



Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting

May 29, 2019
Campbell, California

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Members Present

Marq Truscott, Chair
Andrew Bowden, Vice Chair
Susan M. Landry
Patricia Trauth
Jon Wreschinsky

California Architects Board (Board) Member Present

Tian Feng, LATC Liaison, Board Vice President (arrived at 11:01 a.m.)

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator
Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Deborah Dulay, Special Projects Analyst

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

LATC Chair Marq Truscott called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m., and Vice Chair Andrew Bowden called roll. Five members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

B. Chair's Procedural Remarks and LATC Member Introductory Comments

Mr. Truscott announced that a voluntary sign-in sheet was located near the entrance, and if attendees were to sign-in, they would be recorded in the official minutes of the meeting. Mr. Truscott stated the Committee would be recessing at approximately noon for a lunch break. Mr. Truscott thanked Susan M. Landry for hosting the meeting, and Ms. Landry welcomed the LATC, expressing that she was honored to have the meeting held in the City of Campbell.

Mr. Truscott announced that Mr. Bowden's term on the LATC ends on June 1, 2019, and a one-year grace period to continue to serve will be in effect. Mr. Bowden stated that he will continue to serve on the Committee during the grace period until the Governor makes a new appointment to the position. Mr. Truscott stated that his term would end in 2020, and he would not seek re-

appointment. Mr. Truscott encouraged licensed landscape architects to apply and serve on the Committee.

Mr. Truscott welcomed new member, Jon Wreschinsky. Mr. Wreschinsky introduced himself providing that he has been involved with LATC for subcommittee assignments, and that he currently works with the San Diego Unified School District as a facilities planner. Mr. Wreschinsky thanked the Senate Rules Committee for the LATC appointment.

C. Update on Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Trish Rodriguez summarized a written update from Christopher Castrillo, DCA Deputy Director, Board and Bureau Relations. Ms. Rodriguez stated that (former Director) Dean Grafilo left his post, and the Governor's Office is working to identify a new successor. Ms. Rodriguez continued that the DCA executive team will work with the Governor's Office to ensure a smooth transition in preparation of the new leadership. She announced that the DCA would continue to host the Director's Quarterly Meetings with all EOs and Bureau Chiefs. Ms. Rodriguez reported that the DCA retained KH Consulting to conduct the EO Salary Study, and although originally scheduled to be completed around March 2019, the deadline to complete the study had been extended due to delays in getting timely responses regarding salaries in similar positions in other states, and the final report is expected to be released within the upcoming weeks.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the DCA announced the public data portal for users to view trends and changes in licensing data up to three years. She advised that in the enforcement statistics section, users can access information including the number of complaints received, case aging, and processing times of initial examination and license applications. Ms. Rodriguez mentioned the DCA's Future Leadership Program where participants were given guidance by their mentors, presented team projects, and participated in networking events.

D. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that 11 public comment emails were received regarding the University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program and she confirmed that the topic will be discussed under Agenda Item K.

E. Review and Possible Action on February 8, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes

Patricia Trauth moved to approve the February 8, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes.

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. Member Wreschinsky abstained. The motion passed 4-0-1.

F. Program Manager’s Report – Update on LATC’s Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs

Ms. Rodriguez reviewed topics from the EO Report. She gave an update on the Business Modernization project and stated that staff have completed “as-is” business process mapping and are currently conducting weekly “could-be” workshops.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the LATC implemented the online credit card renewal system on April 23, 2019, and to date 58 licensees renewed using the new online system. She stated that initial glitches with the online payment system have been resolved, suggesting that the new payment method appears to be a useful platform for licensees. She continued that staff will monitor the progress of the new system and provide updates to the Committee.

Ms. Rodriguez shared that the Executive Committee of the Board considered a new Board logo in January 2019 and directed the Committee members to the EO Report for an example of the new logo. Ms. Rodriguez suggested that the LATC logo may be discussed at a future Committee meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez welcomed Deborah Dulay, Special Projects Analyst, who started her employment at the LATC on April 2, 2019.

