

SUMMARY REPORT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee

August 20, 2013
Sacramento, California

LATC Members Present

Stephanie Landregan, Chair
Andrew Bowden, Vice Chair
Nicki Johnson
David Allan Taylor, Jr.

LATC Member Absent

Katherine Spitz

California Architects Board (Board) Member Present

Fermin Villegas, Board Liaison

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, Board
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer, Board
Don Chang, Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC
Matthew McKinney, Enforcement Officer, LATC
Ken Miller, Licensing Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Christine Anderson, Chair, University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force
Pamela Berstler, President, California Chapter, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)
Linda Gates, Chair, Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force
Christine Lally, DCA Board and Bureau Relations Liaison
Kim Larsen, APLD
Dalton LaVoie, California Council/American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA)
John Nicolaus, CC/ASLA
Raul Villanueva, Personnel Selection Consultant, DCA, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)

**A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum
Chair’s Remarks
Public Comment Session**

Chair Stephanie Landregan called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and Andrew Bowden called the roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

B. Approve May 22, 2013 LATC Summary Report

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the May 22, 2013 LATC Summary Report.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0-1 (David Allan Taylor, Jr. abstained).

C. Program Manager’s Report

Trish Rodriguez presented the Program Manager’s Report. She informed the Committee members that phase one release of the BreZE Project is tentatively scheduled for September 12, 2013, and that the LATC website was updated with an informational message regarding potential BreZE-related system delays. She shared that outreach presentations are tentatively scheduled for the Fall 2013 school semester at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and the University of Southern California, and that presentation dates will be determined in the near future. She noted that the regulatory package to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) was disapproved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), and an update on this rulemaking file will be provided under Agenda Item F. She explained that the LATC website was recently updated with the latest regulation changes, the current strategic plan, and the upcoming administration dates for the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE). She also mentioned that staff are developing frequently asked questions (FAQs) that will be posted to the LATC website once approved. She informed the members that both the University of California (UC) Berkeley and the UC Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Programs received LATC approval through December 2020, and both programs were sent approval letters in July 2013.*

Ms. Landregan introduced Fermin Villegas as the liaison for the Board. Mr. Villegas expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the meeting. He said that he has been a public Board member for approximately two years and he is an attorney practicing in Sacramento. The Committee thanked Mr. Villegas for his participation in the meeting.

**The Committee briefly revisited the Program Manager’s Report later in the meeting to discuss several additional topics.*

D. Update on Occupational Analysis from Office of Professional Examination Services

Raul Villanueva of OPES provided an update on the occupational analysis (OA) process. Mr. Villanueva explained that at the May 22, 2013 LATC meeting, the Committee members were asked to answer questions related to the practice of landscape architecture, as provided in meeting packet attachment D.1. He said that the members’ responses to the questions were

provided to the OA focus group during a workshop held on May 30-31, 2013, and that the responses were used as a starting point for the workshop discussions. He noted that the focus group was comprised of ten people, including new and experienced licensees, and several educators. He explained that during the two-day workshop, the focus group evaluated the practice of landscape architecture in four main areas: 1) changes in the practice since the last OA in 2006; 2) changes in the practice that are expected over the next five to eight years; 3) respective laws and best practices; and 4) knowledge areas that candidates need to possess in order to meet current and anticipated practice demands. He commended the OA focus group for engaging in an excellent discussion regarding these topics, and he was very pleased with the quality of their discourse. He provided a summary of the workshop outcomes by listing the following areas of discussion that arose regarding the respective laws and best practices in California landscape architecture: 1) local codes and local preferences; 2) utility restrictions; 3) California Environmental Protection Agency; 4) Endangered Species Act; 5) local shade calculations; and 6) water conservation laws and ordinances. He also listed the following areas of practice that the focus group anticipated changing in the future: 1) introduction of new construction materials; 2) changing environmental conditions; 3) urban forestry; 4) soil conservation; 5) disease prevention; and 6) economic issues. He mentioned that “urban forestry” is a relatively new area within the practice that does not have a fully formed definition, and that the group perceived it may have an impact on their profession in the future. He described current changes to the practice that the focus group discussed, citing examples such as sand re-nourishment, habitat establishment/restoration, and increased emphasis on conservation and restoration. He also provided further examples of things the focus group anticipated could change in the practice in the long-term such as increased emphases on biodiversity, urban gardens, and urban agriculture. He noted a topic that kept surfacing during the discussion was an anticipated emphasis on the integration and education of parties performing site maintenance. He explained that the focus group felt there is a need for professionals in the practice to recognize that, as a site design is developed, there should be ongoing planning for the preservation of the intent of the original plans.

