



Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD **Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting**

May 4, 2018
Sacramento, California

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Members Present

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

LATC Member Absent

David Allan Taylor, Jr.

Staff Present

Vickie Mayer, Interim Executive Officer
Brianna Miller, Program Manager
Trish Rodriguez, Special Projects Manager
Marccus Reinhardt, Program Manager, California Architects Board (Board)
Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA or Department)
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator
Tremaine Palmer, Special Projects Analyst
Stacy Townsend, Enforcement Analyst

Guests Present

Dean Grafilo, Director, DCA (present during Agenda Item B)
Karen Nelson, Assistant Deputy Director, Office of Board and Bureau Services
Tian Feng, LATC Liaison, Board Vice President
Martin Carrion, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)
Leigh Morgan
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, California Council of American Society of Landscape Architects
(CCASLA)
Marcia Scott, APLD

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

LATC Chair Patricia Trauth called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and introduced Susan M. Landry, who was appointed to the Committee by the Speaker of the Assembly on April 19, 2018. Vice Chair Marq Truscott called roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

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

Ms. Trauth introduced the Director of DCA, Dean Grafilo. Mr. Grafilo announced that Dennis Cuevas-Romero was selected to fill the Deputy Director position for the DCA Division of Legislative Affairs. He reported that the Director’s Quarterly Meeting occurred on April 30, 2018, during which he met with executive officers and bureau chiefs regarding Department-facing issues that include pro-rata, a recent executive officer salary study, and various Department policies. He added that the next Director’s Quarterly Meeting would be held on July 30, 2018. Mr. Grafilo also touched on plans to conduct teleconferences with board and bureau leadership.

Mr. Grafilo discussed with the Committee the Department’s efforts regarding internal communication. He reported that, in April 2018, the Department launched its first Licensing and Enforcement Workgroup meeting with executive officers, bureau chiefs, and board/bureau licensing and enforcement staff to identify business processes that would strengthen DCA’s boards and bureaus.

With regard to DCA’s leadership training, Mr. Grafilo stated that 12 participants graduated in March 2018, from the Department’s inaugural Future Leadership Development Program, including LATC’s Program Manager, Brianna Miller. He continued that the program consisted of special leadership development exercises, special projects that could positively impact DCA, meeting with executives who shared career advice, and opportunities for the participants to develop new working relationships.

Mr. Grafilo also reported on the required Board Member Orientation Training held in March 2018 that detailed the important functions and responsibilities of board members. He reminded the Committee that members are required to complete this training within one year of appointment or reappointment. Mr. Grafilo advised that upcoming training sessions would be held on June 6, September 18, and December 5, 2018. He added that new board member and executive boot camp training is now available through the SOLID Training Office.

Following Mr. Grafilo’s update, Ms. Trauth announced that all motions and seconds would be repeated and that votes would be taken with roll call. In response to Andrew Bowden’s inquiry regarding Ms. Landry’s need to be sworn in, Ms. Landry advised that she had been sworn in by her local assemblyman.

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no comments from the public.

D. Review and Possible Action on November 2, 2017 LATC Meeting Minutes

Ms. Trauth asked for a motion to approve the November 2, 2017 LATC Meeting Minutes. Ms. Landry asked if she should abstain from voting due to her new appointment to the Committee. Tara Welch advised that Ms. Landry abstain from the vote.

- **Marq Truscott moved to approve the November 2, 2017 LATC Meeting Minutes.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

Members Bowden, Truscott, and Chair Trauth voted in favor of the motion. Member Landry abstained. The motion passed 3-0-1.

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

In reference to Attachment E.1 (Monthly Report [March 2018]), Ms. Miller reported that LATC is continuing to work on the Business Modernization project, which would transition LATC to a new licensing and enforcement platform. She continued that, in August, LATC and Board staff began meetings with DCA's Office of Information Services (OIS) and DCA SOLID's Organizational Change Management (OCM) team to review the project forecast and, concurrently, completed a project charter.

