

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

December 7-8, 2011

San Diego, CA

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

President Pasqual Gutierrez called the Board meeting to order on December 7, 2011, at 9:09 a.m. Secretary Sheran Voigt called the roll.

Board Members Present

Pasqual Gutierrez, President
Marilyn Lyon, Vice President
Sheran Voigt, Secretary
Jon Alan Baker
Iris Cochlan
Fermin Villegas

Board Members Absent

Jeffrey Heller
Michael Merino
Hraztan Zeitlian

Guests Present

Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, The American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC)

Jon Wreschinsky, President, California Council American Society of Landscape Architects (CCASLA)

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Justin Sotelo, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
Marcus Reinhardt, Administration Analyst
Hattie Johnson, Enforcement Officer
Robert Carter, Architect Consultant
Don Chang, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

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

B. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Mr. Gutierrez welcomed everyone to the meeting. He stated the Board would be conducting regular business today and tomorrow the Board would be conducting strategic planning facilitated by Daniel Iacofano. Mr. Gutierrez briefly summarized the agenda items the Board would be discussing for members of the public.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Jon Wreschinsky, landscape architect and president of the CCASLA thanked the members of the Board present on behalf of the four CCASLA chapters and landscape architects in California for its efforts in relation to Senate Bill 543, which extended the sunset date for the Board and LATC.

Mr. Wreschinsky reminded the Board that CCASLA has previously raised the question about the issue of landscape architects stamping drawings submitted to the Division of the State Architect (DSA). He further stated that since there is a new State Architect, the CCASLA would again be raising the question to DSA.

D. APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2011 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Gutierrez called for a motion to approve the September 15, 2011, Board Meeting Minutes.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the September 15, 2011, Board Meeting Minutes.**

Marilyn Lyon seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

E. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Doug McCauley presented the Board members with a list of tentative dates for 2012 Board meetings which are: March 1; June 14; September 13; and December 5 - 6. Mr. McCauley also stated the March 1, 2012, meeting date was tentative pending the availability of Mr. Iacofano, the strategic planning session facilitator.

Mr. McCauley stated one of the objectives Mr. Gutierrez had when he first became president was to improve the production of the newsletter, which for various reasons (e.g., furloughs, staff vacancies, etc.) had declined. Mr. McCauley also stated that staff were on target for producing four newsletters this year with the latest issue (fall) in the final production stage at the DCA.

Mr. McCauley informed Board members the hiring freeze the Board has had to contend with the past few years was finally lifted. He advised that justifications for hiring will no longer need Cabinet level review, but can now be approved at the DCA level. He added this allows the Board to now begin filling long vacant positions to relieve workload issues.

Mr. McCauley reminded Board members one of the key objectives from the 2011 Strategic Plan was to have a liaison assigned to each of the various collateral organizations. He also stated that Board

members would be providing a report for their respective organization at the strategic planning session tomorrow. Mr. McCauley stated another objective for staff was to identify best practices and cost savings measures, which staff has already started implementing.

Mr. McCauley informed the Board the regulatory package pertaining to the repeal of the Comprehensive Intern Development Program (CIDP) has been sent to DCA to begin the review process. He briefly explained what the process involved before the package is submitted to the Office of Administrative Law.

F. ELECTION OF 2012 BOARD OFFICERS

Mr. Gutierrez asked Nominations Committee member Jon Baker to present this agenda item. Mr. Baker deferred the item to Mr. McCauley for presentation.

Mr. McCauley stated the recommendations from the Nominations Committee for the 2012 officers were: Marilyn Lyon for president; Sheran Voigt for vice-president; and Hraztan Zeitlian for secretary. He informed the Board it could approve the slate of candidates or develop its own slate of candidates.