Mr. Villanueva explained that the information generated from the OA focus group discussion was used as a basis for the licensee interviews that occurred in June 2013. He said that approximately ten interviews were conducted with new and experienced licensees. He noted that, in selecting interviewees, geographic and practice diversity were considered. He said that during the interviews, he looked for recurring topics in the responses related to changes in the practice since 2006, task and knowledge areas required for the principle areas of practice, and examples to illustrate problems and issues in the practice. He stated that these responses provided a sense of the important task and knowledge areas in the practice. He summarized that the licensee interviews resulted in a high level of agreement in the principal areas of work and the important task and knowledge areas of the profession, which is not always the case in other professions. He also noted that a recurring theme was the need for landscape architects to affirm their ongoing relevance in terms of the primary issues of the present and future. He mentioned that there was also a recurring theme regarding the importance of educating the client and general public about the abilities and contributions of landscape architects.

Mr. Villanueva provided an overview of how he prepared for the OA workshops conducted in July and August 2013 by explaining that he reviewed prior studies, the current OA, the results of the focus group discussion, and the licensee interviews. He said that there were two workshops conducted in July and August 2013 that were comprised of 20 licensees who represented both new and experienced practitioners. He noted that some of the interviewees work with educators on a regular basis, and their participation provided a unique and beneficial perspective. He said

that he instructed the workshop participants to “build on the past with an eye towards the future” when developing task and knowledge statements, because the OA will be used for five to eight years once it is complete. He said that over the two workshops, the focus groups developed approximately 50 tasks and 70 task statements, as well as performed the preliminary linkage of task and knowledge statements. He said the groups viewed the task and knowledge statements from a broad perspective in order to demonstrate a broad description of the practice; however, the participants also reviewed the statements from a California-specific perspective to identify the principal task and knowledge areas required to have a strong California-specific examination. Mr. Villanueva said that the focus groups felt the primary areas of practice were adequately identified when the workshops were complete.

Mr. Villanueva explained the next steps in the OA process. He said that OPES is currently preparing for the pilot survey study. He said that one of the best ways to think about an OA is in terms of an applied research project. He elaborated that the OA surveys should be evaluated on criteria such as intelligibility to the practitioner, ability to communicate intent to the practitioner, use to the practitioner, and usefulness of the rating scale. He said that he worked with Ms. Rodriguez to identify a group of licensees who will receive the pilot questionnaire with instructions to provide feedback in specific areas, as well providing an area on the questionnaire to respond with general feedback. He said the pilot survey will occur in late September through early October 2013, with the preliminary goal of using the results of the pilot survey to conduct the formal survey in November 2013. He commended Ms. Rodriguez and LATC staff for doing a remarkable job of obtaining licensee participation for the OA process.

