



DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

June 11, 2021
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 June 11, 2021, Board President, Tian Feng, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and Secretary, Robert Pearman, called roll.

Board Members Present

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

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

Eddy Blane
Mark Christian, Director of Government Relations, American Institute of Architects, California (AIA CA)
Jon Wreschinsky, LATC Member

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)
Jane Kreidler, Manager, Administration Unit
Alicia Kroeger, Manager Enforcement Unit
Marccus Reinhardt, Manager, Examination/Licensing Unit
Darren Dumas, Examination/Licensing Analyst

(Continued)

Drew Liston, Board Liaison
Kim McDaniel, Administration Analyst
Kourtney Nation, LATC Special Projects Analyst
Rikki Parks, Staff Services Analyst
Michael Sganga, Enforcement Analyst
Stacy Townsend, LATC Enforcement Analyst

DCA Staff Present

Carrie Holmes, Deputy Director, Board and Bureau Relations
Michael Kanotz, Board Counsel, Attorney III
Heidi Lincer, Chief, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)
Tracy Montez, Chief, Division of Programs and Policy Review
Derek Nakamura, Information Technology Associate
Ruxandra Nunn, Research Data Specialist II, OPES
Bryce Penney, Television Specialist

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

Mr. Feng announced that 1) the meeting is being webcast and pursuant to the provisions of Governor Gavin Newsom’s Executive Order N-29-20, dated March 17, 2020, a physical meeting location is not being provided, and 2) Jon Wreschinsky, LATC member, is in attendance.

Mr. Feng and Board members acknowledged and thanked Pasqual Gutierrez for his distinguished years of service to the Board and architect profession. Mr. Feng shared that the Board has issued a letter of commendation.

Mr. Gutierrez expressed that it has been a rewarding experience and wished the members well.

There were no comments from the public.

C. Update on the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) – Carrie Holmes, Deputy Director, Board and Bureau Relations

Carrie Holmes, DCA’s Deputy Director for Board and Bureau Relations, provided the following update after thanking Mr. Gutierrez for his many years of service on the Board:

- Individuals interested in applying for the licensee Board position that will be vacated by Mr. Gutierrez at the end of June, may do so through the Governor’s appointments website or DCA Board member resources page.
- COVID-19 Update:

1. California will fully reopen on June 15, 2021.
 2. Existing mask guidance in place until June 15, 2021, when it will align with the Centers for Disease Control guidance for the public, however workplaces and some other settings may have different requirements.
 3. Presently, employees and visitors must still wear masks while at DCA locations.
 4. No definitive answer yet on when and how Boards may meet in-person again.
 5. DCA is looking into changes that can take place on a permanent basis for efficiency and employee well-being such as eliminating paper processes, maximizing telework, and utilizing remote meetings.
 6. Visit DCA's COVID-19 webpage for updates and resources on the state's reopening plans and public health guidance.
- 2021 is a mandatory sexual harassment prevention training year for Board members and all employees.
 - Newly appointed and reappointed Board members are required to attend Board member orientation training within one year of appointment or reappointment. The next training will be via WebEx on June 23, 2021, and registration can be accessed at the DCA Board member resource center at dca.ca.gov.
 - Two new DCA Initiatives have been launched to enhance services for Board and Bureaus:
 1. Executive Officer Cabinet has been maintaining regular communication, providing feedback and information to DCA, and assisting with special projects that impact all Boards and Bureaus.
 2. Enlightened Licensing Workgroup helps board and bureaus streamline and make their licensing processes more effective and efficient by using best practices, technology, and cost-saving measures. The workgroup is currently working with the Board of Registered Nursing.

Sylvia Kwan inquired about when DCA would have a definitive answer about fall 2021 Board meetings being allowed to be in-person. Ms. Holmes clarified that those meetings could be in-person and that the ability to continue with some remote options is what is uncertain. She shared that the State of Emergency and Executive Orders were not all being lifted on June 15, 2021, which means Boards may be able to continue with remote meeting and/or hybrid models and that DCA is looking into the best meeting models so that everyone is healthy, safe and comfortable.

