



CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

February 18, 2022
Teleconference Meeting

Some of the Agenda Items were taken out of order and are reported in the order they were presented during the meeting.

A. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of a Quorum

On February 18, 2022, Board President Tian Feng called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and Secretary Malcolm "Brett" Gladstone called roll.

Board Members Present

Tian Feng, President
Charles "Sonny" Ward III, Vice President
Malcolm "Brett" Gladstone, Secretary
Nilza Serrano
Robert Pearman, Jr.
Ronald Jones
Mitra Kanaani
Sylvia Kwan
Ebony Lewis

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

Guests Present

Andy Bowden, LATC Member
Pasqual Gutierrez, Octavius Morgan Recipient and Past Board Member
Mark Christian, American Institute of Architects (AIA) California

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)
Alicia Kroeger, Manager, Enforcement Unit
Kim McDaniel, Regulations Manager
Marccus Reinhardt, Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Trish Rodriguez, LATC Program Manager
Idris Ahmed, Enforcement Analyst
Coleen Galvan, Communications Analyst
Drew Liston, Board Liaison

Kourtney Nation, LATC Special Projects Analyst
Michael Sganga, Enforcement Analyst

DCA Staff Present

MaryKate Cruz Jones, Board and Bureau Relations
Harmony DeFilippo, DCA Budget Analyst
Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, Attorney III
Michael Kanotz, Legal Counsel, Attorney III
Matt Nishimine, DCA Regulations Budget Analyst
Trisha St. Clair, SOLID

B. President's Procedural Remarks and Board Member Introductory Comments

President Feng mentioned that it is Black History Month and highlighted the works of local Sacramento architect, James Dodd. Mr. Feng then welcomed Andrew Bowden, LATC Board Member. Mr. Feng also stated that all motions must be seconded and a vote by roll call will be taken.

There were no comments from the public.

C. Update on the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) – MaryKate Cruz Jones, Board and Bureau Relations, DCA

MaryKate Cruz Jones provided the following DCA update:

- As California moves past the most recent Omicron surge and into the endemic reality, a new public health order lifted universal masking for vaccinated individuals beginning February 16, 2022. Unvaccinated individuals must still wear face coverings in all indoor settings and some high-risk settings. Local orders may be more restrictive to respond to community conditions. Please be aware of changing public health guidance and remember that as state representatives we are all expected to adhere to state and local orders when carrying out our duties.
- On January 5, 2022, Governor Newsom signed an Executive Order extending the sunset date in Assembly Bill 361, allowing boards and committees to meet remotely until March 31, 2022.
- On January 31, Assembly Member Quirk introduced AB 1733, which would permanently allow boards and committees to meet remotely while also providing both virtual and physical options for members of the public to participate. If this bill passes, it will be effective immediately. Boards should prepare for the possibility of in-person meetings after March 31, 2022. Prior to attending in-person board meetings, members must verify full vaccination status with the Office of Human Resources or participate in COVID.

- Currently, the Board has one public member vacancy appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.
- DCA's Regulations Unit was created in 2020 to address the regulatory needs of the Department's boards, bureaus, and commissions. The Unit has more than tripled regulations packages submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL).
- DCA's Enlightened Licensing Project formed in 2020 to better utilize Subject Matter Experts. The project's purpose is to help individual boards and bureaus streamline licensing processes by using best practices, information technology and cost-saving measures.
- DCA has selected Tonya Corcoran as its first Compliance and Equity Officer. Her appointment is effective March 2, 2022.
- Board members are reminded of mandatory training requirements and to file their Form 700 by April or face penalties. New Board members must complete Board Member Orientation Training (BMOT) during their first year. Classes are scheduled for March 9, June 15, and October 12.

There were no comments from the public.

D. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no comments from the public.

E. Review and Possible Action on Board Meeting Minutes

1. December 10, 2021, Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Gladstone mentioned that the wording on the December 10 minutes needs to be changed from Alternative Dwelling Units to Accessory Dwelling Units.

Sylvia Kwan moved to approve the December 10, 2021, minutes as amended.

Robert Pearman seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Feng, Kanaani, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Jones, Serrano, Ward and Gladstone voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed 9-0.

2. June 12, 2019, Corrected Board Meeting Minutes

Michael Kanotz pointed out the meeting was held on June 12, but the agenda lists June 19. Mr. Kanotz stated a motion could be made as long as the correct date was used.

Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, summarized that these meeting minutes were submitted in a regulations package for the LATC. The meeting packet showed textual changes, and Board members had been deliberating. Tara Welch, then attorney for the Board, suggested a solution, which was to add one sentence, strike half of another sentence and made another addition at the end with a reference citation. The person who moved to have the motion amended was referring to the information in the packet and Tara's verbal comments. When the regulations package was submitted, the minutes did not reflect the verbal comments. These recently revised minutes are the correct minutes that match the video recording of the meeting and provide clarity.

Nilza Serrano moved to approve the June 12, 2019, minutes as amended.

Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

Ms. Lewis asked how to ensure the motion language is captured in the minutes. Ms. Halbo stated that at the time, Ms. Welch was handling all duties for the Board, and now they are split between her and Mr. Kanotz, which should help. Mr. Jones applauded Ms. Halbo's efforts and diligence. Mr. Pearman mentioned that Board members need to be clear when they make motions.

Mr. Ward asked other Board members to recall the accuracy of the revisions since he wasn't a Board member at the time. Several Board members replied in the affirmative.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Feng, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Ward, voted in favor of the motion.

Members Kanaani, Gladstone and Jones abstained. Motion passed 6-0-3.

F. Presentation of the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award to Pasqual Gutierrez

Mr. Feng discussed the many contributions of Pasqual Gutierrez to the Board's mission.

Mr. Gutierrez thanked the individuals he worked with over the years. Members provided comments of support for Mr. Gutierrez and his many contributions to the Board and profession of architecture. Ms. Kanaani singled out Mr. Gutierrez' contribution to the Integrated Pathway to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) and credits him for its existence in California.

Mr. Gladstone provided the following history of Octavius Morgan, who was the Board's first president. Morgan was born in England and moved to Los Angeles. Prior to becoming an architect, he was a contractor. In 1909, an article in the *Out West* magazine credited Morgan and his business partner, John Walls, with being responsible for 33% of the architecture in Los Angeles. Morgan wrote a report about the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and fire, and it was published in the Los Angeles Herald. He was president of the Engineers and Architects Association and president of AIA Southern California Chapter, and a member of AIA Board of Directors.

Public Comment

Mark Christian thanked Pasqual Gutierrez for his many years of service on the Board and highlighted his work ethic and approach as a Board member.

I. Discuss and Action on Proposed Regulatory Language for CCR, Title 16, Division 2, Article 7, Section 144 Fees

Ms. Halbo asked Board members to refer to an updated handout that was sent to them. Ms. Halbo explained that this rulemaking is to raise the application and renewal fees. The Board has the discretion to raise the fee to \$400—it is currently \$300. Board and DCA Budget Office (BO) staff have had several meetings regarding how the Board can maintain operations, and the recommendation is to increase the renewal fee to \$400 and increase the initial license fee up to \$400.

Ms. Halbo turned the presentation over to Matt Nishimine from the BO. Mr. Nishimine explained that on page 158 of the Board packet, a Workload Analysis Chart showed original licensure workload tasks vs. the time/cost of each task. He stated that the cost of each initial application is \$664. The statutory authority to increase the fee is \$400 which results in a loss of \$264.

Mr. Nishimine showed the chart for the renewal fees. The number of workload tasks are less and an enforcement fee was added since the Board takes enforcement-related actions against its licensing population. This brings the renewal cost to \$438, more in line with CAB's statutory cap and the regulatory proposal.

Ms. Lewis mentioned that the Board had a discussion during the last Sunset Review regarding changing the cap. Ms. Zuniga replied that the next Sunset Review will be submitted in January of next year and it is certainly something to consider.

Ms. Zuniga added the fee increase would put the fund in good shape and provide a cushion. She also reminded members that when they talked at last December's Board meeting, one of the primary impacts on the fund is the cost of business modernization, purchasing the new software, and implementation.

Mr. Gladstone stated that the cost of an initial application is 50% higher than we recover. If the license is issued and there are 363 days left in the year, the fee is \$150. He suggested a tiered fee such as \$300 if the license is issued between 6 and 12 months and \$200 for the later period. He asked staff if this were possible.