Mr. Bowden asked how many responses are needed for a valid OA survey. Mr. Villanueva replied that the number of responses needed can vary between professions; however, obtaining responses that have a strong representativeness of the entire sample of the population is a more important factor to consider. He said that if two-thirds of a survey population responded, but only experienced licensees responded, the representativeness of the sample would not be desirable. He continued by explaining that he will begin analyzing the survey results once they have been completed and that he has identified preliminary dates for two more groups of licensees to review the OA survey results. Ms. Landregan asked if there is overlap between workshop participants. Mr. Villanueva responded that there is a small amount of overlap; however, it is important to have some degree of overlap for continuity. Ms. Landregan asked when the new California Supplemental Examination (CSE) will be implemented. Mr. Villanueva responded that the OA Validation Report is tentatively scheduled to be submitted to the LATC after February 2014, and if LATC accepts it, it can be used to develop a new CSE. Ms. Rodriguez clarified that a new CSE was recently developed based on the OA conducted in 2006 and will be released in a few months.

Ms. Landregan asked how OPES ensures that the CSE evaluates California-specific health, safety, and welfare issues that are not typical of test questions on the national examination. Mr. Villanueva responded that part of conducting an OA is to define the practice by evaluating it from a broad perspective because the OA can be used for more than just developing an examination plan. He said that once a broad description of the practice is developed, workshop participants can define critical areas of practice that will be evaluated on the CSE. He also said that Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 139 requires any board or bureau that uses a national examination to provide a linkage that substantiates using the national examination. He noted that broad task and knowledge statements are necessary to provide a linkage to areas to test for on the CSE. Ms. Landregan asked if one of the purposes of the CSE is to ensure that candidates who apply for licensure via reciprocity will have current knowledge of the broad

practice of landscape architecture if they have not taken the national examination in some time, or if that is simply a peripheral effect of the OA process. Mr. Villanueva responded that one of the purposes of the OA is to evaluate current practice, approximately every five to eight years. Mr. Chang clarified that the intent of the CSE is different from the national examination. He explained that the CSE supplements the LARE because at some point, it was determined that there are unique areas of practice in California that are not evaluated on the LARE. He said that the OA is updated approximately every six years for currency in areas that are not otherwise tested for on the LARE.

Mr. Bowden asked if the OA focus groups discussed California-specific knowledge areas regarding seismic conditions and fire management, as these particular issues were not mentioned during Mr. Villanueva's presentation. Mr. Villanueva responded that the issues of seismic conditions and fire conservation were addressed in the focus group discussion and that not all areas of the focus group discussion were mentioned in his presentation to the LATC.

Ms. Landregan asked if knowledge areas pertaining to land planning and the California Subdivision Map Act were reviewed in the OA focus group discussions. Mr. Villanueva responded that OPES cannot ask questions that are region-specific within California because they could potentially give a licensee from a certain region an advantage when discussing the importance of issues. He said that instead, the participants were asked about the impacts of such laws in hypothetical scenarios during the OA workshops. He added that mainstream practice is reviewed in both the OA and during examination development.

Kim Larsen inquired if the OA workshop participants were asked questions about areas of practice they believe should only fall under the purview of landscape architects because issues such as irrigation, habitat restoration, and seismic conditions could overlap into other professions. Mr. Villanueva responded that the OA evaluates the broad practice of landscape architecture and certain functions within the practice overlap into other professions. Ms. Larsen asked if the workshop participants were asked whether they believed certain tasks should only be within the scope of landscape architects because the scope of practice is defined by law.

Mr. Villanueva responded by explaining that the OA is a broad study of the practice of landscape architecture and that licensees were asked questions regarding anticipated changes in the practice. He noted that the OA is only a study of the current practice of landscape architecture. Ms. Landregan thanked Mr. Villanueva for his presentation.

E. Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards

Ms. Landregan provided an update on the upcoming Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) elections. She explained that, since the ballot for the CLARB Committee on Nominations election was due prior to the August 20, 2013 LATC meeting, she and Mr. Taylor reviewed the nominations prior to today and cast their vote for the LATC. She said that they voted to elect Mr. Bowden, Le'Ann Whitehouse Seely, and Chuck Smith to the CLARB Committee on Nominations, and asked the LATC members to ratify this vote.

