



Meeting Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting

December 2, 2020
WebEx Teleconference

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC/Committee) Members Present

Jon S. Wreschinsky, Chair
Andrew C. N. Bowden
Pamela S. Brief
Susan M. Landry
Patricia M. Trauth

California Architects Board (Board) Member Present

Tian Feng, LATC Liaison, Board President

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager
Tara Welch, LATC Counsel, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, Attorney III, DCA
Mary Kathryn Cruz Jones, Staff Services Manager I, DCA Board and Bureau Relations
Stacy Townsend, Enforcement Analyst
Blake Clark, Examination Analyst
Paul McDermott, Budget Analyst, DCA Budget Office
Tracy Montez, Chief of DCA Programs and Policy Review Division
Karen Okicich, Research Data Supervisor, Office of Professional Examinations Resources (OPES)

Guests Present

Stephanie Landregan, Program Director, UCLA Extension Program
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, California Council of American Society of Landscape Architects

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

LATC Chair, Jon Wreschinsky called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. and called roll. Five members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

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

Mr. Wreschinsky thanked the meeting participants for their attendance. He welcomed LATC's new member, Pamela Brief, and asked LATC Program Manager, Trish Rodriguez, to provide a brief introduction. Ms. Rodriguez welcomed Ms. Brief to the Committee and noted that her term expires on June 1, 2024.

Mr. Wreschinsky explained the meeting was held via webcast pursuant to the provisions of Governor Gavin Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, dated March 17, 2020, and there was no physical meeting location.

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Mr. Wreschinsky invited members of the public to address the LATC, stating their comments would be recorded in the official minutes. There were no comments from the public.

D. Update on the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Mary Kathryn Cruz Jones of DCA's Board and Bureau Relations welcomed Ms. Brief and thanked her for her willingness to serve on the Committee. Ms. Cruz Jones continued that one of the Board and Bureau Relations' top priorities is appointments and provided a brief overview of the LATC, adding that there are currently no vacancies on the Committee. She then provided an overview on DCA activity throughout the Pandemic and informed the Committee that DCA has partnered with the Governor's Office and Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency on statewide efforts related to awareness and the enforcement of public health measures. Ms. Cruz Jones explained that, due to the economic impacts of the Pandemic, each Board and Bureau will be required to plan for a five percent permanent budget reduction no later than fiscal year 21/22. She added that LATC staff are working with DCA to identify a plan to best fit operational needs.

Ms. Cruz Jones informed the Committee Board and Bureau Relations held three virtual trainings to provide executive officers with the opportunity to learn and discuss best practices on topics such as appointments, managing staff remotely, and providing Americans with Disabilities Act compliant meeting materials to committee members and the public. She also provided, in partnership with DCA's SOLID, Board and Bureau Relations has been providing Board member orientations quarterly and the 2021 training dates should be released soon. Ms. Cruz Jones stated, additionally, Board and Bureau Relations is hoping to launch a new training for presidents and chairs in 2021.

E. Review and Possible Action on September 4, 2020 LATC Meeting Minutes

LATC Counsel, Tara Welch, requested that the Committee consider revising the minutes to insert "LATC Counsel" after her name and insert "Regulatory Counsel" after Karen Halbo's name under the heading "Staff Present" on page one of the minutes. She also suggested the following clarifying revisions to the third paragraph on page six: replace "feels" with "felt;" delete the word "however" after the word "efforts;" and insert a comma after the word "requires."

- **Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to approve the September 4, 2020 LATC Meeting Minutes as revised.**

Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

Members Bowden, Trauth, Landry, and Chair Wreschinsky voted in favor of the motion. Member Brief 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 announced the recent retirement of the Board's Assistant Executive Officer, Vickie Mayer.

Ms. Rodriguez provided an update on LATC's pending regulations stating that she had requested assistance from DCA to expedite internal reviews of LATC's regulatory packages and, in response, DCA Legal prepared an estimated regulatory timeline including normal and expedited target dates. She added that staff now receives weekly status updates from LATC's Regulatory Counsel.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that staff is working with Legal counsel to finalize the edits to the package for California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2611 (Abandonment of Application), CCR section 2611.5 (Retention of Candidate Files), and CCR section 2616 (Application for Licensure Following Examination) and the next step is to obtain Budget's official review, which is targeted for mid-December 2020.