Mr. Ward asked the following: 1) is this a similar issue for other boards, or is it typical? 2) if you extrapolate the time to service one license renewal or existing license as a percentage of the work, how much is licensing a percentage of the work, and is it becoming problematic as far as staff level?

Mr. Nishimine responded that page 156 of the packet displays the fund condition and explained that at the bottom of the page is a highlighted band titled Months in Reserve. That number is declining over time and shows that taking no action, and assuming you're fully expending your appropriation, and revenues come in as projected, the Board will be insolvent in the 2025-2026 fiscal year. The next page displays fiscal projects with the fee increases effective January 1, 2024.

Mr. Nishimine also wanted Board members to note that on page 157, the labelling is incorrect. It shows the effective date as January 1, 2023, but it should be January 1, 2024. By increasing the fee from \$300 to \$400, it will be about a million-dollar increase in revenue, and the Months In Reserve line stabilizes. There is still a structural imbalance where revenues are less than projected future expenditures; however, it is much more stabilized and not going insolvent.

Mr. Nishimine responded to Mr. Ward's inquiry and stated that across DCA and State service, most Agency costs have been increasing each year.

Mr. Feng inquired if there were any regulatory requirements to limit fees. Ms. Zuniga replied that every board has a statutory cap and the ability to set the actual amount is in regulation.

Ms. Zuniga followed up on Mr. Gladstone's suggestions related to prorating license fees. She stated that we do not have the ability to change fees based on licensure dates on our own because the license fee is described in statute. She said we could discuss it in the Sunset Review and ask for a change. Mr. Gladstone suggested this topic be included in the Sunset Review.

Ms. Serrano stated that the staff is very thoughtful and pragmatic regarding increases. She stated that she has sought fee increases during her tenure on the Board, and now that a fee increase is possible, it's time to do it. She supports the staff recommendation to increase the fees to \$400.

Nilza Serrano made a motion to increase the fees to \$400.

Mr. Jones asked if the benefits of the Business Modernization efforts were calculated into the budget projections. He acknowledged that the initial cost for modernization would be high, but there would be efficiencies gained in the future.

Ron Jones seconded Ms. Serrano's motion to increase the fees to \$400.

Ms. Zuniga commented that Mr. Jones had a good question. She stated there will be efficiencies in the new system, and she will check with other boards who are further along in the process and get estimates.

Ms. Kanaani offered her view from another side of the spectrum—licensees and those who want to become licensed. She said the fee increase will impact licensees and candidates and may cause early retirements and a delay in licensure for candidates. She suggested that the Board be flexible and consider taking installment payments as is AIA's practice.

Mr. Feng made some observations: 1) Business Modernization may bring the benefits of lowering the cost, but for the next few years we are in the investment mode and need to put in the resources. He stated we will realize cost reductions once we have successfully implemented the Business Modernization plan and maybe we can reduce the fee later. 2) There's always an impact on licensees, but licensees choose to join trade and other organizations like AIA and pay far higher dues than our fees. He mentioned that we don't want to impact licensees, and perhaps employers could share the cost of the license or renewal. He agrees with Ms. Serrano because the Board needs the resources to conduct business. In years to come, we can revisit the fees. The license is \$400 for two years, so it's \$200/year.

Ms. Kanaani added that licensees working for single person or small firms will be heavily impacted by this, causing early retirements.

Ms. Serrano said that we can't continue to carry a deficit in the budget. We need to get closer to balancing the budget. She said that we have to support the staff and their thoughtful analysis of the cost increase.

Ms. Zuniga mentioned that Ms. Kanaani's point is important, and we've done things to bring down costs such as having reversion of funds in the budget, leaving the Assistant EO position vacant and keeping operational costs low. However, she cautioned the only way to reduce costs is to hold positions vacant.

Ms. Halbo stated that subdivision (d), second sentence indicates that if the license is issued less than one year before the date on which it will expire, the fee is actually statutorily required under Business and Professions code 5604(c). Raising the fees to \$400 would necessarily require modifying the second sentence to say \$200--not \$150.

Mr. Nishimine added that he appreciates the Board's thorough and robust conversation on the topic. This proposal is to raise the regulatory fees charged under the statutory cap. This is an immediate step to better align revenues with expenditures in the near term. He mentioned that Board members have a tremendous fiduciary responsibility to keep the fiscal, policy, and operational matters of the Board running. Mr. Nishimine highlighted the Board's three options: increase fees; reduce costs by going to the legislature and ask to reduce statutory mandates; or choosing a combination of the two.

