



**MEETING MINUTES
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
(Items are taken out of order due to Business needs)**

December 9, 2022
Stanford University

ITEMS ARE PRESENTED IN THE ORDER THEY WERE DISCUSSED, AS SOME WERE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER.

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

On December 9, 2022, Board President Tian Feng called the meeting to order at 10:05 and Secretary Brett Gladstone called the roll.

Board Members Present

Tian Feng, President
Charles "Sonny" Ward, Vice President
Malcolm "Brett" Gladstone, Secretary
Ebony Lewis
Mitra Kanaani
Nilza Serrano
Robert Pearman (arrived late to meeting)
Ronald Jones
Sylvia Kwan (arrived late to meeting)

Six members of the Board present constitutes a quorum. Seven members were present at the beginning of the meeting; a quorum was established.

Guests Present:

John Barton, Stanford University Architectural Design Program
Jon Wreschinsky, Landscape Architects Technical Committee Chair
Janis Kent, American Institute of Architects California (AIA CA)
Mark Christian, AIA CA, former Director of Government Relations
Ida Clair, Department of General Services, Division of the State Architect
Scott Terrell, AIA CA Director of Government Relations

Board Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer
Drew Liston, Board Liaison

DCA Staff Present

Michael Kanotz, Board Counsel
Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel

B. PRESIDENT’S PROCEDURAL REMARKS AND BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

President Feng welcomed LATC Chair, Jon Wreschinsky, to the meeting as well as members of the public. Board Member Mitra Kanaani reflected on the last couple of months working on the Communication Committee, and congratulated President Feng for receiving a prestigious award, the President’s Medal of Distinguished Service from the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). Ms. Kanaani stated that she has worked with President Feng for many years and said he was very supportive of many great causes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

C. UPDATE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS (DCA)

Brian Clifford, DCA Senior Planning and Implementation Manager, provided the following update:

- Governor Newsom has appointed new DCA staff members. Deputy Director, Board and Bureau Relations Melissa Gear was appointed in September 2022 and Assistant Deputy Director, Board and Bureau Relations Yvonne Dorantes was appointed in October 2022.
- Catherine Nichols was appointed Chief of the Division of Investigation in December 2022.
- Director Kirchmeyer established the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, (DEI) Committee to guide the Department in its DEI effort. The Committee held its first meeting in November 2022.
- DCA released its 2022-2027 Strategic Plan on November 2, 2022. At the same time, DCA revealed its new logo.
- The “Our Promise” campaign continues with DCA encouraging charitable donations.
- DCA’s travel update included a reminder that ALL DCA travel must be made through the Cal Travel Store and must be the least expensive option available. Flight or travel changes that are made for personal convenience will be paid by the Board Member.

Jon Wreschinsky asked about the Division of Investigation’s focus. Mr. Clifford responded that it investigates the more serious complaints or criminal situations. Nilza Serrano asked if the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee was for internal or external operations. Mr. Clifford stated it would focus on both staff and consumer protection.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

Q. Division of State Architect’s Special Report

Ida Clair, State Architect, presented the report which included a history of the Division of the State Architect (DSA). She said that DSA focuses on education, safety, regulatory compliance for public schools and colleges, access compliance and enforcement, and offers several free online educational and continuing education courses. Ms. Clair mentioned that one of the more important courses offered is the Certified Access Specialist, (CAS) course. California access requirements are more stringent than Federal laws and more successful. DSA is available to serve the public with educational opportunities. Ms. Clair said that DSA seeks to be collaborative with the California Architects Board in educational and regulatory opportunities.

Robert Pearman commented that we need to incentivize the educational providers to offer more robust accessibility learning. A general discussion about CASp and its educational challenges ensued. Sylvia Kwan mentioned this designation is difficult and special. Brett Gladstone inquired about a law that requires a CASp study for a new commercial building and asked Ms. Clair to clarify if the law is statewide or local. Ms. Clair responded that the law is statewide.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Janis Kent, AIA, commented that she is a CASp instructor, and the State doesn't differentiate between Title 2 or Title 3 entities. All State buildings are Title 2 and have different access parameters. Architects working on a Title 2 need to understand that they need to follow State and Federal regulations.