Ms. Rodriguez advised that the LATC approved the contract with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) for development of the California Supplemental Examination (CSE), which was fully executed on March 8, 2019. She updated the members that the next Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) will be administered August 5-17, 2019, and the application deadline is June 21, 2019.

Ms. Rodriguez thanked Ms. Landry for her outreach presentation at the University of California (UC), Berkeley on April 18, 2019, in which approximately 24 students attended. Ms. Rodriguez continued that at the end of the presentation, they received 11 surveys with positive feedback.

Ms. Rodriguez provided an update on the regulatory proposal to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 2615, Form of Examination, and 2620, Education and Training Credits. She advised that staff have completed the internal preparation process for the regulatory proposal, and the proposal should be sent to the DCA Legal Office for review this week.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that staff have drafted proposed amendments to CCR sections 2655, Substantial Relationship Criteria, and 2656, Criteria for Rehabilitation, in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 2138. She advised these amendments were approved by the Board on February 27, 2019, and the regulatory proposal went to the DCA Legal Office for review on March 12, 2019. Ms. Rodriguez said that staff are also updating the LATC’s Disciplinary Guidelines and have started to prepare the justification for the proposed changes.

G. Review and Discuss 2019 Legislation

Laura Zuniga presented AB 312 (Cooley), which would require agencies to identify duplicative or overlapping regulations, report to the Legislature and Governor, and repeal outdated regulations.

Ms. Zuniga stated that because the bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee, it will become a two-year bill due to the substantial cost to State agencies.

Ms. Zuniga reviewed AB 476 (B. Rubio), which would require DCA to establish a task force regarding foreign-trained professionals and report to the Legislature. Ms. Zuniga continued that this bill is progressing through the legislative process and is currently in the Senate awaiting referral to the Policy Committee. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether the bill would focus on foreign-trained or foreign-born individuals. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that the bill would apply to foreign-trained individuals. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired if the bill would apply to an American-born professional who was educated and trained in a foreign jurisdiction. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that such an individual would fall within the scope of the bill.

Ms. Zuniga continued with AB 544 (Brough), which addresses inactive license fees, and accrued and unpaid renewal fees. She explained that this bill would limit the amount that boards could recover from delinquent licensees seeking to renew their license. Ms. Zuniga provided that this bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee, which indicates that it is a two-year bill.

Ms. Zuniga reviewed AB 613 (Low), which would allow DCA boards to increase fees every four years according to the corresponding increase in the Consumer Price Index. She explained that this bill would allow for a modest fee increase to keep abreast of costs without the regulatory process or legislation. Ms. Zuniga stated that the Board supports this bill, and currently the bill is in the Senate, having already passed the Assembly. Ms. Landry acknowledged the public service history of Assemblyman Low, and Ms. Zuniga added that Assemblyman Low is the Chair of the Committee on Business and Professions, which has oversight over both the LATC and the Board.

Ms. Zuniga updated that AB 1076 (Ting) would require the Department of Justice to automatically initiate the process of expunging convictions. She continued that the bill would change the current practice where the individual has the burden to initiate the process of expunging convictions from their record. Ms. Zuniga explained that the bill would also impact the type of convictions that may be reviewed during the license application process. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that this bill is on the Assembly floor this week.

Ms. Zuniga reviewed Senate Bill (SB) 53 (Wilk), which would require any advisory committee comprised of at least two members to comply with the Open Meeting Act requirements. Mr. Bowden asked whether a subcommittee meeting comprised of two individuals would need to be advertised. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that the public would need to be notified 10 days prior to the meeting. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether a subcommittee meeting would need to be held in a public location. Ms. Zuniga confirmed the accessibility requirement would apply, stating that the meeting would need to be public and accessible, even if the meeting were to be a teleconference meeting. Ms. Zuniga added that prior legislation was previously vetoed by former Governor Brown.