Tian Feng seconded Nilza Serrano's motion.

Mr. Ward asked Ms. Halbo if it is necessary to amend subdivision (d) under 144 from \$150 to \$200, and Ms. Halbo said yes.

Ms. Zuniga requested that Ms. Halbo read the entire motion.

Move to approve and adopt the proposed regulatory text for section 144 as provided in the meeting materials and modifying subdivision (d), second sentence, to raise the fee to \$200, direct staff to submit the text to DCA and the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency for review, to take all steps to initiate the rulemaking process, authorize the EO to make any nonsubstantive changes to the package, and if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the EO to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed modification to section 144 as noticed.

Nilza Serrano amended her original motion to the motion Ms. Halbo stated.

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Public Comment

Carrie Bernstein stated that the license renewal fee in New York State is \$287 every three years. In California, renewal is every two years. If you look at a six-year period, a New York State architect would pay \$574 and a California architect would pay \$1,200. She stated it is almost twice as much and is very disproportionate and believes that a lot of architects are going to have a hard time with this.

Ms. Halbo mentioned that she just noticed the first sentence of the proposed regulatory language reads, "Pursuant to Section 5604 of the code, the following fees are fixed by the Board effective January 1, 2011." She said that dates are usually not included in fee statutes, and should simply read, "these fees are fixed by the Board as set below and take effect when the regulation becomes effective." The motion needs to be modified to both correct the sentence under (d) to change \$150 to \$200 and "as fixed by the Board as follows."

Ms. Serrano accepted the amendment to the motion stated by Ms. Halbo.

Mr. Feng seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Feng, Ward, Gladstone, Lewis, Serrano, Kwan, Jones, and Pearman voted in favor. Member Kanaani abstained. The motion carried 8-0-1 with Member Kanaani abstaining.

J. Discuss and Possible Action on Modified Regulatory Text for CCR, Title 16, Division 2, Article 10, Sections 165 (Disability Access CE) and responses to Public Comment

Ms. Halbo presented this item and referred to the memo in the packet. She stated that during the public comment period, four comments were received and there was no request for a public hearing. Staff reviewed the comments and felt some amendments were in order. In section 165(a) subdivision (a) (2)(C), the word “standards” was removed from California Building Code. Subdivision (d) was rewritten for clarification to explain the credit will only be given to those who pass the assessment. In subdivision (e) (2) (A) and (3)(A), “residential building inspector” was removed as someone qualified to teach such a class.

All the comments are in the packet along with staff’s recommended responses. If the Board agrees, they will be placed into the materials, and the revised text will go out for an additional 15 days of public comment period on the revisions. The public comments may only relate to the changes made to the text during today’s meeting.

Mr. Feng asked if this item could be postponed to the next meeting because he wants the Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) to discuss at its March meeting.

Ms. Zuniga asked Ms. Halbo to address the timing since the rulemaking process has begun. Ms. Halbo said the package was published on November 12, 2021, and the Board has one year from that date to finish the rulemaking. If the Board wants to delay it until the next meeting, the package can be completed within the one-year timeframe.

Mr. Ward asked why the language was changed in 165 subsections (d) and (e). Ms. Halbo replied it was to clean up the language. Mr. Ward expressed concern that the new language requires the licensee to prove that the instructor is qualified, which places a high burden for the licensee.

Ms. Zuniga mentioned that the Board doesn't have the authority to approve providers of CE. Ms. Kwan asked why we don't have the ability to approve providers and whether we can obtain it. Ms. Zuniga replied that it would be cost prohibitive, and we would need new legislation and additional staffing resources.

Mr. Feng stated that over the years, the PQC and the Board has had a vague understanding of its role in securing training. He shared that the Board is in the midst of implementing CE for zero net carbon design (ZNCD) and he would like to connect the discussions as one to ascertain the impact on the rulemaking process regarding CE requirements. That's the thought behind deferring this item.

Ms. Zuniga mentioned that there are two separate requirements. These regulations need to be adopted by January 1, 2023, and stem from our last Sunset Review bill. If the Board wants more authority over CE instructors/courses, the Board would have to go to the legislature and ask for additional requirements and resources. However, the Board will still have to meet the January 1, 2023, deadline to adopt these regulations.