Paul Menard, AIA, thanked Ms. Clair for her presentation and her time.

M. Discuss and Possible Action on Modified Proposed Regulatory Text for CCR Title 16, Division 2, Article 5, Section 135 (Public Presentments and Advertising Requirements) and Proposed Responses to Public Comment

President Feng stated that this issue deals with the importance of public presentments and advertising that must include a licensee's number. Mr. Feng continued that this issue has drawn much public comment and that the Board wants to respond carefully. This topic has been on the agenda nine times to take action. Mr. Feng ended by saying that he hopes a decision will be made today and turned the item over to Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, to explain.

Ms. Halbo began by stating there has been a push by DCA to have greater disclosure of regulation of DCA boards and that included adding information to public presentments. She continued by saying that she has received many comments and that this Board is responsive to hearing it. She then explained that time was of the essence because if this isn't approved today the Board would have to begin the rulemaking process again, which would be exceptionally time consuming.

Mr. Gladstone asked how many disciplinary actions against people practicing architecture without a license have occurred? Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer, replied that she didn't have those numbers at hand, but that it was not a large

number. Ron Jones said he felt that in many cases the remedy would be educating the person who advertised as an architect without a license. Once they understood the law, it would be unlikely for the unlicensed activity to occur again since there was no initial malice involved.

Nilza Serrano reminded the Board that most of the public comments came from architects and not the public and that we are first a consumer protection agency. Ms. Kwan detailed the complexity and cost to various firms, large or small, and felt this was just the tip of the iceberg and would be far more in-depth than imagined. Mr. Gladstone said that any change is usually resisted to those in the profession, and repeated the Board is a consumer protection agency. He offered some alternate wording for the item that would have a five-year period where those found in violation of the rule where there would not be penalties, just letters of advisements. Mr. Gladstone stated that he was an advocate for the consumer and not the business owner. He did state that he felt that having a license number in social media was an interesting example where compromises should be found.

Mr. Jones voiced his concern over various challenges to the proposal and reiterated that the Board's first job is consumer protection. Mr. Pearman stated that maybe staff should bring this back next year. Ebony Lewis commented that the more people see the license number, the more the consumer becomes educated. Mr. Gladstone said CAB staff should talk to the LATC staff to see what their experience has been. LATC Member Wreschinsky mentioned that LATC preferred to protect the consumer first and that is why it moved forward with this type of regulation. Mr. Feng stated that our mission is the health, safety and wellbeing of the public. The conversation continued regarding other licensed professions and that data should be obtained regarding this type of rule.

Tian Feng made a motion that the Board table this regulation until we have enough data to move forward.

Robert Pearman seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Menard, AIA, started by thanking the Board for their service. He continued by reading two letters into the record.

Letter 1:

Dated December 1, 2022

Tian Feng, FAIA

President, California Architects Board

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105

Sacramento, CA 95834

Regarding: Request for Agenda Item M (CCR 135) not to be Advanced in the Regulatory Process

Dear President Feng:

The above components of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) respectively ask the California Architects Board (CAB) not to approve advancement to the regulatory process the regulation proposed under Agenda Item M. The growing awareness of CCR 135 among licensed architects has caused significant concern to be expressed about the assumptions made regarding the proposed regulation, the impact it will have on licensed architects, and the presumed benefit to the public.

Concerns raised by our Members include:

Assumed Marketing Costs of \$100

The Initial Statement of Reasons assumes "licensees needing to update existing marketing materials (i.e., business cards, letterhead, contracts, forms, etc.) may incur one-time set-up printing costs up to \$100."