Brett Gladstone sought clarification on the term "hybrid model" and Ms. Holmes shared this could mean some Board members attend the Board meeting in person or the public attends remotely and the Board meets in person. Ms. Holmes shared that one intent is to continue with increased public access and not sacrifice in-person Board camaraderie, and that it is not entirely clear what the law will allow at this point.

Robert Pearman inquired about the Enlightened Licensing Workgroup and whether it would work with every Board. Ms. Holmes indicated that ideally any Board or Bureau that wanted a deep dive into their processes should be able and that the timelines are unknown. She also indicated that Boards would benefit from lessons learned by the first Boards looking into their processes. In addition, Ms. Holmes clarified that the workgroup comprises individuals from Board and Bureaus, IT, the Organizational Improvement Office, and experts on various aspects of the licensing process.

Mr. Feng asked if the full Board could attend the Executive Officer Brown Bag meetings because he found the meeting helpful. Ms. Holmes indicated that Presidents were invited to one meeting, and it was so well received that the invitation has been extended. She shared that it may be difficult to have such a large group but could mention the topic for discussion.

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 February 26, 2021, Board Meeting Minutes

Nilza Serrano moved to approve the February 26, 2021, Board Meeting Minutes.

Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Gladstone, Gutierrez, Jones, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Ward and President Feng voted in favor of the motion.

F. Communications Committee Report

1. Update from March 25, 2021, Communications Committee Meeting

Laura Zuniga provided an update on the meeting including the two items the Board had referred for Committee discussion:

- Creating tutorial videos such as the ones created by LATC. The Committee approved creation of the videos.
- Revised Outreach Program objectives that the Board discussed at the February 26, 2021, Board meeting. The Committee discussed this item and

did not act but rather preferred to discuss and take action at an in-person meeting.

Ms. Zuniga shared that DCA provided an update on the Committee-related strategic plan objectives and that the Committee discussed meeting frequency and the desire to meet more often.

Mr. Feng, acknowledging that there may not be an opportunity to meet in person before the September strategic planning meeting, asked the Committee to meet and provide more specific recommendations for the Board to consider for strategic planning.

Ebony Lewis shared that the Committee discussed providing materials in Spanish to be more equitable and inclusive and Ms. Kwan supported the idea and asked if there are state guidance regarding translating materials into other languages. Ms. Zuniga shared there is a requirement, but it is not specific to our publications, and the Board will work with DCA on translation of materials. Mr. Feng asked that the Committee include translation services in its recommendations.

There were no comments from the public.

H. Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) Report

1. Presentation by the DCA Office of Professional Examination Services on the December 2020 Occupational Analysis of the Architect Profession

Heidi Lincer, DCA's Chief of Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) introduced Ruxandra Nunn, Research Data Specialist II, who provided a presentation on the [Architect Occupational Analysis of the Architect Profession](#). The presentation included an overview of OPES's function which is to provide exam consulting services for DCA's Boards, Bureaus, and Committees including the occupation analysis (OA) processes and results.

Licensure examinations provide a reliable method to identify those who can practice safely and competently with a focus on entry-level tasks and knowledge important for public protection. Subject Matter Experts (SME), selected by the Board to represent the profession in geographical location, experience, and specialty, provide input during test development.

The examination development cycle includes the OA, development of an exam outline, test item writing, item review, exam construction, and determining passing scores.

Now that the OA is complete, the next steps in the California Supplemental Exam (CSE) development include implementing a new CSE outline, review of the national examination, and a final report in June 2022. There is a chance that if the national examination is pushed back due to its OA, the timeline may need to change.

Mr. Feng sought information regarding the composition of the team's SME's. Ms. Nunn indicated that she is the main OPES test specialist who works with the Board-selected SME's. Ms. Nunn further clarified that the SME's are recruited and selected by the Board. Ms. Zuniga shared that SME's are not necessarily Board members or architect consultants and Marccus Reinhardt, Examination/Licensing Unit manager, elaborated on how their own SME's are selected. Mr. Reinhardt indicated that Board and committee members are not used in the process of selecting SME's.

Ms. Nunn shared that SME's sign security and conflict of interest agreements certifying they are not educators and do not teach architecture and have no affiliation with anything that would be a conflict of interest with developing the exam or the Board.