Ms. Zuniga shared that AB 1010 for ZNCD CE has a different statutory deadline than the disability access CE requirement. Mr. Feng clarified his interest in policy alignment across the two CE requirements. Ms. Zuniga shared that staff is addressing the issue while drafting the AB 1010 regulations.

Mr. Ward stated the text changes are more complicated and should be moved to the next meeting and the Board should simply respond to the public comments in the Board memo today. Ms. Zuniga shared the Board already approved this proposed regulatory text language and that it went out for public comment, public comment was received, and in response to the public comment staff revised the proposed regulatory text language that is what the Board is reviewing today. Mr. Ward sought clarification whether items (d) and (e) were already approved by our Board. Ms. Halbo stated before the recent text modifications, the approved proposed regulatory text approved read "the provider will only give this credit... and the provider will use trainers..."

Mr. Ward opined that if this new language had been debated, it would have been equally as complicated. We can only regulate the licensee and we don't have regulation over unlicensed individuals. He stated that our mode of operation is to throw it back on the architect (such as the advertising presentment), which only works to a certain point. It works if the leadership understands, but once our Board and EO are retired, a new Board could set up a framework that could be problematic for the practice.

Ms. Zuniga said we can only do what the statute allows us to do, and don't have the ability to approve providers.

Ms. Serrano and Ms. Kanaani support Mr. Ward's recommendations to move this to the next meeting and the Board decided to take this matter up at the next meeting.

Open session recessed at 12 p.m. Closed session convened at 12:30 p.m.

M. Closed Session – Pursuant to Government Code Sections 11126(a)(1) and (c)(3), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to:

1. Perform annual evaluation of its EO.
2. Review and take action on September 10 and December 10, 2021, closed session minutes.

Open session reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

K. Update on Committees

2. January 27, 2022 Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Meeting

i. Discuss and Possible Action on California Code of Regulations Sections 2615 and 2620

Trish Rodriguez began by updating the Board about the January 27, 2022, LATC meeting. During the meeting the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) presented its analysis on the performance of candidates before and after a policy change to allow early entrance to certain sections of the National Landscape Architect Registration Examination. The analysis was inconclusive due to many factors. LATC discussed further research into individual section performances as well as candidate qualifications to understand what may be affecting pass rates. Ms. Rodriguez stated that after the completion of LATC's Business Modernization, OPES and LATC will revisit analyzing exam performance when data collection will be more efficient.

Ms. Rodriguez also mentioned LATC's discussion regarding the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Board's (CLARB) proposed uniformed standards and the discrepancies between CLARB's and LATC's licensing requirements. Concerns include some pathways being more restricted as well as eliminating the experience requirement prior to examination. To address these differences, LATC appointed a subcommittee composed of Jon Wreschinsky and Pamela Brief to develop recommendations on CLARB's bylaws and appoint a voting delegate for CLARB's April 20, 2022 meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the environmental scan was completed in January and will be used to identify objectives for the next Strategic Planning session. The next LATC meeting will be held in Sacramento on April 7-8, 2022.

LATC's committee officers for 2022 are: Jon Wreschinsky, continuing as Chair and Pamela Brief, Vice Chair.

Mr. Pearman asked if the LATC had any reactions to the environmental scan. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the environmental scan will be discussed at the next LATC meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez provided information about California Code of Regulations Sections 2615 and 2620, Education and Training Credits, rulemaking package. On December 1, 2021, the final regulatory package was submitted to OAL. On January 11, 2022, OAL notified LATC staff of an issue with the proposed text and Initial Statement of Reasons. OAL advised the change of the word "may" to "shall". On January 12, the regulatory proposal was withdrawn, and staff worked with DCA Legal Affairs Division (LAD) to prepare the necessary documents to issue a 15-day notice of second modified text. The public comment period began January 24, 2022 and ended on February 9, 2022. No adverse comments were received. Upon Board approval of the second modified text, staff will prepare the final rulemaking file and resubmit to OAL

Move to approve and adopt the second modified text for Article 1, Division 26, Title 16 at Section 2620, direct staff to prepare and submit the rulemaking documents to the Director of DCA and the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency, and if no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, authorize the EO to make any technical or nonsubstantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file.

Nilza Serrano moved to accept the motion as presented.

Tian Feng seconded the motion.