- **David Allan Taylor, Jr. moved to ratify LATC's vote to elect Andrew Bowden, Le'Ann Whitehouse Seely, and Chuck Smith to the CLARB Committee on Nominations.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Landregan continued by presenting the election for the CLARB Board of Directors nominations slate in which the LATC must cast a vote. She noted that all positions are running uncontested except for the Treasurer position in which Christine Anderson and John Tarkany are candidates.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to vote for Stephanie Landregan as CLARB President; Jerany Jackson as CLARB President-Elect; Randy Weatherly as CLARB Vice President; and Christine Anderson as CLARB Treasurer.**

David Allan Taylor, Jr. seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Landregan stated that the CLARB annual meeting will be held in Minneapolis, Minnesota on September 26-28, 2013, and that a travel request to attend the meeting was denied by DCA. She noted that several CLARB bylaw revisions will be considered at the annual meeting and the LATC is asked to review the proposed revisions.

- **David Allan Taylor, Jr. moved to support proposed change #1 to Article V, Section 4. A, of the CLARB bylaws, and support proposed change #2 to Article X, Section 5. B, of the CLARB bylaws as presented in the meeting packet.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Landregan noted that a Region V conference call will occur at 10:00 a.m. on August 29, 2013, in which all LATC members are encouraged to participate. Mr. Bowden asked if CLARB is currently able to provide the California LARE scores to the LATC, as he thought it was indicated previously that CLARB may not be able to provide them to the Committee. Ms. Rodriguez advised that CLARB has been able to provide the California LARE scores for each administration, thus far. Mr. Bowden stressed that it is very important for CLARB to continue to provide California LARE scores to the LATC and he intends on emphasizing this point to CLARB at the upcoming Region V conference call.

F. Update on Proposed Regulations to Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program)

As the Program Administrator for the UCLA Extension Certificate Program, Ms. Landregan recused herself from participation in discussion and voting on Agenda Items F.1 and F.2 due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Bowden asked if his membership on the UCLA Guidance Committee poses a conflict of interest for participation in the discussion and voting on Agenda Items F.1 and F.2. Mr. Chang asked Mr. Bowden if he receives compensation from the UCLA Guidance Committee and Mr. Bowden replied that he does not. Mr. Chang said that there is a possible appearance of a conflict of interest for Mr. Bowden to participate in the voting on Agenda Items F.1 and F.2; however, since there are four members of the LATC present, if both Ms. Landregan and Mr. Bowden recuse themselves, the items cannot be voted on. Mr. Chang said that the “rule of

necessity” allows Mr. Bowden to participate in the discussion even though there is a potential conflict of interest. Mr. Bowden temporarily assumed the Chair’s duties.

F.1. Review Office of Administrative Law (OAL) Disapproval Decision for CCR Section 2620.5

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the final rulemaking file to amend CCR section 2620.5 was submitted to OAL on May 31, 2013. She explained that OAL issued a “Decision of Disapproval of Regulatory Action” for the rulemaking file on July 17, 2013, citing deficiencies in the justification provided for each of the proposed changes to the regulation. The Committee members proceeded to review the “Decision of Disapproval of Regulatory Action” in attachment F.1 of the meeting packet.

F.2. Action to Address OAL Disapproval Decision for CCR Section 2620.5

In light of OAL’s disapproval of the regulatory proposal, Ms. Rodriguez recommended that staff initiate a new regulatory package to amend CCR section 2620.5, and not pursue a resubmission of the pending rulemaking file. She noted that the UC Berkeley and UCLA Extension Certificate Programs have already been approved through December 2020; therefore, there is sufficient time to modify the regulation. Mr. Chang added that OAL disapproved the rulemaking file based on a lack of justification for the necessity to modify the regulation language. He explained that in order to address OAL’s concerns over the proposed language, staff should review each proposed change and attempt to develop sufficient justification for each modification. He said that if staff encounter a proposed change that they do not have adequate expertise to justify, then it may need to be reviewed by LATC to provide further justification. He said that attempting to perform this analysis and resubmit the existing rulemaking file to OAL within 120 days will likely be insufficient; therefore, he recommends starting a new rulemaking file.