We have been told by our Members that these costs will exceed the assumed \$100. The cost to design and print new business cards and letterhead, and other marketing materials (i.e., monographs, brochures, etc.) will be significantly higher than \$100. Additionally, we assume the business cards of non-licensed staff of architectural firms would have to be redesigned and reprinted, which further drives up the cost-per-architect assumption.

Focus on Unlicensed Individuals

This proposed regulation was formed during discussions on how to protect consumers from unlicensed individuals. We believe exploring steps to stop the illegal advertising of architectural services by unlicensed individuals should remain the focus of the CAB in protecting consumers from services being offered illegally by unlicensed individuals. CCR 135 attempts to protect consumers from unlicensed individuals by solely placing a new requirement on licensed architects, subject to disciplinary action and fines for failure to follow the proposed advertising regulation.

CCR 135 Lacks Clarity

Licensed architects would be expected to fully comply with the proposed advertising regulation or be subject to disciplinary action and fines. Some forms of advertising clearly fall within the scope of CCR 135, such as business cards and letterhead; each of these would have to include the name of a licensed architect and a license number.

However, there is a lack of clarity of how it applies to other forms of "advertisement." For example, would all emails from an architect's work email have to include the architect's license number, or all social media posts about a project have to include a license number? We believe any regulation covering the advertising and marketing of architectural services, and how it will be enforced, are not fully defined and explained and therefore should not be adopted.

Could Encourage the Illegal Use of a License Number

As we have seen with general contractors, those who illegally offer and provide contractor services routinely use false contractor license numbers, either a number that is randomly generated or one that is stolen from a licensed contractor. Furthermore, by the widespread advertising of license numbers on electronic and printed material, we are concerned CCR 135 will result in the same with the illegal offering of architectural services.

To be clear, we fully support the primary purpose of the CAB, to protect consumers. However, we question if CCR 135 will accomplish its anticipated benefit to consumers as expressed in the Initial Statement of Reasons. It is for this reason we ask the CAB to not approve advancement of the regulation proposed under Agenda Item M to the regulatory process.

AIA
California

www.aiacalifornia.org

Letter 2:

Dated December 1st, 2022

Mr. Liston

Our firm of 170 people and 40 licensed architects wishes to, once again, oppose CAB's advancement to the regulatory process the regulation proposed under Agenda Item M. CAB has previously received opposition letter(s) from our firm as well as in-person testimony. Additionally, we are concerned about the exclusive nature of this pivotal board meeting - excluding the opportunity for a virtual meeting undoubtedly reduces the ability for active participation of the licensed architects in the state. Specifically:

- The assumed costs of marketing materials is severely underestimated.
- We believe that regulating licensed professionals does nothing to regulate the unlicensed individuals marketing themselves as "architects." Focus should be placed on those unlicensed individuals and stopping their misrepresentation.
- CCR 135 is difficult to implement and unclear. We are very concerned about representing our firm's 40 licensed architects under a single license number. We have many of our Principal Architects act as the Architects of Record on projects – we do not wish their license representation to be in conflict with the license that appears on the firm's business collateral. And on business cards – is it the individual's license number or the firm representative that is referenced?
Architectural licenses are issued to individuals, not firms. A single license should not represent a firm unless you intend to license firms as an entity under a separate licensing mechanism.

We agree with the intention to protect consumers from unintentionally hiring unlicensed professionals. We do not believe the proposal will accomplish this goal but will place undue burden on the licensed professionals of this state. We ask that CAB does not advance Agenda Item M to the regulatory process and that our opposition be read into the record. We appreciate the consideration of the Board in this matter.

Thank you.

