



---

SUMMARY REPORT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

July 17, 2003  
Sacramento, California

Committee Members Present

Linda Gates, Chair  
Stephanie Landregan

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, California Architects Board (CAB) Executive Officer  
Mona Maggio, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Program Manager  
Mary Anderson, Examination Coordinator  
Patricia Fay, Licensing Coordinator  
Erin Mynatt, Enforcement Coordinator  
Justin Sotelo, Enforcement/Special Projects Analyst  
Betsy Figueira, CAB Examination Program Analyst  
Vicki Wilk, CAB Enforcement Officer  
Don Chang, Legal Counsel

Guests Present

Clarence L. Chaffee, Executive Director, Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)  
Alexis Slafer, Director, University of California, Los Angeles, Extension Certificate Program  
Jerry Hastings, Instructor, University of California, Los Angeles, Extension Certificate Program

**A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum**

Chair Linda Gates called the meeting to order at 9:42 a.m. and Mona Maggio, LATC Program Manager, called the roll. Ms. Maggio stated that at present, there are only two Committee members appointed to the LATC and the LATC is without a quorum. Issues that require a quorum will be discussed and a recommendation will be made to the California Architects Board for final approval.

**B. Chair's Remarks**

Ms. Gates welcomed guests and asked that they introduce themselves.

**C. Public Comment Session**

There were no public comments.

**D. Approve the March 27, 2003 LATC Summary Report**

LATC members unanimously accepted the March 27, 2003 LATC Summary Report.

**E. Program Manager's Report**

Ms. Maggio presented an overview of the LATC's budget and how the State budget deficit is impacting the LATC. She specifically reviewed some of the measures that the Governor's Office requested that all boards, bureaus, and divisions implement. She added that in order to identify where spending cuts could be made, she identified the LATC's core responsibilities as timely investigation and resolution of consumer complaints, assuring proper licensure of landscape architects, and administering an examination designed to test for minimum competency.

Doug McCauley provided an update to the LATC on the progress of the judgement/settlement reporting.

**F. Discuss and Possibly Take Action Regarding the August 11, 2003 Beta Computer Administration of the Landscape Architectural Registration Examination (LARE) and Proposed Future Examination Administration Methodologies**

Clarence Chaffee, Executive Director of CLARB made a presentation to the LATC regarding the upcoming beta computer administration of the LARE, and how it might impact the LATC and its licensing process. Mr. Chaffee stated that CLARB's strategic plan directed CLARB to transition to a computer-administered exam once it was feasible to do so. CLARB plans to use the results from the beta examination to validate the proposed change to using a computer-administered examination for the multiple-choice sections of the LARE. Mr. Chaffee stated that approximately 50% of graduates from landscape architectural programs never continue the path to licensure. CLARB believes that education, work experience and the examination are all required components for an individual to become licensed, however, requiring graduates to obtain practice experience before beginning the examination process is creating a disparity in the number of graduates from landscape architectural programs and those who seek licensure. Mr. Chaffee added that Section A- Legal and Administrative Aspects of Practice and Section B- Analytical Aspects of Practice are "knowledge based" versus "practice based" therefore recent graduates would most likely perform better on these sections immediately after graduation. Whereas candidates would most likely need practical experience to pass the graphic sections of the exam. Mr. Chaffee stated that by allowing a candidate to begin the examination process upon graduation would capture the candidate's interest to complete the examination process and the path to licensure.

Another benefit of the computer-administered examination is that results (examination scores) will be available to candidates in approximately two weeks after the examination instead of the 80 days that is the current processing time. Mr. Chaffee also shared that the results of the beta administration would be available and presented to the general membership at the CLARB Annual Meeting in September.

The LATC reiterated some of the concerns surrounding California's ability to participate in the beta computer administration. The LATC stated that it will take a "wait and see" approach

before making any decision as to whether or not it should consider changing the requirements to sit for the examination until the results and additional discussion at the Annual Meeting.

**G. Review and Give Preliminary Approval of Recommendation to Amend Business and Professions Code Section 5651, Examination of Applicants and Title 16, Division 26, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 2615, Form of Examinations, 2624, License Renewal Three Years After Expiration**

Justin Sotelo presented the proposed amendments to Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5651 and California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 2615 and 2624 and the proposed adoption of the CCR 2624.1.

He explained that the proposed amendment to CCR section 2615 was nonsubstantive, substituting the words “U.S. jurisdiction, Canadian province, or Puerto Rico” for “state” and “state licensing authority” to add further clarification to the regulation.

**◆ The LATC members moved to recommend the proposed CCR section 2615 amendment to the Board for approval.**

Mr. Sotelo also explained that CCR section 2624 was originally adopted in June 2001 to establish the re-licensure policy for individuals whose licenses had been expired for more than three years, but less than five years; these individuals could be given the opportunity to establish to the LATC that they are qualified to practice without retaking the licensing examination. Individuals whose licenses had been expired for more than five years would be required to apply for and pass all sections of the current licensing examination to be eligible for a new license. He stated that the regulation was misleading in that it did not appropriately reference BPC section 5680.2; and the reference was not consistent with the regulation’s intent. Staff had therefore drafted amended language, with legal counsel’s assistance, to better align the regulation with the referenced statute.

Mr. Sotelo explained the reason for the proposed adoption of CCR 2624.1 was to create two separate regulations: 1) one that dealt specifically with re-licensure requirements (CCR 2624); and 2) one that listed requirements for individuals whose licenses had been expired for more than five years (CCR 2624.1).

The LATC discussed the possibility of having more discretion over the re-licensure requirements and recommended that the proposed amendment to CCR section 2624 and the proposed adoption of CCR section 2624.1 be tabled. Staff was directed to provide re-licensure candidate statistics at the next meeting so that the regulatory proposals could be reconsidered.

