177 (Bonilla) extends its sunset date to the year 2020. Mr. McCauley also reported that AB 507 (Olsen) would require DCA to submit an annual report to the Legislature concerning cost-benefit analysis of BreEZe. Lastly, he reported that Senate Bill 704 (Gaines), AIACC-sponsored legislation, addresses the issue of conflict of interest as it concerns public officials as members of advisory boards or commissions. Mr. McCauley stated that these bills are of interest, and that the Board should be aware of them.

Board members presented their liaison reports of 2015, which covered assigned organizations’ activities and objectives. Mr. Baker reported on his interaction with AIACC; NewSchool; Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCIARC); Citrus College; Orange Coast College; San Diego Mesa College; and Southwestern College. Mr. Baker requested for SCIARC to be reassigned to another Board member due to its location outside of his regional jurisdiction. Mr. Gutierrez reported on his interaction with the California Polytechnic State University, Pomona; Woodbury University; Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture; Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards; Bakersfield College; Cuesta College; Mt. San Antonio College; and San Bernardino Valley College. Ms. Serrano reported on her interaction with Cerritos College; Los Angeles City College; and Ventura College. Ms. Kwan reported on her interaction with the College of Marin; National Council of Examiners on Engineering and Surveying; Urban Land Institute; Academy of Art University, San Francisco; California College of the Arts, San Francisco; and Cosumnes River College. Matthew McGuinness reported on his interaction with the Associated General Contractors of California, Inc.; City College of San Francisco; College of San Mateo; Fresno City College; and West Valley College, Saratoga. Ebony Lewis reported on her interaction with the University of Southern California, Los Angeles; East Los Angeles College, Monterey Park; and Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys. Barry Williams reported on his interaction with the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; and College of the Desert. Mr. McCauley reported on his interaction with the American Council of Engineering Companies, California; Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors & Geologists; California Building Officials; and Contractors State License Board.

The Board discussed issues pertaining to architect training and education within the context of what liaisons had reported. Ms. Serrano highlighted the need for California colleges and universities to address the chronic problem of California students’ inability to gain admittance to graduate architecture programs. She explained that, to the detriment of California students, these institutions receive greater tuition revenue by admitting more students from out-of-state. Mr. Baker suggested for the Board to discuss the issue of architectural knowledge and education at the community college and university level during the next strategic planning discussions.

Mr. Gutierrez suggested modifying the liaison reporting schedule for reports to be delivered twice annually during the fall and spring months to overlap with the academic calendar.

As a founding member of the architecture program at USD, Mr. López-Pérez informed the Board that the program began six years ago. He stated that the architecture program's five-year review is complete, and spoke about the program's successes. Mr. López-Pérez stated that USD focuses on undergraduate architectural education with a strong undergraduate core curriculum. He characterized the program as a four-year pre-professional program with an annual graduating class size of between 12 and 15 students. Mr. López-Pérez informed that students who choose to continue their studies at the graduate level enjoy a 100% acceptance rate, including to graduate programs at Ivy League institutions. Ms. Serrano asked about student demographics in USD's architecture program, to which Mr. López-Pérez replied that a census was taken of every student for the last five years, and that information is available to the Board. He stated that most students come from California and surrounding states, and very few students are foreign students. Mr. López-Pérez also suggested that he is prepared to commence conversation with NAAB about obtaining accreditation.

G.* DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON AMENDING BOARD'S ADDITIONAL PATH TO LICENSURE SUPPORTING POSITION STATEMENT

Mr. Gutierrez, who also serves as a member of NCARB's Licensure Task Force (LTF), informed the Board that the LTF will reconvene during the first week of August 2015 to review all of the Requests for Proposals (RFP) that were submitted on June 1, 2015 by schools that elected to participate in NCARB's initiative. He also informed that, in September 2015, NCARB will then recognize schools of architecture that are best positioned to launch an Accelerated Path to Architectural Licensure (APAL) program. Mr. Gutierrez explained that, as part of the RFP submittal process, schools of architecture were required to submit a statement from their local board that demonstrated support for the concept. He also explained that the Board's Additional Path to Licensure Supporting Position Statement must be refined to better establish how the Board intends to address the concept. Mr. Gutierrez presented his recommended amendment and asked the Board for approval.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the recommended modification to the Board's Additional Path to Licensure Supporting Position Statement.**

Sylvia Kwan seconded the motion.