Laura Knauss | AIA | LEED AP | ALEP | Principal
She/Her/Hers

Janis Kent, FAIA, CASp, stated we are all concerned about people fraudulently stating they are architects. Architects, consumers, and the Board is concerned. There is an added concern that the public does not understand what an architect does or provides. Our profession is licensed like any other profession. However, the license is a personal license--not a company's license. The public is not educated enough about the profession and when they need an architect. Even when getting a building permit, they don't realize they will need an architect. She mentioned her website, her blog and her business are all online, yet are not advertisements. She stated that she puts her license number on every plan, proposal or document required for my work and mentioned there is a website where you can check on a person's license. All this makes this regulation unnecessary. This rule just seems like we trying to prove the Board is doing something. Ms. Kent ended by offering to work with the Board next year if the regulation comes up again. She also said she believes one of the solutions is educating the public.

Mr. Feng called for a vote on his motion. Mr. Gladstone indicated that he was not ready to vote but agreed with much of what AIA had presented. Mr. Gladstone reminded the Board that the reason they were here is to protect the public. A general discussion among the Board ensued regarding the effect of tabling this regulation. The overall effect is that it would kill the proposal and require the whole process to start over next year. Sonny Ward indicated that a vote to table it was a vote against the rule.

PUBLIC COMMENT WAS REOPENED

There was no public comment.

THE MOTION IS TO TABLE ITEM M.

Board Members Feng, Kanaani, Kwan, Jones, Pearman and Ward voted in favor, Member Gladstone voted no, and Members Lewis and Serrano abstained. Motion passed 6-1-2.

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

- 1. Perform the Annual Evaluation on the Executive Officer.**
- 2. Deliberate and Vote on Disciplinary Matters**

Closed session convened at 12:35 p.m.

The Board reconvened Open Session at 1:37 p.m. with the following members present:

Tian Feng
Sonny Ward
Robert Pearman, Jr.
Brett Gladstone
Ronald Jones
Mitra Kanaani
Ebony Lewis
Nilza Serrano

N. REVIEW OF FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES

Laura Zuniga mentioned the upcoming year’s meeting dates. She talked about the difference in holding a teleconference versus in person meetings. A schedule of planned meetings and events for 2023 are as follows:

Date	Event	Location
January 27	LATC Meeting (cancelled)	TBD
February 24	Board Meeting	TBD
April 14	LATC Meeting	TBD
May 19	Board Meeting	TBD
August 11	LATC Meeting	TBD
September 8	Board Meeting	TBD
November 3	LATC Meeting	TBD
December 1	Board Meeting	TBD

E. Election of 2023 Board Officers

Mr. Feng invited the Nominating Committee to present this item. Mr. Pearman stated that the proposed slate is Charles Ward, President; Ron Jones, Vice President; and Brett Gladstone, Secretary.

Sylvia Kwan moved to approve the slate as read by Mr. Pearman. Mr. Feng encouraged comments. Mr. Gladstone thanked President Feng for his years of service. Sonny Ward commented that he was honored to be nominated and that he will serve with transparency and active communication while carrying out his duties. He continued that he would focus on equity and inclusion during his tenure and will maintain his focus on protecting the consumer.

President Feng made the motion to elect Sonny Ward for President.

Brett Gladstone seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

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

President Feng made the motion to elect Ron Jones for Vice President Sonny Ward seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

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

President Feng made the motion to elect Malcolm “Brett” Gladstone for Secretary.

Ron Jones seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

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

P. Presentation on Stanford Architectural Design Program

John Barton, Director of Stanford University’s Architecture program provided a presentation. His presentation focused on the school’s vision for agency, belonging and wellbeing. His presentation included excerpts of the program’s history, mission, curriculum, pedagogy, impact, and goals. Highlights of his presentation included:

- The program is young and was founded in the early 2000s.
- The program is disproportionately female.
- Mental and Planetary Health are the two main issues of the time.
- Stanford seeks to be the healthiest program available.
- The program focuses on the wellbeing of the student first.
- He offered the school’s strategic goals which included providing students an education that allows them to further their lives by giving them opportunities of the future grad school or career of choice.
- To be the healthiest program at Stanford on personal, programmatic, and planetary levels.
- Be a beacon for change in architectural education.