Additionally, Ms. Rodriguez provided that the rulemaking file for CCR sections 2615 (Form of Examinations) and 2620 (Education and Training Credits) has been prioritized above the other rulemaking files. She explained this regulation package was submitted to Agency for review on November 18, 2020 and the next step will be submission to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for initial notice.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the members that the rulemaking package for CCR section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) is currently with DCA Legal for pre-review and staff submitted revisions to Legal on November 20, 2020. She explained the next step will be for the package to go to Budgets for official review with a target completion date of the end of December 2020.

Ms. Rodriguez continued that the regulatory package to amend CCR sections 2655 (Substantial Relationship Criteria) and 2656 (Criteria for Rehabilitation) to implement Assembly Bill (AB) 2138, which aims to reduce barriers to licensure for individuals with a criminal history, has been with OAL since June 24, 2020. She explained the proposal included a request for expedited review and will become effective when filed with the Secretary of State. She informed the members that OAL is expected to approve the package before the December 4, 2020 deadline.

Next, Ms. Rodriguez provided an update on CCR section 2671 (Public Presentments and Advertising Requirements), explaining that staff worked with legal counsel to finalize edits to the regulatory package and the next step is to submit the package to the Budget office for official review with a target completion date of December 31, 2020.

Lastly, Ms. Rodriguez explained that the rulemaking package for CCR section 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines) required extensive review and the next step is to submit the package to the Budget office for official review with a target completion date of December 31, 2020.

Mr. Wreschinsky requested clarification on whether the resubmittal of Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5659 for legislative approval would be part of a stand-alone bill or part of DCA's omnibus bill. Laura Zuniga confirmed that BPC section 5659 would be submitted for the omnibus bill which is due in January 2021.

Mr. Wreschinsky questioned whether the proposed language to CCR section 2620 allowing reciprocity licensure to applicants licensed in any US jurisdiction also included US territories, specifically, Guam. Ms. Rodriguez explained staff would check with the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) to determine who the member boards with CLARB are and work with the jurisdictions specific to the US territories. Mr. Wreschinsky also questioned how LATC planned to accommodate practitioners from states who have lost their licensure, such as Illinois. Ms. Rodriguez explained that LATC has not encountered a reciprocity applicant with a license in Illinois, however, should that occur, staff would work with the applicant to achieve reciprocity in California in accordance with the regulations.

Member of the public, Stephanie Landregan, requested clarification on the regulatory package status for CCR section 2620. Ms. Rodriguez clarified that it was submitted to Agency for review on November 18, 2020 and it had not yet been submitted to OAL. Ms. Landregan requested confirmation there will be a comment period during OAL's review of the regulatory proposal and there will be notice of the comment period. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed there will be a 45-day comment period to which a notice will be posted on LATC's website and sent via email to LATC's interested parties list.

Andrew Bowden questioned why the exam and enforcement sections of the Program Manager's report were not being discussed. Ms. Rodriguez explained that she did not plan on reviewing the exam data presented unless there was something noteworthy to mention.

Mr. Wreschinsky added that he was saving his questions to discuss during the Occupational Analysis agenda item.

***G. Review and Discuss 2020 Legislation**

1. Assembly Bill (AB) 2113 (Low) Refugees, Asylees, and Special Immigrant Visa Holders: Professional Licensing: Initial Licensure Process

Ms. Zuniga presented AB 2113, which requires all boards within DCA to expedite licensure for applications from refugees, asylees, and Special Immigrant Visa holders. She explained that LATC has made changes to its forms to reflect the new requirement and they will be in place shortly. Ms. Zuniga continued that it is not expected to affect a significant number of applicants. She stated this requirement will take effect January 1, 2021.

Mr. Wreschinsky questioned whether it was known how many candidates have applied under this expedition. Ms. Zuniga explained it is not known how many candidates have applied that fall under this category and there was not much information about the number of candidates that might apply under this, however, LATC and the Board will track the number of applicants and report to the legislature and the members.

Tian Feng questioned whether a person residing in California for an extended period but is not a permanent resident could obtain a license. Ms. Zuniga explained applicants need to submit either a social security number or a taxpayer identification number, making it possible for someone without a social security number to become licensed if they possess the alternative federal identification number. Mr. Feng inquired on if a non-permanent resident can obtain a social security number. Ms. Zuniga stated she would research and provide the information to both Mr. Feng and the Committee members.