Mr. Bowden asked if LATC would eventually transition to BreZE. Ms. Miller responded that the Business Modernization process encompasses a determination of business needs and identification of a business platform that would best fit LATC's needs. Ms. Trauth asked if the Board is currently utilizing BreZE. Ms. Miller responded, "no", and advised that LATC is navigating the process in parallel with the Board.

Ms. Miller also reported on Assembly Bill (AB) 2138 and noted that the LATC and Department are monitoring the bill due to its impact on enforcement processes by proposing new review standards for criminal convictions. Ms. Welch advised that the bill would limit consideration of criminal convictions to only those within five years and it would require boards to revise standards of qualifying convictions. She also advised that the Department is monitoring AB 2483 as its provisions would be impactful to the role a board plays in payment of an antitrust award against a member.

Ms. Miller reported that former Executive Officer, Doug McCauley's, last day was March 1, 2018 and that Vickie Mayer was sworn in as Interim Executive Officer during the Board meeting held on the same day. Ms. Miller continued that the Board is working with DCA's Office of Human Resources to recruit and fill the Executive Officer position. Mr. Bowden inquired whether the Committee would have an opportunity to participate in the hiring process. Ms. Mayer responded that Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5517 requires the Board to make the selection. She advised that the position was advertised to the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) and the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), and that the filing deadline was April 4, 2018. She continued that a selection committee of two Board

members would conduct interviews on May 8, 2018 and that a recommended list of candidates would be provided to the Board at its June 13, 2018 meeting.

Ms. Miller reported that OIS has begun rolling out the new license look-up platform, which will enable the LATC to display current information on an ongoing basis as well as enable consumers to view all license related data for a licensee. She also advised that the Department would be holding a meeting for interested programs for the potential usage of credit cards for license renewals.

Ms. Miller reported that, at the April 18, 2017 LATC meeting, proposed language was reviewed for California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program). She continued that the Committee determined more information was needed and, resultantly, referred it to a subcommittee. Due to competing deadlines, she advised that the process was temporarily halted, but staff have recently begun consultation with legal counsel regarding LATC's next course of action. Mr. Truscott asked if the proposed language would be provided to the Education/Experience Subcommittee (Subcommittee). Ms. Miller responded that, due to the subject matter of the proposal, a new subcommittee may need to be formed as it is not under the Subcommittee's charge. Ms. Welch advised that the LATC first determine the intent of the proposed changes to the regulations.

Regarding examination pass rates contained in the manager's report, Ms. Landry inquired about the 54% pass rate of the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) in comparison to sections of the national Landscape Architect Registration Examination pass rates taken in 2017. Kourtney Nation responded that the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) advised LATC staff that, because of the low number of examinees, the percentages are skewed; further, OPES focuses on the average performance of examination items over three to five years. In addition, Ms. Mayer stated that the examination development process, which includes the occupational analysis, is based on standards that are monitored by OPES. Furthermore, she stated that OPES's present evaluation is that pass rates are in an acceptable range. Mr. Bowden requested that, for the national pass rates, a column be added to the chart for the number of candidates per section. Ms. Nation stated that staff could obtain and include that data.

F. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2615 (Form of Examinations) and Proposed Amendments to CCR Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits)

Ms. Miller reported that, at the November 2, 2017 LATC meeting, proposed language was approved to amend CCR section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) to include related degrees, non-related baccalaureate degrees, an experience-only pathway, accredited architecture and civil engineering degrees, and experience supervised by a landscape contractor. She continued that, following the Board's approval of the proposed language in December, additional modifications to the language were needed. She noted that Attachment F.1 (Proposed amendments to CCR § 2620) depicts previous and proposed amendments.