Ronald Jones asked about the discrepancy between the weights for the topic areas on the slides titled, Description of Practice Content Areas and CSE Content Areas. Ms. Nunn explained that slide 26 represents how often a particular content area, in this case, construction documents/permitting, is performed on the job. The weights differ from slide 27, which represents the proportion of test items on the topic area, because the SME's felt that other areas were more important to test on than construction documents/permitting.

Mr. Jones observed most of the architect practitioners appear to be in the category of residential architecture and it is those members of the practicing industry that oftentimes come before the Board for infractions. There is something to be learned from that, and whether the exam and education we provide them are designed for success in professional practice.

Ms. Serrano asked if demographic information and college/university attended are collected in the surveys. Ms. Nunn indicated that higher education institution information is not collected but could be included in the future. In terms of demographic data such as sex, ethnicity, and age, Ms. Nunn indicated that information is not collected, as it does not apply to what they are using the demographic questions for, but they can look into it in the future.

Sylvia Kwan stated that she wasn't aware of the extent that the CSE is coordinated with the ARE, and said she was pleased that OPES diligently coordinates with NCARB. Ms. Nunn said that every time an OA is performed, they review the ARE and look at their entire process including exam development

information, how they develop exams, forms, handbooks, and other examination information. We also provide recommendations such as educators should not be used in the exam process.

Ms. Kwan asked how many other states have a supplemental exam and Ms. Zuniga shared there are 13.

Mr. Gladstone inquired about the language(s) the CSE is administered in and whether there have been requests to have the examination given in other languages. Ms. Nunn shared the CSE is only administered in English and Ms. Lincer shared an overview of the process for a Board if it were interested in offering an exam in multiple languages.

Mr. Feng shared NCARB's approach to exams is that everyone, including foreign architects, must take the exam in English; however, stated it's a good idea for CAB to look at.

Mr. Gladstone asked if the Board could consider reaching out to students or their professors to determine if there will be demand for the CSE in additional languages. Ms. Zuniga shared that staff could conduct research including any requests we've received, what is entailed. the costs, and other boards' processes, with the goal of having data for the September strategic planning session.

Mr. Gladstone asked if there are any barriers with the CSE, moving beyond language, either psychologically or culturally faced by certain communities such as communities of color, to succeed and getting through the process. Ms. Lincer explained that OPES works with the Board to select SME's who are representative of the population of people who will be taking the CSE in terms of culture, ethnicity, and gender and editors also review items to address cultural differences.

Mr. Feng asked that the full Board be able to provide input on the subject areas of the CSE and include this in the September strategic planning session. Ms. Zuniga said she would follow-up with OPES indicating that there are specific requirements for the CSE to be valid and legally defensible.

Sonny Ward stated that given the Board's interest in a new Continuing Education (CE) requirement on conservation and the environment if it is permissible to include this as a subject area of the CSE. Mr. Ward further posited about having exam questions weighted that are in alignment with state regulations.

In response to an inquiry about the size of California's SME pool informing the CSE, the presenter shared there are many SME's.

There were no comments from the public.

2. Update from March 26, 2021, PQC Meeting

Mr. Gutierrez shared that the Committee approved October 2020 meeting minutes and discussed and approved recommendations for a proposed CE framework consistent with the 2019-2021 strategic plan objective to amend existing law regarding CE requirements for license renewal to reflect the revolving practice of architecture. Mr. Gutierrez indicated that the third item the Committee approved is a recommendation to endorse the intent of AB 1010 and to collaborate with AIA CA on zero net carbon design.

There were no comments from the public.

3. Discussion and Possible Action on Continuing Education Requirements

Mr. Gutierrez provided a presentation to assist the Board in formulating thoughts and perspectives to fulfill the PQC strategic plan objective which is to amend existing law regarding CE requirements for license renewal to reflect the evolving practice of architecture. PQC findings include that the current CE requirements are too narrow to keep pace with evolving contemporary practice to position the California architect to best serve consumers. The PQC assessment to expand learning programs will provide for greater inclusivity of diversified career architects serving multiple types of consumer interests. Mr. Gutierrez indicated that expanding CE subjects serves to foster a well-rounded practitioner that will refine and build upon the minimal levels of competency.