- **Jon Baker moved to approve the recommended slate of officers for 2012.**

Fermin Villegas seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

G. SELECT THE 2011 OCTAVIUS MORGAN DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS

Mr. McCauley stated that this award, named after the first Board president, is given by the Board to recognize the dedicated volunteers who have helped with the examination or have served on committees. The Board reviewed this year's recommendations and identified three individuals to receive the award for 2011.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve that Denis Henmi, Phyllis Newton, and Richard Tannahill be awarded the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award for 2011.**

Iris Cochlan seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

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

The Board went into closed session in order to consider action on three disciplinary cases and closed session minutes. The Board took the following actions: 1) considered the Proposed Decision in the Matter of the Citation Against Phillip R. Felix; 2) considered the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order in the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against Scott Spencer; 3) considered the Settlement of Citation in the Matter of the Citation Against Office of Mobile Design, Jennifer Siegal; and 4) approved the September 15, 2011, Board meeting closed session minutes.

I. REVIEW AND APPROVE RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE RELEASE OF CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION (CSE) RESULTS

Mr. Gutierrez asked Justin Sotelo to present this agenda item.

Mr. Sotelo stated that at the previous two Board meetings there had been discussion about the release of CSE results to candidates. He stated historically, oral examination results had been released to candidates 30 days after the date of their examination, and periodically there were wait periods for results due to necessary statistical analyses. He added that it was now possible with the test vendor, Psychological Services, LLC (PSI), for results to be released to candidates at the test center immediately after their exam is finished.

Mr. Sotelo reminded the Board that at its September 15, 2011, meeting the Board voted to continue releasing results after 30 days until February 1, 2012, (one year after the launch of the computer-delivered examination), and then begin releasing results immediately to candidates at test centers. Additionally, he stated the Board asked staff to provide a recommendation at its December 7-8, 2011, meeting on the release of the CSE results based on the issues discussed at the September 2011 Board meeting. Mr. Sotelo informed the Board that staff met with the exam development vendor, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES), and due to the items/issues listed on the agenda item cover sheet, staff recommended beginning the immediate release of CSE results to candidates effective on June 1, 2012. He also added that periodic statistical analysis would still be required in the future which would occasionally cause CSE results to be held, but that candidates are made aware of this in the CSE Handbook and on the Board's website.

Mr. Gutierrez clarified the recommendation as presented by Mr. Sotelo as asking the Board to consider moving the implementation date of the immediate release of CSE results from February 1, 2012, to June 1, 2012. Mr. Sotelo confirmed Mr. Gutierrez' clarification as accurate.

Mr. Baker strongly disagreed with the recommendation and stated that there are numerous multiple-choice exams for certificate programs where the candidates receive their results immediately after finishing the exam. He indicated the CSE was different from the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) graphic divisions and does not believe the immediate release of CSE results should be postponed. He stated his belief that the information from the statistics is being over analyzed by the test vendor and unnecessarily delaying the release of CSE results to candidates. He opined that candidates should be provided results the minute they finish the CSE and it should commence immediately. Ms. Lyon agreed with Mr. Baker's conclusions and opinion and stated the process for immediately releasing results is taking too long.

Vickie Mayer explained that the vendor would have to complete some required programming to begin immediate release of CSE results and it could potentially be finished by February 1, 2012. She further explained that because of the timing for launch of the next new test form, the immediate release of CSE results would only occur for approximately 30 days before a new analysis phase would begin due to the release of the new March exam form, which will delay the release of CSE results for 60 to 90 days while the analysis is being performed. She suggested that if the Board did not wish to have the new test items analyzed, then it could be possible to begin the immediate release of CSE results February 1, 2012.

Mr. Baker asked why new test items, which are only released with every new version of the CSE, could not be introduced as nonscorable items during prior test administrations and separately analyzed for performance, thus allowing those items that do count to be scored more timely. Ms. Mayer explained that during each release of the CSE there are approximately 100 new scorable items and a certain number of nonscorable items, which must be analyzed. She added that the analysis process requires a minimum number of candidates before the analysis can be performed, after which the results can be released to candidates. She further explained that during the release of the first CSE test form, a pool of 400 candidates was necessary before conducting the analysis. Ms. Mayer stated there was an issue in reaching this amount of candidates and that created the delay. She added that the pool of candidates was reduced in the release of the second test form, but still required more than 60 days to complete the analysis due to issues that arose. Ms. Mayer further stated the next test form is scheduled for March 2012 and would also require an analysis phase.