Ms. Welch noted that, in the proposed language, CCR sections 2620(a)(10) and 2620(a)(11) need edits to change the text of (b)(2) to (b)(1) which reference the definition of partial completion in CCR section 2620(b)(1). Tian Feng inquired about the difference between using the term

“registered” and “licensed.” Mr. Bowden clarified that some states use the term “licensed” and others use “registered.”

In reference to proposed language in CCR section 2620(a)(12), Ms. Landry expressed concern over an out-of-state candidate, who has no practice experience in the state of California, earning six years of experience credit for out-of-state experience. Mr. Bowden clarified that it is one of the newly created pathways, the LATC’s proposed “experience-only” pathway. Mr. Feng commented that the national examination would still need to be taken and passed. Ms. Landry asked if the credit was applied to the national examination or to the CSE. Ms. Trauth clarified that the experience credit is granted to sit for the national examination and, thereafter, the CSE.

Ms. Miller advised that, in order to align initial and reciprocity requirements, CCR section 2615 (Form of Examinations) needed to be amended to ensure congruence with CCR section 2620. She referenced the changes in Attachment F.2 (Proposed Amendments to CCR § 2615) and asked the Committee to review and take possible action to recommend to the Board approval of amendments to CCR sections 2615 and 2620. Ms. Miller added that amendments to both regulations would be jointly submitted to the Office of Administrative Law.

- **Marq Truscott moved to approve the proposed language as presented by staff with editions to CCR sections 2620(a)(10) and 2620(a)(11) to change the text of (b)(2) to (b)(1), which reference the definition of partial completion in CCR section 2620(b)(1).**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

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

G. Discuss and Possible Action on LATC’s Certification of Experience Form to Incorporate Proposed Amendments to CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits)

Ms. Miller reported that, at the November 2, 2017 LATC meeting, during the discussion of creating new pathways to licensure, the Committee discussed how the new pathways could potentially impact the Certification of Experience form. She referenced Attachment G.2 (Sample Employment/Experience Verification forms [DCA Boards and Other States]) and stated that staff reviewed CLARB and other boards’ forms. Ms. Miller continued that, upon analysis, staff discovered that the existing form needed to be updated to be reflective of current requirements delineated in CCR section 2620, which is depicted in Attachment G.3 (Certification of Experience – [Rev. April 2018]).

To address projected changes to CCR section 2620, Ms. Miller presented the proposed amendments to the Certification of Experience form in Attachment G.4 (Certification of Experience – [Draft May 2018]), which depicts the inclusion of a category for work performed as or under a licensed landscape contractor. Mr. Bowden expressed dissatisfaction that the form does not list criteria about a candidate’s experience level to demonstrate diversity in experience gained. Mr. Bowden stated that LATC is unable to verify work experience due to not having an internship program.

With regard to modifying the form, Ms. Miller stated that LATC had to consider current regulatory authority. Ms. Welch stated that, should the Committee wish to expand the experience criteria denoted on the form, the requirements would need to be included in regulation. She added that requirements need to be clear so staff and candidates understand the requirements.

Ms. Trauth stated that the Board has an internship program and that LATC would need to develop something similar. Mr. Bowden stated that the form could act as a means to monitor a candidate's experience. Ms. Mayer stated that staff prepared the form for the LATC's consideration based on the current parameters in regulation. She continued that, if additional parameters are proposed, then they will need to be justified given the LATC presently approves certified experience without having criteria listed on the Certification of Experience form. Ms. Mayer further noted that, with regard to concerns that the experience pathway is unstructured, the Board had an experience-only pathway for many years whereby candidates earned eight years of experience credit without completing an internship program and no issues arose.

Mr. Feng referenced Attachment G.5 (Certification of Experience – [Prior Version February 2017]) and noticed that it lists more criteria. Ms. Mayer commented that staff had removed what was not in regulation and that Attachment G.3 (Certification of Experience – [Rev. April 2018]) depicts what is currently in regulation. Ms. Landry agreed with Mr. Bowden about listing more criteria on the form to verify a candidate's experience, and inquired if "landscape contracting" should be changed to "landscape contractor." Ms. Trauth suggested changing the term to "landscape construction." The Committee decided to change the term on the form to "landscape construction." Mr. Feng noted that Washington State's Employment and Experience Verification form identified percentages and inquired how they were measured. He suggested researching Washington's form and regulations to determine if its experience verification method is effective.