Ms. Kwan asked about the selection process and what the resulting number of schools authorized to begin APAL programs will be. Mr. Gutierrez stated that it will depend on the number of schools that NCARB recognizes or endorses for being positioned to successfully implement such programs.

Mitra Kanaani asked if NAAB will have a role in reviewing schools. Mr. Gutierrez informed that the LTF is composed of individuals who happen to be college presidents, architect practitioners, emerging professionals, and others who may be associated with NAAB. He stated that NAAB, as an entity, is not represented on the LTF.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

J. REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE (REC) REPORT

Mr. McGuinness, as REC Chair, updated the Board on the activities of the REC at its April 29, 2015 meeting. He reported that the Committee discussed 2015-2016 Strategic Plan objectives to (1) review the Board's Occupational Analysis (OA) of the architect profession to identify marketplace trends that impact consumer protection; (2) modify and expand reports to Board members regarding enforcement activities to identify the most common violations and disciplinary actions; (3) pursue methods to obtain multiple collection mechanisms to secure unpaid citation penalties; and (4) monitor NCARB action on the title for interns to ensure appropriate consumer protection, and discuss AIACC's request to expand the current terminology for candidates in the Architects Practice Act (Act) to include the title "architectural intern." Mr. McGuinness reported that the REC voted to recommend that the Board not consider the title "architectural intern" for candidates pursuing licensure any further.

Mr. McCauley provided some background on the "architectural intern" title issue. He stated that NCARB's Future Title Task Force presented recommendations at the NCARB Board of Directors meeting in April 2015 concerning terminology used during the life cycle of an architect's career. Mr. McCauley explained that AIACC, in a letter dated March 4, 2015, asked the Board to consider the following:

- NCARB recommends in its *Legislative Guidelines and Model Law* (2014-2015 Edition) that a person with an NCARB record in good standing and currently employed under the responsible control of an architect, be allowed to use the title "intern architect" or "architectural intern" in conjunction with his or her current employment.
- According to NCARB, 28 jurisdictions have titles specifically for those actively pursuing licensure, and currently allow the use of the terms "intern architect," "architectural intern," "architect-in-training," or a combination of the terms.
- Many jurisdictions require interns to register with both NCARB and the state board prior to using the designated title. This can potentially streamline the licensure process by establishing a relationship with the state board early on, and allowing interns to educate themselves about the state licensure requirements from the beginning of their path to licensure.
- Allowing the use of the term "architectural intern" may promote licensure, as this term sets apart those who are actively pursuing licensure from those who choose not to become licensed.
- The Act regulates the use of the terms "architect," "architecture," and "architectural" in order to protect consumers from being misled by unlicensed professionals. The terms "intern architect" and "architectural intern" are not misleading and clearly indicate – by the definition of the word "intern" – that such individuals are trainees in the field of architecture.

Mr. McCauley asked the Board to review and consider the REC's recommendation to no longer consider the title "architectural intern."

Kurt Cooknick reminded the Board that decisions regarding legal language can only be made by individual licensing boards, and cautioned the Board not to allow NCARB's actions to influence the Board's decisions on the issue. Mr. Cooknick also reminded the Board that the decision to be made at the present time concerns whether to continue or discontinue further consideration of the use of a term similar to "architectural intern." He conveyed that AIACC reflected on and identified remedies to REC's concerns about consumer protection, specifically regarding the use and misuse of the title. Mr. Cooknick stated that he does not find the REC's recommendation to discontinue the "architectural intern" title conversation an appropriate recommendation. He stated that AIACC hopes that, through continued discussion, the concerns of the REC and, ultimately, of the Board, could be sufficiently addressed. Mr. Feng asked who would enforce the use of or the consequences of misusing a title like "architectural intern." Mr. Cooknick replied that he would expect the Board to be the enforcer because the Board's enforcement mechanisms already exist.