Mr. Baker asked why the new form (Form C), which will be launching in March, could not use previously tested and analyzed questions from the previous test forms. Ms. Mayer explained that there are an insufficient number of items in the test item bank. She stated the plan was to launch Form A followed by Form B, and then concurrent with the release of Form C reintroduce Form A. She further stated, the Form A reintroduction may be delayed to allow the development of a sufficient candidate pool for the Form C statistical analysis. Ms. Mayer indicated that gradually a sufficient pool of test items would be developed and there could be a reduced need for future statistical analyses. She stated this approach was agreed to by the Examination Committee and PSI.

Mr. Baker asked how frequently the CSE is administered and how long a candidate must wait to retake the CSE should they fail. Mr. McCauley responded that the CSE is continuously administered and that candidates must wait six months before it may be retaken. He added this is similar to the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) ARE requirement. Mr. Baker also asked how over exposure could occur when candidates must wait at least six months between retakes and why were new test items not included as part of the pre-test to assist in developing the test bank. Ms. Mayer responded that new test items are being pre-tested during CSE administrations. She also informed the Board the number of candidates who are taking the CSE is declining, which can contribute to a longer analysis process.

Mr. Baker expressed his concerns about the process for how the CSE is being administered and cycled. He stated a better plan should have been developed for how new test items would be integrated with existing ones so it would be easier to initialize the immediate release of CSE results to candidates. Ms. Mayer explained that OPES stated the analysis may eventually no longer be necessary after a sufficient test bank had been developed and is performing adequately. Mr. Baker stated his displeasure with OPES for having initiated a process where entirely new test forms are being administered and a year later candidates still cannot get their results more timely.

Mr. Gutierrez asked how many times the release of CSE results could be interrupted by analysis should the Board delay the implementation of the immediate release of CSE results until June and is it conceivable the delay or the analysis could be eliminated altogether by that time. Mr. Sotelo responded that it is recommended an analysis be performed each time a new test form is released and depending on how the test bank develops and its performance, there may be a reduced necessity for analysis. Ms. Mayer added that staff could contact the vendor to see whether the analysis could be eliminated. She indicated, however, that there could arise potential issues related to scoring and test item performance.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that candidates may not necessarily be impacted by delay should the Board decide to wait until June for the immediate release of CSE results. He added that if the test vendor can grant assurances there would be no further delays after June 1, 2011, then the Board could show candidates how the CSE has evolved into a modern computer-delivered exam with no waiting for results (streamlining the licensing process) and is a vast improvement over the older format.

Kurt Cooknick posed two questions to the Board: 1) how would the Board communicate information about the immediate release of CSE results to candidates; and 2) what about reciprocity candidates for whom receiving a commission may depend on the immediate release of CSE results.

Mr. Gutierrez responded to Mr. Cooknick's second question by indicating there are alternate methods an individual can utilize to work on a California project such as partnering with a California licensee.

Mr. Baker made a recommendation that staff work with the test vendor to develop an improved process for implementing new test forms and test items to prevent future delays in the release of CSE results to candidates. He opined that a new process should allow for multiple forms to be simultaneously administered without the need to withhold results for statistical analyses. Ms. Mayer added that holding results is not unique to the CSE and that NCARB also does not immediately release test results.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to accept the recommendation to release CSE results on-site at the test centers beginning June 1, 2012, and request the test vendor to develop a process for future analysis of test items that does not create an interruption or delay in the release of results.**

Marilyn Lyon seconded the motion.