2. Senate Bill (SB) 878 (Jones) Department of Consumer Affairs: License: Application: Processing Timeframes

Ms. Zuniga provided an update on SB 878, which requires all boards within DCA to post online their average processing times for initial and renewal license applications. She explained that DCA is working on implementation for all boards, and although this does not go into effect until July 1, 2021, LATC staff will work on posting this information sooner than the implementation date.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on the length of time it took to update the license status of a licensee who renews online. Stacy Townsend answered that it takes approximately 24 hours for the license status and expiration to update.

3. SB 1474 (Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development) Business and Professions

Ms. Zuniga presented SB 1474, which contained language that would have allowed LATC to implement the fingerprinting requirement that was proposed in 2019 by SB 608. She explained that the bill delays LATC's implementation for an additional year due to concerns the Department of Justice (DOJ) had about the implementation language. Ms. Zuniga explained that staff will work with DOJ to resolve the issues and edit the language. She stated that LATC will then submit the revised language for the Omnibus Bill in 2021.

Ms. Landregan requested clarification on whether the fingerprinting language was still in the Omnibus Bill or if the language had been struck. Ms. Zuniga explained

the language has been revised to delay the implementation date to January 1, 2022.

Tracy Morgan Hollingworth brought AB 2257 to the Committee's attention, stating that the California Council of ASLA lobbied heavily to ensure that landscape architects were included in the exempt category allowing them to be independent contractors in AB 2257 since architects were included in the exempt category.

***F. Program Manager's Report - Update on Committee's Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs**

Mr. Bowden restated that he would like to have more of a discussion regarding the examination and enforcement sections of the Program Manager's Report. He explained that in future meetings he would like to dedicate some time to those sections. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that time could be dedicated to discussing the sections and explained that some sections of the Program Manager's Report would be discussed during other agenda items. Ms. Rodriguez pointed out that the August and September Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) administration had more candidates registered due to the postponement of the June administration as a result of the Pandemic.

Mr. Wreschinsky pointed the Committee's attention to the chart tracking LATC's pending regulations and questioned whether a deadline had been established for the expectation of the completion of actions. Ms. Rodriguez explained that previously deadlines were not established, however, in communicating closely with DCA, target dates had been identified. Mr. Wreschinsky opined that when the regulations are provided to Legal and DCA it does not appear there is a clear timeframe of when packages are expected to move forward. Ms. Rodriguez explained the next steps for each package are included with the regulations updates and she could attempt to provide additional next steps along with their potential completion dates.

Susan Landry inquired if additional action was taken regarding professional advertising websites incorrectly categorizing unlicensed individuals as landscape architects. Ms. Rodriguez reminded the members that staff reached out to the various websites, however, LATC does not have authority over those websites and there is not much more the Committee can do.

Ms. Welch confirmed that LATC only has authority over the individuals who may be falsely advertising. She continued that LATC does not have control over a website who may be automatically generating content the unlicensed individual has no control over. Ms. Welch further explained that a website could not be cited for someone's advertisement, only the individual posting the advertisement could be cited. Ms. Landry clarified that LATC would have to file an allegation for the individuals falsely advertising and could not request the websites to create additional categories. Ms. Welch confirmed that is correct.

H. Discuss and Possible Action on the Committee's Annual Budget – DCA, Budget Office

Paul McDermott informed the Committee he has been working on three budgets: the year-end budget from last fiscal year, the current fiscal year budget, and the future budget incorporating the previously mentioned five percent budget reduction. He explained that last fiscal year there was an estimated revenue stream of \$875,000, however, the Committee actually brought in \$803,000, most likely due to shut downs caused by the Pandemic. He assured the Committee that he was not concerned with the difference because it is well within the deviation of revenue streams and, at year end, the Committee had approximately \$1.3 million in reserves equating to about 13 and a half months to keep the Committee functioning.