Mr. Gutierrez shared a draft CE framework comprised of four subject matter categories and the 12 learning units required which will align California with the majority of the 55 licensing jurisdictions in the nation. The four subject matter areas are: (1) Practice/Project Management – Construction and Evaluation (2) Climate Change, (3) Accessibility – Universal Design, and (4) Project Development/Documentation – Programming and Analysis. Mr. Gutierrez summarized the proposed four category CE framework sharing that it allows California's diverse architects with a flexible selection of subject matter topics that they would deem most relevant to their consumers and serves to keep pace with the evolving practice of architecture.

Mr. Gutierrez summarized the PQC has recommended a flexible framework representing an amendment to existing law to reflect evolving practice in architecture.

Mr. Gutierrez thanked numerous past and current PQC members for their dedication, ideas, and participation.

Ms. Kwan shared her experience on the critical role of the legislative process in establishing new CE requirements during the development of the disability access CE when its sponsor wanted to ensure it remained intact. Ms. Kwan shared that over the years the Board has been hesitant to make CE changes and she applauded the PQC and Mr. Gutierrez on making logical and needed CE standards. Ms. Kwan sought clarification on the approval process for the proposed CE framework. Ms. Zuniga stated the Board would need to go to the Legislature and before doing so, additional information needs to be provided.

Discussion ensued regarding sponsorship for the proposed CE framework and Ms. Zuniga mentioned that the sponsor of the current disability access CE could potentially have concerns if it were modified as proposed. Mr. Gutierrez provided additional context from the PQC meeting sharing they felt it important to expand the current disability access CE requirement to include a more diversified group of individuals that incur challenges beyond barrier-free design.

Mr. Gladstone shared that the PQC had discussion regarding the role of AIA CA and queried if there were legislators who were architects that may be interested in sponsoring the proposed expanded CE proposal.

Mr. Gutierrez suggested that maybe AIA CA could be approached to expand the subject-matter topics of AB 1010 which is solely focused on zero net design.

Ms. Zuniga concluded the discussion stating that if the Board moves forward with the proposed CE framework, the idea and requisite processes could be discussed during the strategic planning session later this year.

Mr. Feng clarified there was no need for a vote because the topic was being moved to the strategic planning session where something would be created for Board approval.

Public Comment

Mark Christian, AIA CA commented that the organization would like to work with CAB should it adopt the proposed CE framework. He shared that AB 1010 passed the Senate Business & Professions Committee earlier during the week and that it is too late in the process to amend.

Ms. Serrano questioned the discrepancies between the proposed number of CE units in slide deck versus the document in the packet. Mr. Gutierrez shared that the document in the packet was the material from the PQC agenda and not the final recommendation and that as a result of the meeting, the units were changed to capture the PQC discussion, represented in the slide deck.

G. Executive Committee Report

1. Update from May 7, 2021, Executive Committee Meeting

Mr. Feng commented formalizing the Board committee structure was the main topic of the Executive Committee (EC) meeting. He also indicated that Ms. Zuniga contacted NCARB to get information about the logistics and process for their resolutions.

Ms. Zuniga shared that NCARB had a resolution to modify their governance structure for their Board of Directors at its Regional Summit, and the board decided to table that resolution and not move it forward and would be getting a consultant. Ms. Zuniga indicated that there will be a second resolution going forward at the Annual Business meeting to modify term limits of regional directors and she had inquired if the tabled resolution could be offered as an amendment to the resolution that would be on the floor and the parliamentarian indicated that would be ruled out of order.

Ms. Kwan mentioned she has been receiving training to become a future Board member when her term begins in July. Ms. Kwan provided additional background information on the tabled diversity, equity, and inclusion resolution. She shared that that a third-party consultant would conduct education on the topic.

Ms. Serrano shared her frustration that the NCARB committee had worked two years on the matter and mentioned the EC had discussed sending a letter to NCARB expressing thoughts about this not being taken as a priority. Mr. Feng asked the Board to consider if sending a letter, what would be the objective knowing that procedurally it cannot change the outcome.

Ms. Kwan indicated that NCARB was surprised by the lack of input and that the letter could serve as notice that the national board should be deliberative that the resolution is well understood and passes next year. She shared that NCARB used the fact that they did not receive many responses to suggest people were uninterested in the issue; when, in fact, the opposite could be true since people expected to vote on the matter.