Mr. Cooknick stated the Little Hoover Commission just released a report about how the regulatory process in California is hampering business. He added that primarily candidates taking the CSE now have an expectation the CSE results should be immediately released when their exam is finished. He also added these types of candidates view the delay in releasing results an unnecessary artificial hindrance in obtaining their license and advancement.

Mr. Baker stated his disagreement with the motion. He added that the benchmark of "it's better now" is unacceptable. He noted the release plan developed by OPES is ineffective and a better plan which would have minimized or eliminated the delay to candidates for their results should have been implemented. He opined the delay to candidates was completely avoidable. Ms. Mayer explained that the vendor believed there would be a higher number of candidates testing in order to begin the statistical analysis. Mr. Baker further added that candidates are getting licensed in other states and later taking the CSE because of the artificial delays and the bureaucratic process in California.

Mr. Gutierrez offered an amendment to the motion "requiring" the test vendor to develop a process for future analysis of test items rather than "request." Marilyn Lyon accepted this amendment to the motion.

The motion passed 5-1 (Jon Baker opposed).

J. REPORT ON NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURAL REGISTRATION BOARDS (NCARB)

Mr. Gutierrez asked Mr. Baker to present this agenda item.

Mr. Baker reported that the NCARB quarterly meeting was held last week in New Mexico. He stated that as a regional director he also serves as the board liaison to the Committee on Internship and is also the co-chair for Intern Development Program (IDP) Advisory Committee. He further stated his responsibility for one of the NCARB long-range strategic issues related to continuing education (CE).

Mr. Baker reported that at the annual meeting last year a resolution was passed by the Member Boards to develop a model CE program at the NCARB level which could be recommended to individual state boards. He stated the recommendation would be for a specific type of CE (health, safety, and welfare) with a 12 hour minimum in order to provide consistency among the state boards' requirements. He added that currently requirements vary greatly from state to state and this creates a burden on licensees to track the individual state requirements when they are licensed in multiple jurisdictions. Mr. Baker further stated that NCARB has been working with The American Institute of Architects (AIA) to examine the quality of the CE programs and establish a minimum benchmark for the quality of health, safety, and welfare CE programs. Mr. Baker also reported that NCARB has been attempting to define their role in the process of developing a consistent national CE standard.

Mr. Cooknick asked whether the standardized CE requirement would be tied to licensing. Mr. Baker responded that it is unknown whether at the national level it would be tied to licensure. He did state however, that many states currently require CE as a condition of renewal. Mr. Cooknick added that Governor Brown recently vetoed the court reporters CE and took the position that CE is for those who wish to remain relevant and current in a profession. Mr. Baker stated the purpose of examining CE at a national level is to make it easier for practitioners to comply with state requirements.

Mr. Baker indicated that many architects conduct significant research into new methods, materials, and inventions when designing projects and opined that this is as much CE as any profession receives. He further opined that many CE programs are not rigorous or technically demanding. He stated that some of the issues being faced are how to make CE for architects meaningful, reasonable, and consistently applied.

Mr. Baker stated that in April 2012 NCARB will change the units of experience used in IDP from "training units" to hours. He further stated that the amount of hours for individual training areas within IDP will be changing slightly and that candidates who have not completed the required training units for a given training area will have to meet that training area's new hour requirements.

Mr. Baker reported that NCARB is budgeting to help states send delegates to the 2012 NCARB Annual Meeting. He also stated his frustration with the out-of-state travel situation. He indicated that this prevents opportunities for California representation at the NCARB annual meetings.

Mr. Baker reported that there have been numerous complaints regarding the fee increases to the IDP and ARE programs. He stated that NCARB has prepared a fee history which he is currently reviewing and will share with the Board at a later meeting. He further stated the IDP and ARE programs are heavily subsidized by the fees NCARB Certificate holders pay. He added that it would be cost prohibitive for candidates to charge the actual costs of program administration without

subsidization. He also stated that NCARB is working on methodologies to better balance program funding.