Mr. McDermott shared that he and Ms. Rodriguez had reviewed the budget and had identified several line items that can be reduced without jeopardizing LATC in overspending its budget or allocation. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on the identified line items to be reduced. Mr. McDermott responded that the items include external Consulting and Professional (C/P) services, general expenses, information technology, and consolidated data centers. Mr. McDermott explained that facilities and pro rata were two line items that could not be reduced. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned what occurred with the unused funds. Mr. McDermott explained the unused money would be placed in the reversion to be saved and moved into the fund condition for the next fiscal year and could be used should a scenario occur in which LATC stopped receiving funds. Mr. Wreschinsky pointed out, with no traveling, the Committee moved to virtual meetings and asked the cost to LATC for holding these meetings. Mr. McDermott confirmed there are expenses involved with holding virtual meetings, however, he did not have a specific dollar amount.

Ms. Brief requested a breakdown of the types of expenses that would be included in the "special items of expense" line item. Mr. McDermott explained that he would have to research what those expenses were and, at Ms. Brief's request, would provide for the Committee's next meeting.

Ms. Landry inquired on whether reducing license renewal fees again had been considered. Ms. Rodriguez explained there were no considerations to reduce the current renewal fees. Mr. McDermott added that at the time of the recent renewal fee reduction, LATC had about 28 months in reserves which was significantly higher than the current 13 and a half months. Ms. Landry inquired on whether there was a provision in place for a licensee experiencing a hardship due to the current economic situation to apply for a renewal fee reduction, to which Ms. Rodriguez answered there were no provisions currently in place for a renewal fee reduction.

I. Discuss and Possible Action on the August 2020 Occupational Analysis (OA) of the Landscape Architect Profession – DCA, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES)

Ms. Rodriguez introduced Research Data Supervisor from OPES, Karen Okicich, and Chief of DCA Programs and Policy Review Division, Tracy Montez, to present the Occupational Analysis (OA). Ms. Okicich explained that Business and Professions Code section 139 requires that boards submit a yearly report about

their OA and exam development processes as well as requiring that boards conduct an OA every five to seven years.

Ms. Okicich informed the Committee that conducting an OA is the first step in the cycle of examination development and the results of the OA provide a detailed description of practice which forms the basis for developing legally defensible licensing exams.

Ms. Okicich provided an overview of LATC's recently completed OA, stating that an invitation was sent out to all California landscape architects with an email on file with LATC, equaling to 3,215 licensees. She continued that a sample size of 571 responses was received, or a 17.8% response rate. Ms. Okicich explained that after receiving the responses, the demographics of the respondents were reviewed, specifically looking at experience, education, work setting, and geographical location. She went over the results observing that there was a diverse representation of experience levels ranging from 20 or more years of practice to fewer than five years with the majority of work experience from a landscape architecture firm followed by multidisciplinary firm and government agency with representation from throughout California. She continued that the majority of the respondents held a bachelor's degree with some also possessing a master's degree and there were a few respondents with a Doctorate degree, certificate, or some other form of education with many holding a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) accreditation professional certificate. Ms. Okicich provided that many landscape architects indicated they had experience working on multiple types of projects including residential, parks and recreation, and transportation, in addition to green projects related to conservation, stormwater management, water reuse and recycling, erosion control, slope protection, and permeable paving. She also explained the survey yielded the top specialists landscape architects work with were arborists, geotechnical engineers, and traffic engineers.

Ms. Okicich informed the Committee there were four content areas defined: (1) scope of project; (2) program development; (3) design process (4) and construction documentation and administration.

Ms. Okicich informed LATC the next step of the OA is reviewing the content of the National LARE against the current California description of practice, however the National LARE OA has been delayed due to the Pandemic and their survey is expected to be administered in Spring 2021. She continued that once the results of the National OA are available, another group of Subject Matter Experts (SME) will review the results and determine whether the competencies that are required for California are adequately covered by the LARE. Ms. Okicich additionally explained that OPES will work with SMEs to develop a California specific exam outline if it is determined that some competencies that need to be assessed at the California specific level remain. She acknowledged that the Committee had some questions regarding the pass rates of the LARE and clarified that OPES does not typically track those rates on an ongoing basis since they are not involved with that exam, however they do look at them as part of the OA review process.

Ms. Landry pointed the Committee's attention to the construction documentation and administration content area and opined that it was interesting that the mean importance for preparing drawings to communicate the construction of project design was 4.35 out of 5 when the landscape exam is only multiple choice without requiring drawings and the practice of landscape architecture has mostly to with preparing drawings. She continued that she felt it important for candidates to be able to draw and be tested on that aspect of the profession.