Mr. Barton then took questions. Ms. Serrano asked about the school’s demographics. Mr. Barton related that his program was one of the most diverse on campus. Ms. Kanaani asked how or if the program was able to implement an

interdisciplinary approach? Mr. Barton responded that they are always open to interaction and involvement in different areas of study and that the school was working on it. Mr. Gladstone commented that he is impressed that the school was so concerned about the students' wellness. He continued by asking why the school was focusing on racism and not the other protected classes. Mr. Barton replied that the school is looking to improve the focus on the other protected classes.

D. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Mark Christian, AIA CA, congratulated Mr. Ward, Mr. Jones and Mr. Gladstone on their new positions. He continued by saying he was honored to have worked with such a great Board. Mr. Christian then introduced Scott Terrell, the new AIA CA Director of Government Relations. He will be the new representative from the AIA. Mr. Terrell said he is looking forward to working with the Board.

F. Review and Possible Action on Board Meeting Minutes

President Feng opened the item asking for comments. There were none.

Nilza Serrano moved to approve the September 16, 2022, Board Meeting minutes.

Mitra Kanaani seconded the motion.

Members Feng, Jones, Ward, Pearman, Gladstone & Kanaani voted in favor, Members Lewis and Serrano voted against, and Member Kwan was absent. The motion passed 6-2-0.

G. Budget Update

Ms. Zuniga presented this item. She shared that a statutory fee increase would be required soon but the Board is in better financial shape. This will allow a deeper fee increase study be conducted next year. Mr. Jones had a financial question about savings and Zuniga responded that staff savings would be most effective.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

H. Update and Discussion of NCARB

Ms. Zuniga stated that there was nothing to report but added that NCARB is starting to focus on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

I. Update on Committees

a. LATC

Ms. Zuniga began by saying there are three motions in her report that call for a vote.

She provided a short history of sub item i. and stated that recent developments have made this sub item moot and no action needs to be taken.

- i. Discuss and Possible Action on Proposed Regulatory Language to Amend CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2615 (Form of Examinations) as an Emergency Rulemaking
- ii. Discuss and Possible Action on Modified Proposed Regulatory Language to Amend CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines)

Due to concerns from the OAL reviewing attorney regarding license surrender while on probation as well as continuing education courses and providers, the regulatory package was withdrawn on September 20, 2022. Staff worked with LAD to address the concerns and issue a 15-day Notice of Modified Text. The public comment period on the Modified Text commenced on October 14, 2022 and ended on October 31, 2022. No comments were received.

Ms. Zuniga read the proposed motion: **The Board is asked to consider a motion to approve and adopt the proposed Modified Text to amend 16 CCR section 2680, and as there were no adverse comments received during the 15-day public comment period, delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file and to adopt the proposed Second Modified Text as noticed.**

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

The motion was moved by Sonny Ward.

Nilza Serrano seconded the motion.

Members Feng, Jones, Ward, Pearman, Gladstone, Kanaani, Lewis and Serrano voted in favor. The motion passed 8-0-0 with Member Kwan absent.

- iii. Discuss and Possible Action on Proposal to Amend the Committee's Fee Schedule

The Board is asked to review the proposed LATC fee schedule and recommend to the Legislature that the statutory fee caps under BPC section 5681 (Schedule of Fees) be raised.

Ms. Zuniga shared that the LATC budget is not strong and LATC is considering a fee increase. She spoke on that process and how a fee study has already been produced. Jon Wreschinsky stated that the LATC does not want to make the fee structure prohibitive to candidates. He also stated that the LATC will operate at a deficit next year. Mr. Jones asked if there is any regulatory enforcement being considered and if LATC is finding ways to entice and incentivize people to get their license. Mr. Wreschinsky replied they realize that the size of the LATC license population was much smaller than CAB's and made it more difficult to initiate any enforcement to increase licensure. LATC feels it came up with a reasonable solution to a difficult problem. He also stated that they need to encourage people to get their license. He ended by asking the Board to support sub item iii.