Mr. Bowden asked whether the Open Meeting Act requirements would apply if two committee members went to lunch and discussed topics related to the Committee. Ms. Zuniga explained that the example would not be directly covered by the bill. Ms. Welch clarified that, although the intent of the bill pertains to a formal subcommittee or taskforce, committee members should be careful about discussing substantive issues related to the LATC. Ms. Landry inquired whether the term subcommittee would be included in the definition of committee. Ms. Welch affirmed that it

would, and Ms. Trauth added that the language of the bill was consistent with this interpretation of the term subcommittee.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether a committee or subcommittee comprised of at least three individuals would need to satisfy the Open Meeting Act requirements. Ms. Zuniga stated that although boards are able to appoint two-member committees, currently the Open Meeting Act requirements would not apply. However, Ms. Zuniga stated that under the proposed bill, the Open Meeting Act requirements would apply when more than one committee member is present. Ms. Welch also stated that under existing law the Open Meeting Act applies to committees or subcommittees comprised of three or more individuals, however, the bill seeks to change this requirement. Ms. Zuniga added that under the proposed language, any advisory body that is part of the state body and supported by state funds would be subject to the Open Meeting Act requirements, and the language of the bill did not specify a minimum number of committee members. Ms. Zuniga commented that this bill passed out of the Senate and is in the Committee on Governmental Organization of the Assembly.

Ms. Zuniga presented SB 601 (Morrell), which would authorize any state agency that issues a license to waive the replacement or renewal fee for anyone who was displaced by a declared Federal or proclaimed State emergency. Ms. Zuniga added that the bill had passed the Senate and is in the Assembly awaiting assignment.

Ms. Zuniga reviewed SB 608 (Glazer), which extends the sunset date for the Board and LATC, and makes the requested changes, including changes to the written contract requirements. Ms. Zuniga explained that the bill would require the LATC to fingerprint applicants for licensure. Ms. Landry stated that she was in support of the fingerprinting requirement, and Mr. Truscott asked whether the fingerprint requirement would apply to applicants or current licensees. Ms. Zuniga replied that the bill currently applies to applicants; however, legislative staff would still need to work on the implementation of the bill and address whether all licensees would also need to be fingerprinted.

H. Discuss and Possible Action on the California Department of Water Resources, Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo)

Ms. Rodriguez stated that staff have been monitoring the activity related to MWELo. She continued that Department of Water Resources (DWR) did not anticipate an update to the MWELo until 2023. Ms. Landry advised that staff should also monitor whether other state-wide programs pertaining to mandatory municipal composting programs will affect any updates to MWELo. Ms. Zuniga stated that she is getting updates regarding the implementation and the regulatory process for MWELo, and an update can be provided to the LATC in the future.

Mr. Bowden inquired whether MWELo was tested on the CSE. Ms. Rodriguez said that water management is tested on the CSE and comprises 12% of the exam. Kourtney Nation added that the 2015 MWELo is tested on the CSE even though it is not listed on the *CSE Candidate Guide*. Ms. Landry asked whether the *Guide* will be updated to reflect that MWELo is tested on the CSE. Ms. Nation responded that the exam development staff determined that MWELo did not need to be specified on the *Guide*, and the CSE Test Plan in the *Candidate Guide* was sufficient.

Tian Feng asked about the jurisdiction of MWELO and whether the ordinance applied to any agency or entity that receives state funding. Ms. Trauth explained that MWELO applies to all new landscapes that satisfy a certain square footage requirement. Mr. Feng clarified his question about the jurisdiction of MWELO, specifically asking whether any organization, public or private, must comply with the ordinance. Ms. Trauth replied that each municipality may alter the MWELO language to suit their needs, and if no changes are implemented, then the standards outlined by the model ordinance would be in effect. Mr. Truscott added that private associations would not be within the jurisdiction of the ordinance; however, the agency that supplies water to residents or private associations would be subject to the ordinance and would need to comply with MWELO requirements. Mr. Truscott continued that agencies that supply water to residents may adopt their own standards based on the MWELO standards. Ms. Landry gave an example where new projects above a minimum square footage would require individual residents to comply with MWELO. Mr. Truscott stated that in his experience, the implementation of MWELO has not been consistent, and therefore staff should monitor the activity relating to MWELO and report back to the LATC when appropriate.