Deborah Gerard addressed the Board. Ms. Gerard advised that current restrictions are affecting young professionals' sense of belonging to the profession, and asked the Board to loosen constraints for use of the term "architectural." She stated that use of the term as it concerns young professionals who are "not yet licensed" would not be confusing, and, instead, would help her to better engage and groom the next generation of leaders at her firm. Ms. Gerard asked the Board to lead on this issue.

Julia Flauas spoke about the confusion that exists for young professionals who are graduates of schools of architecture, but who are not yet licensed. Ms. Flauas asked the Board to help young people, and the architecture firms that employ them, to identify an appropriate title to be used until the day they become licensed.

Mr. Cooknick stated that the Board should not be afraid to consider the issue on a deeper level. He informed that an enforcement officer with the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists communicated to him that misuse of the title "Engineer in Training" is very rare. Mr. Cooknick said that if the engineering profession can designate a title for their young professionals who are not yet licensed, so can the architectural profession. He asked the Board to take a step toward meeting AIACC half-way and continue discussion of designating a title for professionals in the architectural community who are not yet licensed.

Mr. Baker asked about other professions' practices. He asked, for instance, if the legal profession has a term like "intern attorney," or if the medical profession has a term like "intern doctor." Mr. Cooknick stated that the legal profession uses the term "clerk," and the healing arts profession uses the term "intern" when referring to people who are not yet licensed to practice their profession, but are in pursuit of licensure. Ms. Lewis advised the Board that the terms "intern," "resident," and "fellow" are used in the medical profession. She explained that "fellows" are doctors who have completed residency and are specializing in a field of medicine. Ms. Lewis also informed the Board that graduates of medical school are considered "doctors" even if they hold an "internship," "residency," or "fellowship" position.

Ms. Serrano expressed a sense of agreement with the concept of identifying a term like "architect intern," "architect in training," or something similar, for young professionals who are not yet licensed to practice architecture. She opined that, from a consumer perspective, a designation would be positive.

Mr. Gutierrez asked what rationale the REC had to prompt it to recommend discontinuing the “architect intern” title discussion. Mr. McGuinness explained that the Committee considered enforcement implications, and a sense of vagueness that appeared to “water down” the prestige of the title “architect.” Mr. Williams added that the REC did not believe a new title was needed. Mr. Gutierrez stated his belief that the consumer would be more endangered by individuals who present themselves illegally as architects than by those who present themselves illegally as interns. He also stated that the protection of the title “architect” has more to do with emotion than it has to do with its relevance to the social climate of the profession. Mr. Gutierrez told the Board that he would not be in favor of accepting the REC’s recommendation.

Mr. Feng asked Ms. Gerard if not being able to call her staff “intern,” or something similar, harms her firm or her firm’s relationships with clients in any way. Ms. Gerard explained that titles are given to her unlicensed staff in a way that respects current law, but does not accurately reflect the work they are tasked to do (e.g., project manager, project coordinator). She informed that there are professionals in her community who feel that the term “intern” is demeaning, and that very few of these professionals are willing to call themselves “intern.” Ms. Gerrard stated that she is advocating for use of the term “architect” as a modifier (e.g., architectural staff, architectural technician, and architectural designer).

Mr. Baker asked pointed questions about how to effectively manage the administration of a program for individuals who are not licensed, the program’s timeframe, as well as its enforcement. Mr. Cooknick stated his desire for the REC to consider and address each of Mr. Baker’s questions, as well as other questions that have not yet been asked. He said that these questions must be addressed in a fair process moving forward, and the discussion should not end at this point in time. Mr. Baker explained that the Board’s jurisdiction is architects, and a part of its responsibility is to manage the use of the word “architect” in the context of consumer protection. He further explained that, since the Board’s jurisdiction is licensed architects, the management of a process that oversees titling for individuals who are not in the profession is difficult to justify. Mr. Baker opined that modifying the Act to manage anyone “thinking about” becoming practitioners of architecture, alters the Board’s mandate in a serious way.