Ms. Zuniga read the proposed motion: **The Board is asked to consider a motion to approve and adopt the proposed Modified Text to amend 16 CCR section 2680, and as there were no adverse comments received during the 15-day public comment period, delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file and to adopt the proposed Second Modified Text as noticed.**

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

The motion was moved by Nilza Serrano.

Brett Gladstone seconded the motion.

Members Feng, Jones, Ward, Pearman, Gladstone, Kanaani, Lewis and Serrano voted in favor. The motion passed 8-0-0 with Member Kwan absent.

b. November 18, 2022 REC Meeting

Ms. Zuniga discussed the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee's Strategic Plan Objectives. She explained that the EO report will provide more information about enforcement cases to inform and educate the public. She also spoke about the goal of creating common narratives to better educate architects and consumers.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

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

Ms. Zuniga started her report by saying the Business Modernization project will roll out its first phase in February. She highlighted the following: personnel changes, the new outreach program for Zero Net Carbon Design continuing education requirements, increase in social media followers, LATC regulatory progress, and ARE pass

rates, Mr. Pearman asked if there were any changes in the enforcement numbers. Ms. Zuniga replied that those numbers were consistent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

K. DISCUSS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED MODIFIED REGULATORY TEXT FOR CCR, TITLE 16, DIVISION 2, ARTICLES 2 AND 7, SECTIONS 109.1 (RETIRED LICENSE APPLICATION) AND 144 (RETIRED LICENSE FEE), PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO TEXT

Mr. Feng introduced this regulatory item sharing the Board has already approved this regulation and that staff have a small change. Ms. Halbo explained that the proposed modified text makes it very clear that someone retiring and returning to practice does not have to go and get a brand-new degree. The proposed modified text was circulated for 15-day public comment. The Board is asked to adopt the modified text.

Mr. Feng made a motion that the Board consider the proposed Modified Text which was circulated from October 5, 2022 to October 25, 2022, and received two public comments in support, entertain a motion to approve and adopt the rulemaking text as modified, direct staff to take all necessary steps to complete the rulemaking process, delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes to the proposed regulations that may be required in completing the rulemaking file and adopt the proposed regulatory changes.

Ebony Lewis seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Christian, AIA CA, supports the regulation.

Members Feng, Gladstone, Jones, Kanaani, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, and Ward voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed 8-0. Member Kwan was absent for the vote.

L. DISCUSS AND ACTION ON PROPOSED REGULATORY LANGUAGE FOR CCR, TITLE 16, DIVISION 2, ARTICLE 7, SECTION 144 (FEES) AND PROPOSED RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Zuniga shared there is a handout to accompany this agenda item. Ms. Halbo explained that the Board memo (handout) provides each comment and identifies why the Board chose not to make any changes. The Board is asked to approve the comments and to direct the EO to finish the rulemaking process.

Ms. Serrano made a motion to the Board upon reviewing and considering the public comments received during the 45-day public comment period and during the public hearing, to adopt the proposed response to the written

comments, direct staff to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking process, delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes to the proposed regulations that may be required in completing the rulemaking file and adopt the proposed regulatory changes.

Robert Pearman seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mark Christian stated that AIA CA has no position on this and supports the Board in having the necessary funds to carry out its mission and protecting the public.

Mr. Christian elaborated that many years ago the statutory cap was raised from \$200 to \$400 with legislation jointly sponsored by AIA CA and CAB. He said that AIA CA would not advocate for higher fees for AIA CA members, but fully supports the Board having the means to carry out its duties.

Members Feng, Gladstone, Jones, Kanaani, Lewis, Pearman, Serrano, and Ward voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed 8-0. Member Kwan was absent for the vote.

Outgoing President Tian Feng thanked the Board and staff for making his experience as Board President memorable. He also thanked Mark Christian and AIA. He announced that a Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between CAB and AIA. He ended by saying, Thank you all.

R. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.