Mr. Sotelo explained that the proposed amendments to BPC section 5651 did the following: 1) clarified the written examination waiver for reciprocity candidates by adding that applicants currently licensed by a U.S. jurisdiction, Canadian province, or Puerto Rico would qualify for the waiver; and 2) deleted the CLARB certification and proof of job experience waiver option (as CLARB certification requirements could change which could potentially be in conflict with the written examination waiver).

Upon review of the proposed amendment to BCP section 5651, there were questions regarding CLARB certification requirements. Therefore, the LATC recommended that this proposal also

be tabled and directed staff to provide additional information at the next meeting so that the proposal could be reconsidered.

#### **H. Review and Give Preliminary Approval of Proposed Regulations to Amend Title 16, Division 26, CCR Section 2608, Complaint Information System**

LATC members unanimously accepted the proposed regulations to amend Title 16, Division 26, CCR section 2608, Complaint Information System and recommended the proposed language and supporting documents be forwarded to the Board for its review and preliminary approval at its next meeting scheduled for August 7, 2003.

- ◆ **The LATC members moved to recommend the proposed amendment to CCR section 2608 to the Board for approval.**

#### **I. Review of Licensee Survey Data**

Erin Mynatt presented a summary of the results of the Licensee Survey conducted in April 2003. Staff mailed the licensee survey to more than 3,000 licensees and received a 46% response rate. Ms. Mynatt shared that staff also used this opportunity to recruit individual volunteers to help serve the LATC in various capacities, and again the response was very good. Ms. Mynatt asked the LATC for direction as to what they would like done with the data at this point.

The LATC shared that they were very pleased with the survey and the response rate. They did suggest that staff categorize the comments to make it a little clearer to see patterns, and to make sure we follow up with those that volunteered as soon as possible to sustain interest.

The LATC had previously discussed the desire to conduct a Task Analysis as a follow up of this initial survey, and the LATC again stated their interest in doing so. Mr. Chaffee suggested that the LATC should consider working with CLARB as they conduct their Task Analysis in 2004. The LATC agreed that it would be the best use of resources to partner with CLARB and collaborate on the Task Analysis.

#### **J. Review and Approve Newsletter Editorial Calendar**

Ms. Mynatt presented a proposed newsletter editorial calendar for the LATC to approve. She shared that staff identified areas of interest based on licensee input in the survey, as well as past discussions at strategic planning sessions that would be featured as “spotlight issues” in the newsletter. Staff also presented a proposed distribution and features cycle. Ms. Mynatt asked the LATC if they had any additions or changes. Ms. Gates shared that she thought it might be beneficial to our licensees to include an update on the California Architects Board’s activities. Also Mr. Chaffee shared that the LATC has access to all the articles that CLARB uses for their own newsletter. Ms. Landregan suggested another area of interest to the licensees might be brown fields (abandoned industrial fields) and suggested staff contact the Department of Toxic Substance Control for assistance. Again Ms. Gates echoed the importance of following up with those licensees that volunteered to assist with the newsletter and ask for them to submit papers and ideas for articles as soon as possible. The LATC complemented staff on putting together the editorial calendar and approved it to use for future newsletter planning.

#### **K. Review and Approve Frequently Asked Questions Guide to the Landscape Architects Practice Act**

Ms. Mynatt presented the final draft of the “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ) guide to the Landscape Architects Practice Act and asked the LATC for approval to post it on the Web site. The LATC thanked staff for their hard work on the FAQ’s and agreed that it was ready to be posted on the Web site.

#### **L. Review and Approve Request for Re-Licensure**

The LATC reviewed a request for re-licensure from Diana Bergen, former license number LA 1996. Ms. Landregan reported that Ms. Bergen was originally licensed in California in February 1981 and her license expired in July 1992.

Ms. Landregan reported that the work samples submitted by Ms. Bergen did not demonstrate current knowledge and minimal competency in all areas for entry-level practice and coupled with the length of time that had elapsed, recommended that she not be granted a waiver and be required to take and pass the entire LARE examination.

- ◆ **The LATC members moved to deny Ms. Bergen’s request for waiver of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination.**

#### **M. Report on California Council of the American Society of Landscape Architects Conference Calls**

Dennis Otsuji was not present. Ms. Landregan reported that the California Council of the American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA) would hold its second Annual State Conference in late March 2004 in Sacramento. She suggested holding a LATC meeting in conjunction with the conference.

#### **N. Enforcement Program Report**

Ms. Mynatt presented an overview of the actions of the Enforcement Program since the March 27, 2003 meeting. She provided a summary of Citation 2001-02 pending with the Attorney General’s office and reported that staff requested the hearing be rescheduled from May 21, 2003 to a future date to allow for the expert witness to be present to testify. Ms. Mynatt added that the letters to cities regarding landscape architect title and practice act have created positive dialog between the LATC and municipalities.

#### **O. Announcement of Future Meetings**

The LATC set tentative meeting dates for October 17, 2003 at the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; January 23, 2004 at the University of California, Berkeley; April/May 2004 at the University of California, Davis to be held in conjunction with the CC/ASLA’s State Conference that will be held in Sacramento; August 27, 2004 at the University of California, Los Angeles; and a date to be announced during the week of November 15-19, 2004 at the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

**P. Election of Officers**

Former LATC member Sandra Gonzalez recommended that Ms. Gates remain as Chairperson for the coming year. Ms. Landregan agreed with Ms. Gonzalez' recommendation. Ms. Gates will remain as Chair and Ms. Landregan will serve as Vice-Chair.

**Q. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.