Mr. Feng asked whether the City of Campbell has adopted MWELO. Ms. Landry confirmed that the City of Campbell has adopted MWELO as well as all the cities in Santa Clara County and the water districts. She conceded that implementation of MWELO has been inconsistent.

Ms. Trauth asked who is permitted to prepare MWELO calculations. Ms. Landry responded that an individual homeowner may prepare the calculations provided that the project is over a certain size, and landscape architects and irrigation designers may also prepare the calculations. Mr. Truscott stated that individuals who may prepare the calculations are defined under the Practice Act rather than in the MWELO ordinance itself. He commented that it is the intention to continue deferring to the Practice Act for the definition of individuals who may prepare the MWELO calculations. Ms. Trauth asked whether the individuals qualified to make the calculations should be referenced in the MWELO. Ms. Landry referenced language in the MWELO that identified the individuals qualified to make the calculations. Mr. Wreschinsky added that when MWELO was revised, there was a section that identified individuals qualified to make calculations. He continued that another issue is the qualifications of those tasked to review the calculations and that the purpose of MWELO was not to weaken current licensing law.

I. Discuss and Possible Action on 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objective to Research the Feasibility of Requiring a License Number on All Correspondence and Advertisement Platforms to Inform and Protect Consumers and Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Section 2671 Public Presentments and Advertising Requirements

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the proposed changes in CCR section 2671 would require landscape architects to include their license number on public presentments and all forms of advertising. Mr. Wreschinsky stated that he believed this requirement was already in effect, and Mr. Bowden responded that the license number requirement had previously been in effect, but somehow was no longer required. Mr. Bowden continued that he supported the changes to CCR section 2671, suggesting that the requirements would help the public verify a licensed landscape architect. Ms. Trauth asked whether architects are required to include their license number on communications. Mr. Bowden stated that contractors are required to include their license numbers on documents, and he reiterated that it would be helpful for the public to verify a landscape

architect's license number by having it listed on advertisements and other documents. Mr. Feng stated that the proposed regulation would apply to advertisements and correspondence. However, Mr. Bowden clarified that the regulation would require a license number on all documents including plans, specifications, and correspondence. Ms. Landry concurred and stated that the changes in CCR section 2671 would apply to all presentations made to the public including business cards. Ms. Landry went on to ask whether online advertisement listings are required to enforce the license number requirement. Ms. Zuniga clarified that the burden of enforcement is on the licensee which means that LATC may ask advertisement listing services to require that the landscape architect include their license number on their platform; however, LATC cannot enforce the requirement on the listing service. She reiterated that LATC may cite the individual licensee if they fail to include their license number. Ms. Zuniga also commented that the Board does require architects to include their license number on contracts.

Ms. Welch noted that the proposed language for CCR section 2671 is listed as blue text in the meeting materials. Mr. Feng added that although the proposed regulation may create a discrepancy in that landscape architects would be required to put their license numbers on all communications whereas architects are not required to do so, he did not foresee a potential harm to the public. Ms. Rodriguez stated that architects are required to inform clients that they are licensed by displaying their license in a public area or providing a letter stating that they are licensed. Mr. Feng added that it is common practice for architects to post their license on the wall in their offices.

Susan M. Landry moved to approve the proposed amendments to CCR, Title 16, Division 26, section 2671 Public Presentments and Advertising Requirements.

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

J. Review and Possible Action on Assessment of Individual Landscape Architect License Fee

Ms. Rodriguez stated the license fee assessment stemmed from a public comment from the previous February 2019 meeting. She explained that the results of the assessment showed a large disparity among the license fees for all jurisdictions, and therefore, the assessment was further narrowed to focus on the Council of Landscape Architects Registration Boards (CLARB) Region 5 jurisdictions and larger jurisdictions, including California, New York, Florida, and Texas. Ms. Rodriguez also mentioned that the data presented in the meeting packet was annualized to make it easier to compare fees on a yearly basis. Lastly, Ms. Rodriguez stated that input by DCA Budget Office staff would be needed to assess the initial license fees provided that the LATC wished to pursue the issue further.