Mr. Baker reported the 2012 Practice Analysis (PA) will be mailed in April to approximately 80,000 recipients. He further reported the 2012 PA will not just be sent to licensees, but will also be sent to owners, developers, contractors, and educators. He added that a variation of the PA will be sent to the American Institute of Architecture Students for their input related to the National Architectural Accreditation Board's accreditation process and could serve as a vehicle for attempting to match the student experience with the accreditation process. Mr. Baker stated that changes to the ARE and IDP programs may result from the PA.

Mr. Baker reported on some general NCARB operations items. He stated the outreach conducted to state boards is an ongoing practice and that NCARB will be visiting every jurisdiction. He added that this provides NCARB with a better understanding of what occurs on the frontline. He also stated that many hours were spent rewriting the NCARB policies in an effort to streamline the process of policies which run NCARB. He added that NCARB is also developing business plans for each directorate, program, and service line which will include: 1) directorate, program, or service line function; 2) related constituency; 3) revenue generation methodology; 4) operational methodology; and 5) annual goals.

Mr. Baker reported that NCARB, in attempting to define its role in the profession of architecture, recently created a forward looking process called Horizon 2020. He stated that Horizon 2020 is presently developing its strategic plan for the multi-year process with the intention of collecting ideas and hosting discussion about how NCARB should present itself and what it does into the future.

K. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE (PQC) REPORT

Mr. Gutierrez asked Mr. Sotelo to present this agenda item.

Mr. Sotelo informed the Board that there has been an interest in understanding the Board's reciprocity requirement, more specifically having a better understanding of the Board's position with regard to the NCARB Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect (BEFA) program. He stated the BEFA program is a mechanism through which a foreign architect can receive an NCARB Certificate. Mr. Sotelo stated that in response to the interest and questions about BEFA, NCARB was invited to the Board's September 15, 2011, meeting to provide a presentation on the program. He further stated that Derek Haese, Assistant Director of Member Board Relations, provided a very comprehensive presentation which outlined the program requirements and process and stated more information was available in today's meeting packet and on the NCARB website.

Mr. Sotelo reported that 36 Member Boards accept the BEFA NCARB Certificate for licensure and 12 foreign architects have met the requirements and been licensed through the program. He informed the Board that staff was directed to return information about the program and to provide recommendations for implementing a structure to align it with NCARB's BEFA Program. He indicated that the social security number (SSN) requirement, while also a separate issue, is an additional obstacle for foreign architects who would like to become licensed in California. Mr. Sotelo also stated that the implementation options which the staff developed for the Board's consideration were: 1) pursue a regulatory proposal to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 121 to recognize NCARB Certification obtained via the BEFA Program (expanding

reciprocal licensure to candidates from countries other than Canada and the United Kingdom) and direct the PQC to develop the proposal with a recommendation to the Board; 2) direct staff to continue to evaluate and/or pursue a legislative proposal to recognize the Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN) in lieu of a SSN for purposes of licensure in California; and 3) further discuss and/or refine course of action with regard to the SSN exemption issue through a strategic plan objective.

Mr. Sotelo stated that a sample exemption to the SSN requirement was provided in the meeting packet for the Board's review should they opt to pursue legislation that would allow the acceptance of an ITIN in lieu of the SSN. Mr. McCauley stated that the acceptance of an NCARB Certificate through BEFA and the SSN requirement are not mutually exclusive issues. He further stated that the SSN requirement is not unique to California and added that several other states have a similar requirement. He added that most (11 of 12) of the individuals who have completed the BEFA process previously had an SSN. He further stated it would be in the Board's interest to pursue a regulatory amendment to create a licensure pathway for those individuals who possess an NCARB Certificate through BEFA. Mr. McCauley stated that the Board could separately address the SSN requirement on a parallel track with a different time sequence.