Ms. Brief requested that OPES consider adding the Envision certification in addition to the LEED certification for the next OA survey because some practitioners may also have that designation. Ms. Okicich confirmed that OPES would consider adding the certification to the next survey. Ms. Brief also observed that civil engineers were not included in the list of professionals that landscape architects collaborate with and inquired on if that profession should be included in the next survey. Ms. Landry agreed with this observation and felt that civil engineers should be included in the list as well as government agencies.

Mr. Wreschinsky noted that the survey went out to the 3,215 landscape architects who had an email on file with LATC and inquired on the total number of current California licensees. Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that California currently has approximately 3,700 licensees demonstrating that the majority of licensees had provided their email addresses to LATC, although providing email addresses is not a requirement at this time. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned whether, when selecting the sample size, if any practice specialties or non-traditional roles were identified and used to determine the sample. Ms. Landry added that she felt that participants should be asked if they hold any non-traditional roles relating to landscape architecture and that data be collected in the future. Ms. Okicich explained that when determining the sample size specializations were not taken into consideration because they were interested in looking at the general practice across the profession, however, it could potentially be looked at with the data gathered. Lastly, Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on the criteria used to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities unique to California when reviewing the National OA and comparing it to LATC's OA. Ms. Okicich explained that SME's are relied very heavily on for input and providing which California specific requirements should be included in the California exam based on the current practice.

Ms. Landregan, observed that it could be helpful to include the questions asked on the survey when presenting the data. Ms. Landregan additionally observed that some of the content areas and descriptions of the OA were modified, however, the reasons and validations for the modifications were not discussed. Ms. Okicich explained the statements were modified by SME recommendations for clarity and the modifications were addressed in the validation report. Ms. Montez explained the statements are task statements outlining the most critical tasks to assess on a licensing exam.

Ms. Montez explained that some knowledge statements were removed, retained, or modified using OPES's methodology and psychometrics. Ms. Montez added that the validation report has more details regarding this information. Ms. Landregan expressed concern that the survey sample could be too small and not have the

breadth of practice to justify the modifications of certain elements and inquired on whether there was a process in place to challenge the modifications. Ms. Montez explained that there was not an appeal process for the knowledge statements and as the examination validation process continued, the statements would be monitored. Ms. Montez continued that the response rate was defensible and was higher than the typical response rate. She added that if any concerns arose with the validity or reliability of the data, they would work with LATC staff to recruit additional SMEs or hold additional workshops. Ms. Montez explained the Committee's feedback would be used during the various exam workshops, and although OA's are typically conducted every five to seven years, the Committee could decide to hold another OA sooner, if necessary.

Ms. Landregan inquired if the OA would be included in LATC's Sunset Review and could legislators use the information to change laws that could potentially impact the landscape architecture scope of practice. Ms. Montez explained that any significant decisions regarding the scope of practice would not be made solely on the results of the OA and that other information would be considered when changing the scope of practice. Ms. Rodriguez added the previous OA conducted was included in the most recent Sunset Report and she expected this OA would be included in the next Sunset Report. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on whether the OA would be officially blessed and if there would be recourse to address specific line items of the OA. Ms. Rodriguez explained that it was not required for the Board nor the Committee to approve the report, however OPES was taking notes regarding the Committee's input of the report for the next OA. Ms. Montez confirmed it was not required for the Committee to approve the OA but were encouraged to provide comments for any areas to be followed up on. She continued that it was rare for a Board or Committee to not accept the findings of an OA, typically because OPES would have to defend the report and the California examination should any litigation or allegations regarding the exam occur.

Mr. Wreschinsky expressed concern that the OA generated a more general product which could potentially put landscape architect licensure at risk. Ms. Montez pointed out the OA was being used to develop an exam plan for creating a California examination that measures the most critical competencies at that time, which did not mean that the other competencies were not important but that it was determined they were not as critical or practiced as frequently. She continued that the exam plan was not intended to be used to define the scope of practice but rather as a piece of the scope that was being assessed. Mr. Wreschinsky also inquired on the next steps after the completion of the OA. Ms. Montez explained the next step would be to review the National OA with a group of SMEs and evaluate the LARE plan comparing California's practice to create a unique California exam that did not duplicate what was tested on the LARE. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on a time frame of when the process would be completed. Ms. Okicich explained that a time frame would be determined upon completion of the National OA which was tentatively scheduled to be administered in Spring 2021 but there has been no firm deadline of when the study would be finished.