Julianne D’Angelo Fellmeth informed that several other professions with the same kind of licensing structure as the Board have identified a designation for people who are pursuing licensure. Ms. Fellmeth encouraged the Board to reach out to other boards that incorporate the term that is used post-licensure into a term used for someone who is still in training. She said that there is room for inviting young people into the profession who are actively pursuing licensure by making them feel wanted.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that, according to his calculation, 38 states have found a way to use “architect” in one way or another to describe people who are in pursuit of licensure. He noted that a change in reference to people who are not yet licensed that involves the word “architect” will require a revision to the Act. Mr. Gutierrez reminded the Board that these possibilities will never be fully vetted if there is an agreement to discontinue the conversation at this point in time.

- **Sylvia Kwan moved to reject REC’s recommendation to discontinue consideration of the term “architectural intern” for candidates pursuing licensure.**

Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

Ms. Kwan stated that her perspective on the issue has evolved as a direct result of the current discussion.

Mr. Baker clarified his concern that if the Board decides to take jurisdiction over this new group of people and a new title, then the consequence of that decision would likely include additional funding and staff, and several logistical changes that would be required to oversee a new program. He questioned whether the need is great enough to justify the consequence.

Mr. Baker reiterated that the Board's mandate to govern and oversee the practice of architecture is written into law. Mr. Cooknick reminded the Board that its mandate is over 110 years old, and suggested that it may now be time to consider modifying the Act.

Ms. Kwan asked about the possibility of holding a joint meeting between the Board and the REC, to which Mr. McCauley confirmed the possibility. Mr. McCauley stated that, historically, the committee process has worked well. Mr. Baker suggested considering NCARB's and AIA's research on the issue to inform any future conversation the Board may have.

- **Pasqual Gutierrez moved to amend the motion to reject REC's recommendation to discontinue consideration of the term "architectural intern" for candidates pursuing licensure, and to have the REC research and reevaluate its recommendation to the Board.**

Tian Feng seconded the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Cooknick expressed his support for the REC to reconsider the intern title issue.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted to amend the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the amended motion. The motion passed 9-0.

F. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB)

Mr. Baker reminded the Board that its positions on NCARB resolutions for 2015 have already been identified, but, if desired, the Board may reinforce or modify the positions. Mr. McCauley recommended that the Board support all three of NCARB's resolutions for 2015.

- **Tian Feng moved to support Resolutions 2015-1, 2015-2, and 2015-3.**

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

Mr. Baker stated that the only contested election is between Margo Jones and Kristine Harding for the NCARB First Vice Presidency. He asked the Board to consider whether to take an immediate position on the candidates, or to allow the Board delegation that will attend the

Annual Meeting identify candidates to support after hearing speeches and considering all information not yet available.

- **Matthew McGuinness moved to allow the Board's NCARB delegation to identify candidates for office to support.**

Barry Williams seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

H. REVIEW AND APPROVE MODIFIED TEXT REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR), TITLE 16, SECTION 120 (RE-EXAMINATION) AS IT RELATES TO REFERENCED EDITION OF ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION GUIDELINES

Marcus Reinhardt reminded the Board that, at its September 10, 2014 meeting, it approved proceeding with a regulatory amendment to CCR section 120 (Re-Examination) as it relates to the ARE. He advised that the proposed amendment would update the Board's regulations to incorporate by reference the NCARB *ARE Guidelines*. Mr. Reinhardt explained that, during preparation of the final regulatory package for submission to the regulatory agencies for review and approval, staff was informed that an updated edition (October 2014) of the *ARE Guidelines* was published by NCARB. He stated that, consequently, the regulatory amendment was revised, a 15-day Notice of Modified Language was prepared and made publicly available, and no comments were received regarding the modified language during the comment period.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to adopt the proposed regulatory changes to CCR section 120 as modified and delegate authority to the Executive Officer to make minor technical or non-substantive changes, if needed in completing the rulemaking file.**