Ms. Trauth inquired about how the initial license fee was determined. Ms. Rodriguez discussed the renewal fees as an illustrative example, stating that the LATC had to work with Budget Office staff to develop the renewal fee reduction to prevent reaching the fund statutory limit under Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 128.5. Ms. Rodriguez explained that analysis from

the Budget Office was required to determine whether a fee reduction was feasible. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether a newly licensed individual would have to pay the initial license fee and a renewal fee when the requisite timeframe had expired. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed, and Mr. Truscott inquired whether the renewal period was for two years. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed this as well. Mr. Wreschinsky went on to ask about the fiscal impact of a reduction in initial license fees, however, Ms. Rodriguez stated that the purpose of the fee assessment was to compare the initial license fees to other jurisdictions. Ms. Rodriguez said consultation with the Budget Office would be necessary to assess the feasibility of a reduction in initial license fees.

Mr. Truscott prompted the LATC to discuss whether the issue should be pursued further, in which case, budget staff would need to be consulted to assess the impact on the LATC's budget, or whether no further action was necessary. Mr. Bowden asked whether adjustment to the initial license fee was necessary given that this amount has been in place for several years. He commented that the initial license fees for California are not the highest nor the lowest among comparable jurisdictions. Continuing, Mr. Bowden noted that California has the highest number of licensed landscape architects compared to other states. Given the information he cited, Mr. Bowden asked whether the initial license fee needed to be changed at all. Ms. Trauth commented that new graduates are having a difficult time becoming licensed due to fees. Based on the comments of the Committee members, Mr. Truscott stated that the issue of initial license fees could be agendaized for a future meeting to assess the feasibility of a possible fee reduction. Ms. Zuniga stated that the initial license fees could be discussed at the November 2019 meeting when the budget staff are present and accurate budget data are available.

Mr. Bowden asked whether evidence was available to demonstrate that people are not able to become licensed due to the initial license fee given that candidates pay several examination fees. Mr. Bowden asked whether a cost breakdown was needed to assess the legitimacy of the initial license fee amount, and he continued that the initial license fee includes items such as the wall certificate and pocket certificate. Mr. Truscott inquired whether a cost breakdown for the initial licensing fee could be addressed by budget staff. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed this, and she reiterated that the purpose of the initial license fee assessment currently before the LATC was to evaluate whether Committee members wished to pursue the issue further, and any discussion of the feasibility of a fee reduction could be discussed at a future time. Ms. Zuniga commented that the LATC's budget is fixed, which implies that if the fees in one area are modified, then other fees may need to be changed as well to make up the difference in the budget. Mr. Feng inquired how long the initial license fee had been in place and assumed that the amount had remained the same for several years. Ms. Zuniga agreed that Mr. Feng's assumption was a reasonable assertion. Mr. Feng continued and asked how much the initial license fee was for architects, and Ms. Zuniga said she would verify the amount. Mr. Feng concluded that if the fee amount had been in place for some time, and the cost of living has been increasing, then relative to the costs of other items and expenses, the initial license fee would have, in effect, been decreasing by comparison.

K. Review and Possible Action on the University of California Extension Certificate Program Subcommittee's Recommendation to Amend CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Section 2620.5 Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program

Mr. Bowden expressed a possible conflict of interest due to his membership as the Chair of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Landscape Architecture Program Guidance Committee and recused himself from this agenda item.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that at its meeting on February 8, 2019, the LATC reviewed a list of recommended changes to CCR section 2620.5 provided by the Extension Certificate Program Subcommittee. She added that at that time, the LATC directed staff to prepare proposed regulatory language to amend CCR section 2620.5 to reflect the Subcommittee's recommendations.

Ms. Rodriguez advised the Committee that proposed changes were included within the meeting materials along with clarifying comments provided by DCA Legal Counsel. She shared that LATC had received 11 public comments in support of the proposed regulatory changes and deferred to Ms. Welch for an overview of the proposal and legal comments received.