Mr. Bowden inquired about the LATC utilizing the findings of other states' experience certification forms and regulations as supporting documentation to justify a list of experience criteria. Ms. Welch responded that the Committee could possibly rely on other states listing specific experience criteria as supporting documentation. Mr. Truscott asked if LATC could utilize testing criteria and incorporate specific experience criteria from other states. Ms. Welch responded that any changes to the Certification of Experience form would need to be justified; therefore, relying on examination criteria alone may not be sufficient.

Ms. Trauth stated her desire to research how other states manage their experience-only pathways. Ms. Welch suggested that LATC review the regulations and forms of one or two states of interest and draft a proposal to validate specific experience requirements.

Ms. Landry expressed her discomfort with the proposed form and suggested utilizing test plan percentages and examination categories as a reference to create a list of experience criteria. Ms. Trauth suggested researching New York and Washington's experience certification forms for experience-only pathways. She added that if New York and Washington do not have experience-only pathways, staff should research Florida's experience requirements, as well.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to hold previously approved proposed regulatory language under Agenda Item F until additional experience verification information is obtained**

regarding the Certification of Experience form from two other states, New York and Washington, with experience-only pathways.

Susan Landry seconded the motion.

Tracy Morgan Hollingworth commented that, during the Subcommittee meeting, the landscape contractor on the Subcommittee expressed discomfort in signing the Certification of Experience form without specific experience criteria listed. She also offered to gather information and conduct research with the assistance of CCASLA.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to amend the motion to hold previously approved proposed regulatory language under Agenda Item F until additional experience verification information is obtained regarding the Certification of Experience form from two other states with experience-only pathways.**

Susan Landry seconded the amendment to the motion.

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

H. Review and Possible Action to Approve 2018-19 Intra-Departmental Contract with Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) for California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Development

Ms. Nation reported that the current contract with OPES for CSE development expires June 30, 2018 and that the new contract extends from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Ms. Landry expressed her satisfaction with OPES.

Mr. Bowden asked about the frequency of the contract. Ms. Nation responded that the contract is executed annually, which results in the issuance of a new CSE form yearly in September.

Mr. Bowden inquired about the cost for OPES's services. Ms. Nation responded that there was a slight increase due to having more workshops on the weekends, which require additional staff time and costs.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the Intra-Departmental Contract with OPES for CSE development for fiscal year (FY) 2018-2019.**

Susan Landry seconded the motion.

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

I. Discuss and Possible Action on 2017-2018 Strategic Plan Objectives to:

- 1. Revamp the LATC's Website to be More User-Friendly for Consumers**

2. Prepare for Sunset Review Process to Demonstrate the LATC's Effectiveness

Ms. Miller reported that, as part of LATC's 2017-2018 Strategic Plan, the Committee has an objective to "Revamp the website (using the California Architects Board's website as a possible template) to be more user-friendly for consumers." She stated that the Board's website utilizes the California Department of Technology's (CDT) website template, which is designed for state agency use to promote uniformity and a standardized look and feel.

Ms. Miller explained that staff, utilizing CDT's v5 template, created a developmental website portrayed in Attachment 1 (Screenshots of Select LATC Developmental Website Pages). She continued that some examples of design changes include: a more reader-friendly layout for easier navigation, CDT's formatting of the header and footer, active tabs which display descriptors, and CDT's accessibility standards. She added that, if approved, staff will work with OIS to implement the developmental website.