Ms. Zuniga stated if the Board does not want to move forward with a letter that another option could be to consider language for the next resolution. Ms. Kwan offered that the letter could reiterate the resolution and expand to clarify and strengthen it. Ms. Kwan stressed the need to get the letter to NCARB before they leave for the meeting on June 23, 2021.

Mr. Gladstone supported the recommendation to write the letter as it would show NCARB that it the whole Board was speaking and not just the two members of NCARB's Diversity Committee.

Mr. Feng supports sending a letter expressing disappointment and the inclusion of several recommendations as a way of moving forward.

Mr. Ward provided his thoughts that the letter should be specific to the motion that failed. Mr. Ward indicated a second issue is that California does not have proportional representation within NCARB and that it is a non-government organization with a huge amount of power over the profession in the country and in California. He said there are fundamental representational issues and that systemic racism and lack of diversity engrained in NCARB's process is the direct result of California not having representation.

Ms. Lewis agreed with Mr. Ward regarding representation.

Mr. Gutierrez said that numbers speak to NCARB and suggested gathering an assembly of consortium Boards who are like-minded to bring the issue to NCARB.

Mr. Feng offered that because it is not procedurally possible to revitalize the resolution there is no clear deadline for a letter and he is supportive if more time is needed to express views together with other states and jurisdictions.

Ms. Serrano expressed her support for the letter to be sent now and for the Board to also gather support.

Mr. Feng supported an immediate letter and another later with other Boards and jurisdictions.

Ms. Lewis indicated that statewide data should be included in the letter such as the proportion of the profession that California represents nationally.

Mr. Ward volunteered to serve on any committee related to this topic. Mr. Feng indicated the topic should be part of the Communications Committee. Ms. Zuniga offered that a special committee of the Board could be created for a nimbler approach to the issue.

Public comment.

Jon Wreschinsky, LATC Chair commented that LATC has similar issues with CLARB regarding no California representation on the executive board or board of directors. Mr. Wreschinsky shared that LATC had shared concern regarding CLARB's work on a uniform standard for licensure and that he applied to serve on CLARB's board. He was interviewed and was offered to serve on the nomination committee, precluding him from serving on the board. and making him nominate other individuals to serve on the board. He withdrew his acceptance of that position.

2. Discussion and Possible Action on Revisions to the Board's Committee Policy

Ms. Zuniga reported on the EC discussion to review the policy on committees. She provided an overview of the current Board committees and shared the modifications approved are: (1) establish term limits, (2) increase meeting frequency to twice a year, (3) committees provide reports once per year, and (4) alignment with the strategic plan.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Gladstone inquired about the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee and Ms. Zuniga shared that it was not included on today's meeting agenda because there has not been a meeting since the February 2021 Board meeting. She indicated that REC completed its strategic plan objectives. REC chair, Mr. Pearman, shared that the committee will meet again once any relevant activities are established with a new strategic plan.

I. Update and Possible Action on Legislation:

1. AB 107 (Salas) Licensure: Veterans and Military Spouses

Ms. Zuniga stated this bill made it out of the Assembly and is now in the Senate and would require each Board within DCA to issue temporary licenses to a spouse of someone who is on active duty in the military. Ms. Zuniga shared while some Boards already issue temporary licenses, CAB does not. She indicated that a remaining question with the bill is whether temporary licensees would be required to take the CSE as the language is not clear on the matter and that this should be addressed at its next committee hearing. CAB does not receive many applications from candidates eligible for expedited licensure so there would not be a significant impact on the Board.

Mr. Gutierrez shared that if there is a possible 30-day reciprocity exemption of the CSE, the integrity of the licensure process would be undermined, and Ms. Serrano agreed. Ms. Zuniga stated that concern has been raised--not just by this Board--anyone receiving a temporary license needs to meet the same requirements as regular applicants.

In response to a query about whether an applicant for a temporary license would need to pass a test, Ms. Zuniga clarified that the applicant would be required to be licensed in another jurisdiction.

2. AB 646 (Low) Department of Consumer Affairs: Boards: Expunged Convictions

Ms. Zuniga shared that while this bill is included in the meeting packet, it did not make it out of the Appropriations Committee and will monitor whether it becomes active next year.