Mr. Gutierrez asked whether those individuals who have an NCARB Certificate through BEFA would be unable to get a California license without an SSN. Mr. Sotelo responded that under the current regulations California does not accept the BEFA method for obtaining an NCARB Certificate. Mr. Gutierrez clarified the issues before the Board as: 1) accepting BEFA; and 2) whether to pursue legislation for amending existing law related to the SSN requirement. He opined that it would be a positive step forward to begin accepting the BEFA, but indicated his reluctance to pursue changing the requirement for the SSN. He added that perhaps including the acceptance of the ITIN in lieu of the SSN for tax and family support compliance would be a better alternative to not requiring the SSN for licensure. Mr. Cooknick asked whether the ITIN would meet the requirements for both the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Mr. McCauley responded that FTB had reviewed the proposal and did not raise any concerns, but the IRS component is a federal issue. Mr. Baker added that the ITIN addresses the taxation issue, while the SSN allows an individual a greater access to government services.

Mr. Gutierrez summarized the staff recommendations for the Board members to consider and opined that staff should conduct additional research into the matter of whether an individual must have an SSN in order to work in California.

- **Jon Baker moved to pursue a regulatory proposal to amend CCR section 121 to allow the Board to recognize NCARB Certification obtained via the BEFA Program and to direct staff to continue evaluating and/or pursuing a legislative proposal to recognize the ITIN in lieu of a SSN for purposes of licensure in California.**

Sheran Voigt seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Baker reported on the AIACC, Academy for Emerging Professionals 2011 Architectural Education Summit. He stated that the goal of the summit started out as improving collaboration between the practice and education communities and incorporating candidate input into the process.

He further stated that Mr. Iacofano of Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman (MIG) facilitated what essentially was a strategic planning session whereby areas of overlap, commonality, and conflict were identified to address causal factors which are impeding collaboration. Mr. Baker stated the categories addressed by each of the committees were: 1) increasing diversity; 2) streamlining the licensure process; 3) reviewing barriers to licensure; 4) examining the current expanding definition of architecture; and 5) strengthening relationships with community college students. He stated one issue in particular that was a subject of debate was tiered licensure which he opined runs contrary to the concept of promoting the value of licensure. He further stated that other discussion topics included how to better integrate practice with education and co-op educational programs. Mr. Gutierrez opined that based on his review of the report from the summit, the alternate (non-degree) path to licensure California affords candidates is validated.

L. REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Gutierrez asked Hattie Johnson to present this agenda item.

Ms. Johnson stated that statistical reports have been provided to the Board at each meeting since December 2010 and reminded the Board that efforts have been undertaken to bolster the performance of the Enforcement Program since 2009. She reported that the enforcement tables in the meeting packet included closed cases for the reporting period from January 2011 until October 2011. She distributed an updated report that included data until November 2011. She said the reports show the number of cases that have been closed by category since the last Board meeting.

Mr. Baker asked why some citations listed in the statistical report that was provided took a year or more to close. Ms. Johnson explained that there could be a number of causes which affect the length a case is processed such as an inability to contact the subject of a complaint due to incorrect address information, failure of the subject to respond, or failure of the complainant to provide the necessary evidence. Mr. McCauley added that each case is different and the circumstances surrounding each case affect the amount of time it takes to close cases. Mr. Baker then inquired about a Statement of Issues case listed in the statistical report that took nearly a year to close. Ms. Johnson responded by explaining the process from the beginning to clarify the time frame for the case. Mr. Gutierrez proposed the statistical data be presented annually as opposed to each Board meeting. Ms. Voigt indicated that there have been other Board members who have requested such information be available at the quarterly Board meetings. Ms. Lyon inquired whether the data collection would be ongoing. Mr. McCauley responded the data collection would occur on a continuous basis with presentation annually as suggested by Mr. Gutierrez.