Ms. Welch began by noting that the proposed revisions to section 2620.5 subdivision (a) are primarily clarifying language. She continued that the proposal would revise subdivision (a)(2) to remove the unnecessary phrase "the program's literature shall fully and accurately describe the program's philosophy and objectives." Mr. Wreschinsky questioned what was included in the term 'literature.' Ms. Welch responded that it is currently unclear as it could possibly refer to literature meant to entice new students or material provided on the first day of school. Mr. Truscott clarified, as member of the Subcommittee, that the term referred to all literature related to the program.

Ms. Welch continued with the next substantial change under subparagraph (a)(9)(I), as requested by the Subcommittee, to expand the list of required program curriculum areas to include "Current California statutes and regulations covering the environment, landscape architecture, and water conservation." She explained that this addition would presumably help prepare students as license candidates in taking any California-specific license examinations. Ms. Welch clarified that proposed subparagraph (a)(10) is an existing provision that she recommends reorganizing within the regulation, as specified, to make clear that it is a separate term. She added that the proposal expands on this term to allow for a program to revise their curriculum in order to correct deficiencies identified by the Board. Ms. Welch further explained that this change would provide sufficient authority to the program to revise the curriculum to address deficiencies that the Board has identified. She mentioned that proposed subdivision (b) would clarify what is required by a program to apply for program review and that proposed subdivision (c) would provide the procedure for the site visit itself based on what was included in the Subcommittee's recommendations. Ms. Welch expressed concern regarding the Subcommittee's recommended requirements pertaining to the site visit timeframe and designated makeup of the site visit review team. Specifically, she questioned if the regulation should specify a time requirement for the site visit. She added that LATC does not have any real reason to require an entire day for the site visit and listing out specific members of the site visit review team may be difficult to comply with. Ms. Welch shared that when providing for similar program approvals, other boards have provided for "a board designee" rather than explicitly listing out individuals within regulation. She suggested an alternative version of subdivision (c) which would remove the one-day site visit requirement, authorize a Board designee who shall not be personally affiliated with the educational program, so as to avoid a conflict of interest, to complete a site review of the educational program prior to granting Board approval or renewal of approval. Ms. Welch added that this change would allow for the Board designees to consist of one LATC member and one faculty member from a California school accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). She expanded that while the Subcommittee recommended including a faculty member from an LAAB-accredited program, she has concerns with doing so because the extension certificate programs are in direct competition with the LAAB-accredited programs. She clarified that she could not see any justification for requiring a faculty member from an LAAB-accredited program who may or may not have any affiliation with the LAAB accreditation process.

Ms. Welch then directed the Committee to proposed subdivision (d) and explained that this new addition would require the Board designee to review the educational program's self-evaluation report and site inspection, and submit a written report to the LATC which shall contain findings as to whether the educational program's application, supporting documents, and site inspection comply with the approval requirements, outlined in CCR section 2620.5, and make a recommendation to the Committee regarding approval. She explained that proposed subdivision (e) provides what the Committee may do with that recommendation. Ms. Welch continued to proposed subdivision (f) and explained that it provides for the Board to grant approval, provisional approval, or denial of the program under review.

Mr. Feng asked how many programs are currently subject to CCR section 2620.5. Ms. Rodriguez responded that there is currently one program within UCLA. Mr. Feng asked whether the program grants a degree or certificate. Mr. Truscott clarified that the program grants an extension certificate in landscape architecture. Mr. Feng questioned the value of the certificate in the context of a candidate's qualifications for taking the licensing examination. Mr. Truscott explained that credit is established in regulation for such certificates. Ms. Rodriguez expanded that it is one of the available pathways to licensure and that California is the only state that accepts the extension certificate toward licensure. Mr. Feng asked if LAAB is involved in accreditation of the extension certificate program. Mr. Truscott responded that LAAB is not able to accredit an extension certificate, but rather undergraduate and graduate degrees only. Mr. Feng asked if LAAB has raised any concerns with the extension certificate programs. Ms. Rodriguez responded that we have not received any concerns; however, LATC has approached LAAB twice in the past to inquire if they could accredit the certificate programs but both times LAAB responded that they were unable to do so. Mr. Wreschinsky added that he does not believe LAAB could take an official position on the programs. He added that some individual members of LAAB had expressed concern about accepting an extension program as qualifying to sit for the licensing examination as they viewed it as a threat to existing accredited programs.