During the demonstration of the website, Ms. Landry asked about the organization of the links under the Consumers Quick Hits section. Board Program Manager, Marccus Reinhardt, responded that the Board's Communications Committee opted to display page links in alphabetical order and the LATC is following this model. Mr. Feng inquired about the banner links on the bottom of the homepage. Mr. Reinhardt responded that the links are required to be a part of the template.

Ms. Landry inquired about the LATC's contact information not being displayed at the bottom of the homepage. Mr. Reinhardt responded that contact information was directed by DCA to be a part of the "About Us" tab. A member of the public asked if the website had undergone user testing and if more graphics were considered for visual cues. Mr. Reinhardt responded that the state has been using the template and the Board has not received any user complaints.

Upon request, the LATC compared the proposed developmental website with the Board's existing website. Through this review, the Committee chose to include on the LATC's website the same web buttons used by the Board for license verification, enforcement actions, and email subscriptions. Mr. Feng inquired about the relationship between the Board and LATC's developmental website and asked if each website included a prominent link to the other. Ms. Mayer responded that the Board has a link to LATC's website under Recommended Links, and that the websites cross-reference one another. The Committee decided that the LATC's developmental site will more prominently display a link to the Board's website.

Under the "About Us" tab, Ms. Landry suggested switching the placement of the History link with the Mission, Vision, and Values link. Upon discussion, the Committee decided to place the Mission, Vision, and Values link first.

Mr. Bowden asked whether the Practice Act link on the homepage could state "Practice Act" instead of "Act." Ms. Miller responded that it is consistent with the Board's display. Mr. Reinhardt commented that the wording of the Practice Act was not covered under CDT's requirements; however, it might be due to spacing constraints. Upon discussion and, in order to be more descriptive, the Committee decided to change "Act" to "Practice Act" or, if "Practice Act" does not fit, then "Laws."

- **Marq Truscott moved to approve the developmental website with the revisions of: 1) Changing the License Search, Enforcement Actions, and Subscribe for Email Alerts buttons to mirror the Board’s website; 2) Under the About Us tab, place the Mission, Vision, and Values link first; 3) For the Practice Act link on the homepage, change Act to Practice Act and, if Practice Act does not fit, then change to Laws; and 4) Make the cross refence link between the Board and LATC more visible.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Miller reported that the LATC must complete the Sunset Review process once every four years and that the Sunset Review Report (Report) is due December 1, 2018. She continued that the most recent iteration of the Report is included as an attachment for the Committee’s review and feedback. Ms. Miller advised that, for subsequent review and feedback, the Report will be provided to the Board’s Executive Committee and, thereafter, to the Board at its June 13, 2018 meeting. Following Board review, Ms. Miller advised that the Report would be presented to the LATC during its meeting on July 20, 2018 for approval. The Report, thereafter, will be presented to the Board on September 12, 2018 for final approval.

Ms. Miller reported that a working group, comprised of Ms. Trauth and Mr. Bowden, will assist staff while developing the Report. She announced that DCA’s Sunset Review Training would be held on May 24, 2018. She continued that, at that time, the 2018 Sunset Review Template may be revealed and that, if necessary, the LATC’s current draft may be updated and mirror the Board’s responses where appropriate. In addition, Ms. Miller stated that data for FY 17/18 is nearing completion and, once received, the data will be recorded to the appropriate sections of the Report and summarized trends will be updated. Ms. Trauth asked if the training would be webcast. Ms. Mayer responded, “no,” and advised that a Committee member could attend or that an update on what was presented could be provided.