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

I. REVIEW AND APPROVE 2015/16 INTRA-AGENCY CONTRACT AGREEMENT WITH OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION SERVICES FOR CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Reinhardt informed the Board that its current Intra-Agency Contract (IAC) agreement with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) for development of the CSE is due to expire on June 30, 2015. He advised that a new IAC agreement is needed for FY 2015/16 for continued examination development.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the new IAC agreement with OPES for examination development for FY 2015/16.**

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

K. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO AMEND CCR, TITLE 16, SECTION 154 (DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES) AS IT RELATES TO REFERENCE OF PROPOSED REVISED *DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES*

Justin Sotelo reminded the Board that revisions to its *Disciplinary Guidelines* were approved at the December 2014 meeting. Mr. Sotelo further reminded that those revisions were based on input provided by staff, the Board's legal counsel, Deputy Attorney General liaisons, and the REC. He asked the Board to approve proposed regulatory amendments to CCR section 154 that would, consequently, modify its *Disciplinary Guidelines*. Mr. Baker asked about substantive changes, to which Mr. Sotelo directed the Board's attention to proposed regulatory change documents that detail each modification.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the proposed regulations to amend CCR section 154 and delegate authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the regulations provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and make minor technical or non-substantive changes to the language, if needed.**

Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

L. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

Trish Rodriguez reported that the LATC held a teleconference meeting on May 13, 2015. Ms. Rodriguez informed that an update to the Committee on the status of efforts to reduce licensing fees was provided, and that a new fee schedule will become effective on July 1, 2015. Ms. Kwan asked why LATC's licensing fees are reduced, to which Ms. Rodriguez explained that current fee reductions are part of the process to decrease the Committee's fund balance. Ms. Rodriguez also reported that 1) members received an update on the Committee's ongoing exam development workshop; 2) staff made updates and posted the 2015 LATC Practice Act to its website; 3) the Committee ratified the 2015 Sunset Review written responses to the Legislature; 4) the Committee approved a proposed regulatory change to allow up to one year of training/practice credit for teaching in a landscape architecture degree program; 5) a new member, Patricia Trauth, was recently appointed to the Committee, whose term expires on June 1, 2018; and 6) Mr. Bowden was reappointed to serve on the Committee through June 1, 2019.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Board that, on February 11, 2015, the LATC participated in a strategic planning session to update its Strategic Plan for 2015-2016. She reported that the LATC approved the draft Plan at its teleconference meeting in May, and asked the Board to ratify the Committee's approval of the Plan.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to approve the draft 2015-2016 LATC Strategic Plan.**

Pasqual Gutierrez seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Serrano, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 9-0.

Mr. Cooknick informed that AIACC would like to open discussion with the Board about coursework requirements concerning CE. Mr. Baker asked Mr. Cooknick to provide a written outline of the issues involved (with data) to Mr. McCauley for the Board's consideration.

M. CLOSED SESSION – PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126(A)(1), (C)(1) AND (C)(3)

The Board went into closed session to consider possible action on the:

- Closed Session Minutes of the March 12, 2015 Board meeting;
- Proposed enforcement decisions and stipulations; and
- Annual evaluation of Executive Officer.

N. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE

Mr. Feng requested that, being there was not going to be a Strategic Planning session at the December Board meeting, there be time allotted (agendized) for the Board to discuss strategic planning items at the meeting.

O. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Baker asked for a motion to adjourn.

- **Nilza Serrano moved to adjourn the meeting.**

Denise Campos seconded the motion.

Members Gutierrez, Feng, Campos, Kwan, Lewis, McGuinness, Williams, and President Baker voted in favor of the motion. Member Serrano was absent at time of vote. The motion passed 8-0.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate the schedule of guest speakers. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*