Mr. Feng asked if the regulatory requirement would apply to another school who is interested in establishing an extension certificate program. Ms. Landry clarified that the regulatory change is not specific to UCLA but rather could apply to all qualified programs across the state.

Mr. Wreschinsky added that he agrees with Ms. Welch's recommendation to change the site visit terminology so as to not specify a timeframe. Mr. Truscott added that the Subcommittee's intent with specifying a one-day site visit was to accommodate the visiting team's schedule, but he is in support with not addressing the time factor for the site visit. Mr. Feng agreed not to specify a time length.

Ms. Trauth added that she is hopeful that LAAB will reconsider approving the extension certificate programs. She expressed that she believes it is important to have some kind of LAAB representation on the site review teams. Ms. Trauth asked who would determine the makeup of the site visit review team and stated that it may need to be clarified in regulation. Ms. Welch explained that the Committee may not need to specify how the Board designees are determined because the intent of this regulatory proposal is to accomplish several big picture items including establishing an approval and renewal process, specifying the time frame in which program approval is valid, and clarifying for the site reviewer the LATC evaluation criteria and how those standards are meant to protect students of these programs. Ms. Welch added that she does not know how to incorporate

LAAB experience within the review team without creating a conflict of interest. She reiterated that she recommends keeping the regulatory language broad so that the LATC and the Board can determine the number of individuals as needed. She added that if at some point the LATC determines that a change is necessary, it can be made at that time. Ms. Landry suggested including regulatory language that mentions the potential conflict of interest related to having a LAAB faculty member on a site review team. Ms. Welch clarified that removing reference to LAAB does not ensure that there is not a conflict of interest and asked the Committee to clarify what language is necessary to limit the scope so that there is not a potential conflict of interest. Mr. Feng recommended that as a state entity, LATC must be cautious of being in direct conflict of LAAB within the regulation. He added that when the Board appoints designees to conduct a site visit it may include an individual affiliated with LAAB even if that is not specified in regulation. Ms. Trauth added that she would like to keep the requirements broad but include some type of LAAB representation. Ms. Welch clarified that a faculty member from a LAAB-accredited program, who may or may not be subject to the rigors and direct review of LAAB, may not be connected to the LAAB process enough to ensure that they are a qualified reviewer of the extension certificate program.

Ms. Landry opined that the current regulatory proposal is vague when referring to the number of required reviewers and she expressed that there should be a minimum of three. She added that one should be a licensed landscape architect. Ms. Welch clarified that if an LATC member is specified then there would be at least one licensed landscape architect. She added that should the Committee decide to specify in regulation who may be a Board designee, it must also specify that each designee is not personally affiliated in a conflict of interest way. Ms. Landry added that the regulation should specify that none of the reviewers have any explicit or implied conflict. Ms. Welch asked if it is outlined in the Administrative Manual. Ms. Rodriguez responded that she did not believe so. Ms. Welch proposed that the LATC could specify who may serve on a site visit review team within the Manual rather than outlining this information in regulation. She expanded that this option would allow LATC to easily adjust the composition of the reviewing team as needed, rather than having to update the regulation. Mr. Wreschinsky opined that it will be difficult not to have some bias in the review process because there is a limited number of schools and practitioners are familiar with each other. He shared that when he previously served as a member of a site visit review team during the last review of the UCLA program, the three members of the team were all extremely professional. Mr. Wreschinsky also expressed that he would like LATC to continue to request that LAAB recognize these alternative ways to licensure. He added that he is a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) National Policy Committee and is aware of ASLA commencing discussions on recognizing extension certificate programs and alternative paths to licensure. He added that LATC should join that conversation if it will benefit the public as far as increasing the number of licensees that are delivering services. Ms. Trauth asked for clarification on how the Committee could specify the required makeup of the site visit review teams in the Manual. Ms. Welch explained that any changes made to the Manual are always made at public meetings so there is public participation and confirmed that the Committee could choose to specify within the Manual possible conflict of interest parameters pertaining to any three-member committees. Ms. Landry questioned if the Committee could make a vote on final approval or make a motion about reviewing these comments and coming back for approval. Mr. Truscott responded that because a proposal was presented based on the Subcommittee's recommendations he was comfortable with the changes discussed. He added that the Committee could craft a motion and move forward with the proposal. Ms. Trauth agreed and stated that she hesitates to unnecessarily prolong this issue. She recommended that subdivision (a)(7) be amended to require a licensed landscape architect.