3. AB 1010 (Berman) Architects: Continuing Education

Ms. Zuniga presented that this bill, sponsored by AIA CA, will require a new CE requirement on zero net carbon design and that the Board was given a presentation in December 2020 by AIA CA on the bill.

Mr. Gutierrez commented that the narrow definition of CE coursework as zero net carbon design in AB 1010 does not embrace other critical subject matter topics of climate change such as resilience, adaptation, and environmental justice.

Ms. Zuniga shared that the bill was recently amended to provide the Board more time to adopt the regulations that the bill would require, and the requirement would start beforehand.

4. SB 607 (Roth) Professions and Vocations

Ms. Zuniga presented that this Business and Professions Committee omnibus bill contains language that would allow LATC to begin fingerprinting next year. She mentioned that the Board started fingerprinting applicants this year; however, implementation language for LATC was unsuccessful last year and their requirement was postponed a year. Ms. Zuniga indicated the issues of concern with the Attorney General's Office were resolved and revised language is now in the bill.

Public comment.

Mr. Christian, AIA CA, shared the organization is working to ensure that those applying for temporary licenses under AB 107 need to take the CSE. He offered to answer questions regarding AB 1010.

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

1. Update and Discussion of Committee Meetings

Ms. Zuniga presented that NCARB recently announced appointments to committees for next year and asked members to send her information on their committees, if any.

Mr. Feng shared that he was appointed to the Certificate Alternative Review Committee/Review Team and the Future Committee.

Mr. Ward shared that he was appointed to the Credentials Committee.

Ms. Serrano shared that she did not apply to any committees but is happy to serve wherever needed. Ms. Kwan indicated that Ms. Serrano is on the Diversity Committee.

Ms. Kwan shared that she had not received a formal notification; however, she is a member of the Diversity Committee and the Regional Leadership Committee, comprised of the leaders for each region.

Mr. Feng expressed that he shared his interest in serving on the Diversity Committee and NCARB informed him the Diversity Committee was heavily comprised of California's region.

2. Review of 2021 Annual Business Meeting Agenda

Ms. Zuniga shared the agenda is in the packet so that members are aware of discussion items and that Board members were still able to register to attend virtually.

Ms. Kwan encouraged members to attend the WestCARB (Region 6) meeting on Saturday, June 26, 2021, 8:00 a.m. PST. She shared that there will be opportunities to participate on WestCARB committees. Ms. Kwan indicated that Mr. Pearman was a member of the Bylaws Committee, and they still need volunteers for the Education Committee.

3. Discuss and Take Action on Candidates for 2021 NCARB Board of Directors

Ms. Zuniga stated that NCARB materials for each candidate were not ready yet and did not believe that any officer positions were contested. She suggested the Board consider doing what it did last year and defer the voting decision to the Board's delegate, Mr. Feng.

Mr. Feng indicated that candidate resumes, and materials just aren't ready yet.

Mr. Gutierrez shared that NCARB Model Law will serve as an updated national model and enhance resources for jurisdictions/Boards to adapt or adopt at their choosing as they update their Acts, processes, and regulatory frameworks. He indicated that approval of the resolution does not require member board laws and regulations to be identical to these provisions. Mr. Gutierrez said the Model Law allows for experience to be represented as education which would keep in alignment with California's Table of Equivalents. It also allows boards to have supplemental exams, thus the fabric of California's licensing process was preserved in NCARB's Model Law.

Mr. Feng sought confirmation that a vote in support of NCARB's Model Law does not preclude the Board to adopt or not adopt the Model Law as a jurisdiction. Mr. Gutierrez clarified that a vote in favor of the new NCARB Model Law would sunset the old Model Law.

4. Review May 2021 NCARB Special Meeting and Resolution 2021-01 NCARB Bylaws Amendment – Remote Meetings

5. Review and Approve Credential Letter

The Board voted to approve Mr. Feng as the voting delegate and Ms. Serrano as the alternate.

Robert Pearman moved to approve Mr. Feng as the voting delegate and Ms. Serrano as the alternate.

Sonny Ward seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Gladstone, Gutierrez, Jones, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Ward and President Feng voted in favor of the motion.

6. Review, Discussion, and Possible Action on 2021 Resolutions

Ms. Zuniga shared that the Board could vote on each resolution or defer the decision to the voting delegate. She indicated that the resolutions were not controversial and there is one resolution which modifies board governance by changing term limits for regional directors from three to two years.