Ms. Trauth asked where current proposed policy changes and newly created pathways should be placed in the Report. Ms. Mayer responded that there is a section for new issues and that the Committee can decide if incorporating research related to the Certification of Experience form is appropriate.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.1 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 1 Background) depicts the history, mission, organizational structure, and major changes in key legislation and regulations. Ms. Welch indicated that Table 1b, Board/Committee Member Roster, should include a footnote to clarify member appointment terms, and that the *Disciplinary Guidelines* and CCR section 2680 should be included in Item 3 of the Report. The Committee noted Ms. Welch’s recommendations.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.2 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 2 Performance Measures) depicts the customer satisfaction survey and feedback results. She noted that performance measures would be included as an attachment in Section 12 of the Report.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.3 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 3 Fiscal) depicts budget trends, fees, and expenditures. In reference to Item 12 of the Report, Mr. Bowden inquired about the absence of figures in Table 3, Expenditures by Program Component. Ms. Mayer responded that the table is still in the process of being completed, adding that the Board is collecting data using the same calculation method as the prior Sunset Report. Ms. Welch suggested inserting the fee authority within LATC's response to Item 14 of the Report, which authorizes the Board to collect fees.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.4 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 4 Licensing) depicts licensing data, information provided to applicants, questions regarding criminal history, fingerprinting, and examination data. Ms. Landry asked if Item 21 of the Report would need to be updated based on today's motions for Agenda Items F and G. Ms. Mayer responded that it may need to be updated to reflect staff's research results related to the Certification of Experience form. Ms. Landry asked if the LATC would implement a fingerprinting requirement. Ms. Mayer responded that neither the Board nor LATC has authority to fingerprint; however, ability to gain authority to conduct fingerprinting is being reexamined. Mr. Feng asked about the purpose of obtaining fingerprints. Ms. Mayer responded that fingerprint results could be grounds to deny an applicant if the violation relates to the scope of licensure.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.5 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 5 Enforcement) depicts enforcement program statistics, statistical trends, and unlicensed activity. Ms. Miller advised that, for Item 34 of the Report, an amendment to Table 9b Enforcement Statistics (continued) was needed whereby the average number of days to complete a disciplinary action case is 953 days, not 1,092 days. Mr. Feng asked if the average is considered low compared to the Board. Ms. Mayer responded that it is slightly lower.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.6 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 6 Public) depicts information published on LATC's website, frequency of meeting webcasting, information provided to the public, and methods of consumer outreach and education.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.7 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 7 Online Practice) depicts online practice issues. Ms. Miller noted that the response will be updated to align with the Board's response. Mr. Feng inquired about the meaning of online practice and Mr. Bowden responded that his interpretation of the prompt is that it is seeking information about when a licensee provides services online to persons in another state. Ms. Mayer advised that the Board has slightly revised their response and needs to determine if it applies to landscape architects. Ms. Landry commented that the Practice Act states that licensees cannot stamp plans that are not under their direct supervision and asked how an online production mill meets said criteria. In response to Ms. Landry, Mr. Bowden read from the section which states that, "such arrangements can stretch the limit of an operational definition of the landscape architect's 'responsible control' over the work produced." He commented that no one has complained about a landscape architect stamping plans from another state; however, it may not be proper practice. Ms. Mayer stated that by stamping the plans, they are considered correct and that the licensee who stamped the plans is taking responsibility of such plans. She advised that the Board has not received any complaints. As an aside, Mr. Bowden inquired about a landscape architect stamping his/her license number on any form of written communication or advertisement, adding that the license number was once required. Ms. Mayer responded that the license number is only required to be on a written contract and stamp. She continued that there is a general provision of the BPC

that requires the license number to be added to advertisements; however, a regulation would need to be promulgated in order to require the general provision.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.8 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 8 Workforce) depicts workforce development, job creation, actions taken by LATC, licensing delays, and barriers to entry. Ms. Miller advised that this section portrays LATC's expanded pathways to licensure.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.9 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 9 Current Issues) depicts current issues and includes the Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative and LATC's participation in BreZE.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.10 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 10 Response to Prior Sunset Issues) depicts LATC's actions and responses to issues raised in the prior Sunset Review Report. Ms. Miller advised that responses to the 2014 Sunset Review Report would be included with an update.