Ms. Landry asked if that requirement is already implied by default due to the Landscape Architects Practice Act. Ms. Welch asked if it should instead specify a California licensed landscape architect.

Susan M. Landry moved to recommend to the Board approval of the proposed amendments to CCR section 2620.5 including the substantive changes outlined in the provided DCA legal comments, the changes of removing the specific titles of the people on the review board, specifying a site review team of three individuals, and adding the term “California licensed” to subdivision (a)(7).

Ms. Welch questioned if Ms. Landry was moving ‘Alternative (c)’ with changes to remove the site reviewer titles but to require a minimum number of three designees for a site visit. Ms. Landry confirmed. Ms. Welch clarified that the Committee intends to specify that no more than one site review designee shall be affiliated with the educational program and then leave the other two silent. She added that this change could give an idea that the group of three should be diverse.

Ms. Landry agreed and confirmed that the motion would include a minimum of three members, one of which is an LATC member and another could be associated with the program.

Mr. Wreschinsky added that they would like to drop the designation for how many days are required for a site visit. Ms. Landry clarified that was included in her motion as it is part of the referenced legal comments. Ms. Welch confirmed that the Committee had discussed adopting ‘Alternative (c)’ which does not contain the one-day terminology.

Patricia Trauth seconded the motion.

Ms. Trauth asked if a second motion is necessary to develop a better description of the site review team designees in the Manual. Ms. Welch responded that it may not be necessary at this time as the Committee agreed to clarify in regulation that a site visit review team will be made up of at least three individuals, including an LATC member and specifying that only one individual can be affiliated with the program, possibly as a recipient of an extension certificate or otherwise affiliated. She expanded that this designation would allow for the third person to possibly be affiliated with an LAAB-accredited program. She added that once the proposal is approved by the Board, the LATC could revise the Manual if additional clarification is necessary.

Members Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. Member Bowden abstained. The motion passed 4-0-1.

L. Review and Ratification of Contract With Cedars Business Services, LLC for Debt Collection Services to Collect Outstanding Administrative Fines and Cost Recoveries

Ms. Rodriguez stated that per the 2017-2018 LATC Strategic Plan, the Board and LATC sought debt collection services to collect outstanding administrative fines and cost recoveries.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that staff worked with the DCA Budget Office to develop the scope of work to be performed by the debt collection agency, and staff requested quotes from seven vendors, three of which responded, and the lowest bid was accepted. Ms. Rodriguez stated that under this combined contract, the vendor will provide services for the Board and LATC. Lastly, Ms. Rodriguez stated that the contract would be in effect from April 9, 2019 through April 8, 2022, and the Committee is asked to ratify the contract.

Andrew Bowden moved to approve the contract with Cedars Business, LLC for debt collection services to collect outstanding administrative fines and cost recoveries.

Patricia Trauth seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

M. Review of Future LATC Meeting Dates

Ms. Rodriguez announced tentative future meeting dates as:

Tuesday, August 13, 2019, in Chula Vista
Friday, November 8, 2019, in Sacramento

Ms. Rodriguez also stated that the Board has an upcoming meeting on June 12, 2019, and she invited members of the LATC to attend. She stated that the August 13, 2019 meeting will be held at Southwestern College in Chula Vista, California.

N. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:04 p.m.