Mr. Pearman asked for an explanation of the concept of the abandonment of applications. Ms. Rodriguez stated that it's a clean-up regulation to coincide with LATC's records retention schedule. Mr. Pearman asked when this particular rulemaking began. Ms. Rodriguez stated it began a few years ago.

There was no public comment on the motion.

Members Feng, Serrano, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Kanaani, Gladstone, Jones and Ward all voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed 9-0.

ii. Discuss and Possible Action of California Code of Regulations Section 2620.5

This agenda item is tied to this packet's Agenda Item E. revised June 12, 2019 meeting minutes that the Board approved today. On December 27, 2021, the final regulatory package to amend 16 CCR section 2620.5, Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program, was submitted to OAL for review. On February 4, 2022, OAL notified LATC staff that the text changes made after the Board's June 12, 2019, meeting were not clearly reflected in the minutes and carried through in the text. Additionally, OAL raised clarity concerns within the proposed text that would require a 15-day notice to the public of modified text. On February 8, 2022, the proposal was withdrawn from OAL, and staff worked with DCA LAD to prepare the necessary documents and issue the 15-day notice of modified text indicating changes to subdivisions (b), (c), (d), and (j).

Move to approve and adopt the proposed modified text for Article 1, Division 26, Title 16 Section 2620.5, direct staff to prepare and submit rulemaking documents to the Director of DCA and the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency for review, and if no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, authorize the EO to make any technical or nonsubstantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file.

Tian Feng moved to accept the motion.

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

There was no public comment on the motion.

Members Feng, Kanaani, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Jones, Serrano, and Gladstone voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Jones did not vote. Motion passed 8-0-1.

G. Executive Officer's Report – Update on Board's Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing and Enforcement programs

- The Business Modernization plan is moving along, and vendor bids to implement the software are being evaluated.
- Staff has experienced turnover as people leave for promotions and other opportunities. Management and staff have done a great job covering those positions.

- Ms. Zuniga will be attending a virtual outreach meeting with NCARB next month.
- She also described the charts on the last pages of her report.

Mr. Pearman asked if the two positions needed to implement the modernization plan were permanent or temporary. Ms. Zuniga responded that an LATC staff person will handle business modernization for LATC and the Board. The position is limited term, and an outside vendor will be used to partner with the State for implementation. All agencies that are implementing the program will share the cost.

Mr. Gladstone asked if future outreach is planned and Ms. Zuniga shared that she will update the Board members when she gets this information.

There was no public comment.

H. Update and Discussion of National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)

Ms. Kwan pointed out that most of the NCARB resolutions involve basic housekeeping; however, the Diversity Collaborative is important and will probably become a full-fledged committee. Ms. Feng asked the Board members to study the resolutions and they will be discussed at the May Board meeting. Ms. Zuniga shared that NCARB sent out a status update regarding NCARB culture and governance and will forward to Board members after the meeting.

There was no public comment.

K. Update on Committees

1. January 25, 2022, Communications, Professional Qualifications and Regulatory and Enforcement Committee Meetings

Ms. Zuniga shared that all committees met on January 25, 2022.

- Ms. Kanaani, Chair of the Communications Committee, felt the meeting was very productive from her standpoint of a newcomer. She mentioned that she is assembling a panel of small and large firms and principals to open a dialog among us. She is creating an agenda to share with committee members and will ask their opinion regarding the direction of the panel discussion of principals, licensees, and candidates.

Mr. Feng reminded the committees to remember the Strategic Plan priorities when formulating an agenda.

- Mr. Ward, Chair of the Professional Qualifications Committee, stated the meeting was short, and that it focused on action on Strategic Planning objectives. The main objective was a collaboration with LAD to implement AB 1010 and developing regulations. The next PQC meeting is scheduled next month.

Mr. Feng mentioned the committee needs to be part of the rulemaking process for AB 1010.

- Mr. Pearman represented the Regulations and Enforcement Committee and stated the committee discussed six possible items and narrowed them down to two or three items. The committee discussed how to get the ball moving on those topics.

Mr. Feng said that if the other committees also want to meet on March 30, 2022, to notify Ms. Zuniga.

There was no public comment.

L. Review of Future Meeting Dates

The next Board meeting will be held on May 20, probably in-person, in the Bay Area.

N. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m.