Mr. McCauley reported on informing planning departments of unlicensed practice issues regarding non-exempt projects. He stated that this was a 2011 Strategic Plan objective which initially was visualized as informal discussions with American Planning Association, California Chapter and the League of California Cities to make them aware of issues that have occurred where a project advances through several project review phases and ultimately when submitted to the building department is rejected because the project was non-exempt and required an architect. He added that the owner then incurs additional costs and delays to project. He further stated the Board later decided to develop a stronger approach whereby a communique would be sent directly to the individual planning departments. Mr. McCauley reminded the Board a letter was presented at the September 15, 2011, meeting and a decision was made to strengthen the letter and include additional constituencies and regulatory agencies. He informed the Board that California Building Officials

(CALBO), during a recent licensing committee meeting, expressed possible interest in a joint communiqué with the Board which would be sent to planning departments. Mr. Gutierrez stated that he had some comments regarding the letter which consisted of a minor edit and suggested adding a list of non-exempt projects in a more prominent location on the Board's website to assist consumers. Mr. McCauley asked the Board for clarification with regard to whom the letter would be distributed. He suggested sending the letter only to planning departments initially and gauging their feedback.

Marilyn Lyon moved to approve a joint letter with CALBO informing planning departments of unlicensed practice issues regarding non-exempt projects.

Sheran Voigt seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Gutierrez presented the next agenda item which included the review and approval of a proposed regulation to amend CCR section 103.

- **Sheran Voigt moved to approve the proposed regulation to amend CCR section 103, Delegation of Certain Functions and delegate authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the regulation provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.**

Iris Cochlan seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Johnson presented the next agenda item regarding the *Consumer's Guide to Hiring an Architect*.

Ms. Johnson reminded the Board that the current supply of the guide is nearly depleted and was last revised in 2004. She stated the guide has been reviewed by staff and revised taking into consideration common consumer questions and misinterpretations. She further stated the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee reviewed the revisions and made additional recommendations. She added that upon Board approval the guide will be published for distribution and available on the Board's website.

Mr. Gutierrez suggested the guide include in pertinent sections information regarding the 5,600 hour IDP requirement, flood hazard zones, and clarification of the differences between project costs and construction costs. Mr. Baker also suggested including information regarding the owner's responsibilities related to a project. Mr. McCauley stated staff would make the suggested edits as discussed and provide it to the Board president for review.

- **Jon Baker moved to approve the revised text for the *Consumer's Guide to Hiring an Architect* with the edits as discussed.**

Sheran Voigt seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

M. REVIEW AND APPROVE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVES TO FORMULATE COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGIES ON THE VALUE OF AN ARCHITECT LICENSE

Mr. Gutierrez asked Iris Cochlan to present this agenda item. Ms. Cochlan deferred to Marccus Reinhardt.

Mr. Reinhardt explained these objectives were part of the Board's 2011 Strategic Plan assignments for the Communications Committee. He stated one objective was to formulate a strategy to communicate the value of a license to schools and students, and the other objective was to formulate a strategy to communicate the value of a license to consumers with the additional component of conveying the importance of a written contract. He further stated that staff had conducted research and formulated recommendations which were presented to the Committee at its July 28, 2011, meeting and approved. He indicated the recommendations included: 1) expanding the scope of the biannual letters to schools and students; 2) expanding content of the Board's career website to include more information on the value of a license; 3) provide, via videoconference, lunch time presentations to schools; 4) email local chambers of commerce explaining the Board's objective and requesting their cooperation in communicating information to their membership; and 5) distributing copies of the *Consumer's Guide to Hiring an Architect* and the *Design Success* consumer tip information card to local building departments. Mr. Reinhardt asked the Board to approve the Committee's recommendations.

- **Marilyn Lyon moved to approve the Communications Committee recommendations for formulating strategies to communicate the value of an architect license.**

Sheran Voigt seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

N. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (LATC) REPORT

Mr. Gutierrez asked Trish Rodriguez to present this agenda item.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Board that the LATC had met on November 16, 2011, via teleconference. She highlighted some items from the meeting agenda, which was included in the Board meeting materials.