Mr. Feng sought input from the Board regarding how they wanted to proceed and if they preferred to go through each resolution.

- a) Resolution 2021-02: *NCARB Certification Guidelines* Amendment – Qualifications for Education Alternative
- b) Resolution 2021-03: *NCARB Certification Guidelines* Amendment – Qualifications for Foreign Alternative
- c) Resolution 2021-04: Sunset of Resolution 2000-1 (Opposition to Interior Design Licensing)
- d) Resolution 2021-05: Amendment and Restatement of the *NCARB Legislative Guidelines and Model Law/Model Regulations*
- e) Resolution 2021-06: Omnibus Sunset of Resolutions in Conflict with Current Council Policies
- f) Resolution 2021-07: *NCARB Bylaws* Amendment – Director Term Limits
- g) Resolution 2021-08: Member Board Dues Reduction

K. Executive Officer's Report – Update on Board's Administration / Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs

Ms. Zuniga presented the Executive Officer's Report (EO Report), which was prepared in a new format, and shared highlights including:

- Business modernization, although not included in the written EO Report, CAB has completed stage 2 of the process and expects to go out for proposals later this year.
- Outreach – The Communication Analyst who had been reassigned full time for COVID-19 contact tracing will be returning to the Board.
- Telework – majority of staff continue to telework.
- Regulations - Priorities are the retired license fee, and CE disability access reg packages.
- ARE – Board previously discussed getting additional demographic data on test-takers and NCARB is working on creating individual state-level reports. This information can provide insight for outreach and messaging.
- Enforcement – number of complaints down over the prior year, which was higher than normal which is about 300 complaints per year.

Mr. Gladstone inquired about the budget and whether the funds borrowed to offset the state budget would be returned since there is a surplus in the state budget. Ms. Zuniga shared that the Legislature is required to pass a budget by June 15th and once the details are available, she will provide members with an update on whether the funds will be repaid.

There were no comments from the public.

L. Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Report

1. Update on April 29, 2021, and May 25, 2021, LATC Meetings

Trish Rodriguez announced that LATC held two meetings, April 29, 2021, and a special meeting on May 25, 2021, and presented highlights. She informed members that during the April 29, 2021 meeting proposed regulations to adopt waiver of fees for licensure upon declaration of an emergency was approved by the Committee.

Karen Halbo, Board Regulations Attorney, provided the following edit to section 2650, subdivision c: "shall include proof" changed to "shall require proof" and removed a comma from subdivision d (4).

2. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Regulations to Adopt California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2651, Regarding Waiver of

Fees for Licensure, Renewal, or Replacement of License Upon Declaration of Emergency.

Nilza Serrano made a motion to approve the proposed regulatory changes, as modified, direct the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, authorize the Executive Officer to make any technical or non-substantive changes to the rulemaking package, notice the proposed text for a 45-day comment period and, if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, adopt the proposed regulatory changes, as modified.

Sony Ward seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

Members Gladstone, Gutierrez, Jones, Kwan, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, Ward and President Feng voted in favor of the motion.

Ms. Rodriguez shared that the California State Water Resources Control Board provided a presentation for LATC regarding the qualified stormwater pollution prevention plan developer (QSD) certification requirements. She indicated that the special meeting held on May 25, 2021, was to provide input on the Landscape Architectural Accrediting Board diversity, equity, and inclusion 2021 accreditation standards. Ms. Rodriguez shared that Mr. Jones is the new Board liaison for LATC.

There was no public comment.

M. Review of Future Board Meeting Dates

Mr. Feng mentioned the next Board meeting will be in Sacramento on September 9-10. The second day will be the strategic planning session on the second day. Ms. Kwan agreed that hosting the September Board meeting in Sacramento would be easiest in terms of travel and familiarity with the location.

Mr. Feng and Ms. Zuniga reminded members the September Board meeting is two days to accommodate strategic planning.

Members discussed hosting the December 10, 2021 meeting in-person in Northern California at either the Frank Lloyd Wright Civic Center or the College of Marin. Ms. Kwan agreed to host a dinner Thursday night before the December Board meeting.

There were no public comments.

N. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.