- **David Allan Taylor, Jr. moved to approve staff recommendations to 1) not pursue a resubmission of the existing rulemaking file for CCR section 2620.5 to OAL; 2) have staff analyze the proposed modifications to CCR section 2620.5 and attempt to provide sufficient justification for each proposed change that will meet OAL standards; and 3) submit a new rulemaking file to OAL once sufficient justification for the proposed changes to the section have been developed.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.

Mr. Bowden returned Chair duties to Ms. Landregan.

C.* Program Manager’s Report

Ms. Landregan directed the Committee to revisit the Program Manager’s Report, as Ms. Rodriguez wished to provide several additional updates. Ms. Rodriguez said that the limited-term Examination Coordinator position was vacated on July 30, 2013, and recruitment efforts are underway to fill the position. She also said that all staff and Committee members are required to complete Sexual Harassment Prevention training before January 2014.

G. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Regulations to Amend CCR Section 2610 (Application for Examination)

Ms. Rodriguez presented staff's recommendation to amend CCR section 2610. She said that current law requires all applications for examination be received in the LATC office at least 70 days prior to the date of the examination. She explained that, since LATC no longer administers any portion of the LARE, it is not necessary to have applications received 70 days prior to the date of the examination. She said that staff recommend changing the 70-day requirement to 45 days as this will be a sufficient amount of time for LATC to process applications for examination, and potentially allow more candidates to register for the LARE. Mr. Taylor asked what the filing deadlines are for other landscape architecture Boards in the nation.

Ms. Landregan replied that other boards typically have deadlines similar to those of CLARB.

Mr. Bowden asked Ms. Rodriguez if the suggested period of 45 days will be a sufficient amount of time to process applications. Ms. Rodriguez responded that LATC processes applications within two to three weeks of receipt and that 45 days should be more than sufficient to process applications for examination.

- **Nicki Johnson moved to approve staff's recommendation to proceed with a regulatory package to amend CCR section 2610, to require all applications for examination to be received in the LATC office at least 45 days prior to the date of the examination.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

H. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Regulations to Amend CCR Section 2649 (Fees)

Ms. Rodriguez provided an overview of recommendations to address the LATC fund condition. She explained that at the January 24-25, 2013 LATC meeting, DCA Budget Office staff presented the fund condition at which time there were 19 months of funds in reserve. She explained that staff were asked to evaluate the possibilities of a license fee reduction and a negative budget change proposal (BCP) to address the fund condition. She noted that after further discussion it was recommended that LATC implement a negative BCP of \$200,000 and temporarily reduce license renewal fees from \$400 to \$220 for one renewal cycle. She indicated that the temporary license renewal fee reduction would be implemented in fiscal year (FY) 2015/2016 due to competing priorities such as BreEZe implementation and Sunset Review. She said that at the May 22, 2013 LATC meeting, LATC approved the temporary fee reduction and the negative BCP of \$200,000.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to approve the proposed language to amend CCR section 2649, to reduce the license renewal fee from \$400 to \$220 for one renewal cycle beginning in FY 2015/2016, at the end of which the renewal fee will revert back to \$400, as presented in the meeting packet.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

J. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates**

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

November 7, 2013 - Ontario

January 16, 2014 - Sacramento

I. Review and Approve Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force Recommendations Regarding Business and Professions Code Section 5641 (Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions)

Ms. Rodriguez explained that at the May 22, 2013 LATC meeting, the Committee directed the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force to convene a final meeting to conclude their work on ensuring the provisions of BPC section 5641 protect the public, and bring the findings to the LATC at their next meeting. She said that the Task Force held a final meeting on July 23, 2013, and as a result made two recommendations: 1) BPC section 5641 is sufficiently clear and does not need modification; and 2) LATC consider providing further interpretation and specificity regarding terminology used in the section.