Ms. Miller reported that Attachment I.2.11 (LATC 2018 Sunset Review Report Section 11 New Issues) depicts solutions to issues identified by the LATC and new issues undergoing work by the Committee. She continued that prior to Mr. McCauley's departure, a decision was made to include enhanced pathways to licensure and written contract requirements in this section. Ms. Mayer advised that, previously, the Board had pursued statutory amendments to revise the written contract provisions; however, it was too substantive to be applied to an omnibus bill. She continued that Mr. McCauley decided to include the proposal in the Board's Sunset Review Report, provide the proposed language to the legislature, and ask for it to be included in their bill when they extend the sunset date. Ms. Mayer further stated that the Board's proposed amendments have not been presented to the Committee for possible amendments to LATC's written contract provisions; however, at the July 20, 2018 LATC meeting, the Committee would be provided the proposal that the Board approved for architects. She added that, if the Committee is in agreement with the amendments, it will be included in the Report.

J. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Amendments to LATC's *Disciplinary Guidelines* and CCR, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines)

Stacy Townsend reported that, at the July 13, 2017 LATC meeting, the Committee voted to approve the *Disciplinary Guidelines (Guidelines)*. She advised that, thereafter, DCA Legal reviewed the *Guidelines* and recommended additional edits, which the Board approved at its September 7, 2017 meeting. Ms. Townsend continued that, at the December 7, 2017 Board meeting, the Board approved its *Guidelines* and recommended corresponding changes to LATC's *Guidelines*, which are depicted in the attachment. She asked the LATC to review and take possible action to recommend to the Board approval of the revised *Guidelines*.

Ms. Landry suggested that, in section 125.6 of Attachment J.1 (LATC's *Disciplinary Guidelines* with Recommended Revisions), the term "handicap" should be changed to "disabled" to align with the California Building Code Standards. Ms. Mayer responded that, if that is the standard, the term could be changed. Upon further review, the Committee decided to revert back to the title's current language of "Discrimination by Licensee" in lieu of amending the language.

Ms. Welch stated that, due to section 2 on page 20, the attachment on page 26 needs to include “Attachment A” and “(Rev. 5/2018).” She also advised using the full spelling of “revised” for the revision date in the proposed language of Attachment J.2 (Proposed Regulatory Language, Title 16, California Code of Regulations Section 2680) as well as on the front page of Attachment J.1 for consistency. Ms. Welch further advised that, in the reference authority of the proposed language, existing text of “, 11425.50” needed to be reinserted and, after the text, the addition of a comma. The Committee agreed with Ms. Welch’s editions.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the *Disciplinary Guidelines* with the revisions of: 1) Reverting back to the existing language of the title of BPC section 125.6 (Discrimination by Licensee); 2) Adding the language “Attachment A and (Rev. 5/2018)” to the Quarterly Report; 3) Editing line 3 of CCR section 2680 of the proposed language to “(Revised 2018)” as well as including “(Revised 2018)” on the *Disciplinary Guidelines* face page; and 4) Reinserting existing text of “, 11425.50” and, after the text, the addition of a comma in the Authority Cited section of the proposed language.**

Marq Truscott seconded the motion.

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

K. Review of Future LATC Meeting Dates

Mr. Bowden requested that the annual meeting dates for ASLA and American Institute of Architects be included on the schedule. Mr. Truscott inquired about the July 20, 2018 meeting location. Ms. Miller responded that the meeting would be held in Southern California and that staff is working on securing a meeting location.

Mr. Truscott commented that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) formed a landscape stakeholder advisory group for the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo) amendments and that they would soon have a draft summary of the proposed amendments. He continued that new development and retrofitted landscape water efficiency standards are governed by MWELo; therefore, LATC should attempt to participate in the process. He suggested inviting DWR for a presentation.

Ms. Morgan Hollingworth suggested the LATC hold its meeting at the Metropolitan Water District in Southern California. She added that its resource personnel could possibly provide a briefing on MWELo amendments.

L. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.