Ms. Rodriguez stated the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) held its 2012 elections and two LATC members were elected to positions. She informed that LATC member Stephanie Landregan was elected CLARB vice-president, and LATC member Christine Anderson was elected Region V Director.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Board that CLARB has a transition plan in-effect for the forthcoming change to the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) which will now become a fully computer-delivered four division examination. She advised that a regulatory amendment to CCR section 2614 related to exam transition is necessary. Ms. Rodriguez asked the Board to review and approve the proposed regulation amendment and delegate authority to the Executive Officer to adopt

the regulation, provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period, and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.

- **Iris Cochlan moved to approve the proposed regulation to amend CCR section 2614, Examination Transition Plan and delegate authority to the Executive Officer to adopt the regulation provided no adverse comments are received during the public comment period and make minor technical changes to the language, if needed.**

Sheran Voigt seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

O. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

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

President Pasqual Gutierrez called the meeting to order on December 8, 2011, at 8:34 a.m. Secretary Sheran Voigt called the roll.

Board Members Present

Pasqual Gutierrez, President
Marilyn Lyon, Vice President
Sheran Voigt, Secretary
Jon Alan Baker
Iris Cochlan

Board Members Absent

Jeffrey Heller
Michael Merino
Fermin Villegas
Hraztan Zeitlian

Guests Present

Kurt Cooknick, Director of Regulation and Practice, AIACC
Daniel Iacofano, Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc. (MIG)

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Justin Sotelo, Program Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Marccus Reinhardt, Administration Analyst
Hattie Johnson, Enforcement Officer
Robert Carter, Architect Consultant
Don Chang, Legal Counsel, DCA

Six members of the Board present constitute a quorum. There being five present at the time of roll, a quorum was not established and the Board met as a subcommittee.

Q. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

There were no public comments.

R. STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION

Mr. Gutierrez turned the meeting over to Mr. Iacofano who facilitated the Board's strategic planning session. The Board reviewed the accomplishments in 2011 and key trends in the profession. Mr. McCauley reported that the notable accomplishments for 2011 included the: 1) completion of the Board's Sunset Review; 2) starting the decommissioning process for CIDP; 3) successful launch of the computer-delivered CSE in February 2011; 4) reduction of Enforcement Unit caseload by 50% and case aging to within DCA specified time frames; and 5) successful completion of several major initiatives despite multiple budget mandates throughout the year in response to requests from DCA, the Department of Finance, and the Administration. Mr. McCauley also reported that there were several projects from the 2011 Strategic Plan which staff had accomplished in addition to legislative and other mandates. He stated other significant accomplishments included: 1) communicating the value of an architect license to consumers; 2) increased transparency with the implementation of electronic meeting packets; and 3) identification and development of best practices and cost savings measures.

Mr. Iacofano reported on the issues raised by key stakeholders during the individual interviews conducted in preparation for the session. He then assisted the Board as they identified and established goals for the upcoming year(s). The Board: 1) reviewed and updated the six goal areas of the Strategic Plan (Professional Qualifications, Practice Standards, Enforcement, Public and Professional Awareness, Organizational Relationships, and Organizational Effectiveness and Customer Service); 2) identified several objectives to meet these goals; and 3) established target dates for completion.

MIG will revise the Strategic Plan with the changes made during this session, and the Board will finalize the plan at its next meeting tentatively scheduled for March 1, 2012.

Because the Board met as a subcommittee, agenda items R1 (Review and Approve Implementation of Committee Procedures) and R2 (Finalize Action on Consolidation of Examination Committee and PQC) were deferred until the next Board meeting where a quorum of members is present.

S. REVIEW OF SCHEDULE

The Board selected the following dates in 2012 for Board meetings:

- March 1, 2012 (tentative)
- June 14, 2012
- September 13, 2012
- December 5-6, 2012

T. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.