Linda Gates provided an update to the Committee members on the July 23, 2013 Task Force meeting. She recounted the discussions that the Task Force engaged in and noted that they discussed a variety of opinions related to clarity of BPC section 5641. She stated that the majority of the Task Force felt the section was sufficiently clear; however, the Task Force also acknowledged that certain terminology in the section could benefit from some manner of clarification to assist the layperson in understanding the law. She explained that it is more practical to provide interpretations and clarifications as the need arises rather than amend the law. She said the Task Force recommended that staff keep a record of any interpretations that are applied regarding BPC section 5641 to determine if there are any ongoing issues with clarity. She further said that if substantial information is gathered regarding any potential problematic areas with interpretation of BPC section 5641, the information should then be reviewed by LATC. She suggested that LATC share any clarifications for BPC section 5641 with the public.

Pamela Berstler explained that the Task Force voted on whether BPC section 5641 was clear following a discussion regarding examples of what might be considered a violation of the section. She noted a common question that arose during this discussion was how to determine when a conceptual plan becomes what could be considered a construction plan. She said that the Building Official on the Task Force indicated that most of the hypothetical examples of conceptual plans discussed by the Task Force would be given a construction permit without stamps because they fall under the architect's or engineer's practice act exemptions. She said that through this discussion, the Task Force returned to the idea that, until there is a problem, conceptual design is ambiguous, and the ambiguity will not be addressed until someone files a complaint. She expressed dissatisfaction with this idea.

Ms. Anderson added that during the Task Force discussions, the Task Force said the language is clear and there is a distinction between conceptual and construction drawings. She said that the field of landscape architecture is constantly evolving and licensees are perpetually inundated with new legislation and requirements to abide by as a licensee. She stated that it is up to landscape architects to stay abreast of changes in the practice. She said there is a knowledge gap between the licensee and the layperson, and clarity issues seem to occur on the side of the

layperson who is not aware of the laws governing the practice. She advised that there should be more communication and education of the consumer regarding the practice, and the LATC should determine how to implement this. She stated that enforcement cases must be evaluated on their own merits, and it is not possible to define conceptual design in a manner that will avoid the necessity of cases to be evaluated according to their own unique details.

Ms. Berstler added that the idea of “educating the consumer” mentioned by Ms. Anderson was also intended to ensure clarity amongst landscape architects by informing them that there is permissible practice aside from landscape architecture. She said that licensees should have a clear understanding of the difference between conceptual and construction drawings and that there is work that can be performed by unlicensed persons that is not illegal. Ms. Gates concurred with Ms. Berstler and suggested that outreach could be conducted to licensees.

- **David Allan Taylor, Jr. made a motion to accept the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force recommendation that BPC section 5641 is sufficiently clear and does not need modification.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Chang clarified that the Task Force made two recommendations and the LATC only voted on the first recommendation. He said the intent of the Task Force’s second recommendation is to have staff keep a record of interpretations that are provided regarding the terminology in BPC section 5641 so that the interpretations can be used to determine if the section needs further specificity rather than speculate without evidence that a problem exists. Ms. Landregan concurred with Mr. Chang and said that further specificity cannot be provided until LATC has a record of any interpretations used for terminology in BPC section 5641.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to direct staff to 1) maintain a record of any interpretations used for the terminology in BPC section 5641 during enforcement case review; 2) identify any problematic areas of interpretation for BPC section 5641 during case review; and 3) provide a summary of any interpretations of BPC section 5641 to the LATC.**

David Allan Taylor, Jr. seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Landregan expressed her gratitude to the Task Force members for their participation.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to conclude the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

K. Adjourn

- **Stephanie Landregan adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

***Agenda items were taken out of order to accommodate the arrival of a guest speaker. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*