J. Discuss and Possible Action on Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2630.2 (Appeal of Citations)

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that BPC section 5526.5 as amended on January 1, 2020 regulates the Board's appeal of citations which allows the respondent of a citation to request a formal administrative hearing after an informal conference if the citation is upheld or modified as well as authorizing the executive officer to appoint a designee to hold an informal conference in the event of a conflict of interest. She provided that LATC's appeal of citations is regulated by CCR section 2630.2 and currently allows the respondent to have a formal administrative hearing after an informal conference if one is requested within 30 days of service of the original citation. Ms. Rodriguez explained that in order to align with the Board, staff drafted amendments to CCR section 2630.2 to include language allowing respondents to request a formal administrative hearing within 30 days of the affirmation or modification of a citation following an informal conference, as well as, authorizing the executive officer to appoint a designee to hold the informal conference in the event of a conflict of interest. She continued that additional information was added to clarify that another informal conference cannot be requested for a citation that has been affirmed or modified following an informal conference. Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that the proposed amendments in the meeting materials had been modified and that they should refer to the handout provided separately.

Ms. Welch provided an additional revision to the proposed language of CCR section 2630.2, specifically under the new subsection (i), on the fourth line where it says, "waived his or her right," the language "his or her" needs to be stricken and "their" needs to be inserted.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on the definition of an informal conference and the individuals typically involved. Ms. Townsend explained, typically, informal conferences were attended by the enforcement analyst, the executive officer of the Board, and the respondent. She continued that there was an option for the respondent to have their lawyer present, which in return the Board would have its legal counsel present. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on whether subject matter experts could potentially be involved in the informal conference. Ms. Townsend confirmed that if a case was reviewed by a subject matter expert and resulted in a citation there was the possibility that the reviewing subject matter expert could be involved in the informal conference. Mr. Wreschinsky clarified that the informal conference was held by the Board and not LATC and inquired on whether LATC had representation at the informal conference. Ms. Townsend confirmed that informal conferences were held with the executive officer of the Board and the LATC enforcement analyst would be the representation for the Committee as well as the subject matter expert, if necessary, who would be a California licensed landscape architect. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned whether an informal conference could be requested prior to the issuance of a citation to rectify the situation. Ms. Welch explained the individual would have the opportunity to respond to investigative questions and could present their evidence that they have not committed a violation, however, it would not be until a citation was issued that an informal conference would be important. She continued that an informal conference could

only be held after the issuance of a citation in accordance with the Business and Professions Code procedure as well as the Administrative procedure.

Ms. Trauth inquired on how respondents were notified they had the options to request an informal conference, a formal administrative hearing, or both.

Ms. Townsend explained that when citation is issued, respondents are provided forms to complete and send back to the Board requesting an informal conference, a formal administrative hearing, or both.

- **Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to recommend to the Board approval of the proposed regulatory amendments to CCR section 2630.2 (Appeal of Citations) as revised.**

Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

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

K. Discuss and Possible Action on University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Program Self-Evaluation Report and Curriculum Approval

Mr. Wreschinsky introduced the item and announced that both Mr. Bowden and Ms. Brief recused themselves from the discussion. Ms. Rodriguez presented the item explaining that the Committee reviews and the Board approves the landscape architecture extension program that meets specific standards within LATC's California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program). She continued the Committee last conducted a review of the Program in 2013 and approval was given through December 31, 2020. Ms. Rodriguez explained that in anticipation of the upcoming expiration of that approval, the Program submitted a self-evaluation report (SER) to LATC on June 15, 2020 for the 2013 through 2020 academic years. She further stated that former LATC Chair, Marq Truscott, appointed a subcommittee consisting of LATC staff and current LATC Chair, Mr. Wreschinsky, to review the Program's SER and provide a recommendation to the Committee on the continued approval of the Program. Ms. Rodriguez went on to explain that following the initial review of the SER, the subcommittee sent additional questions to the Program Director, Stephanie Landregan, regarding recommendations from the 2013 Site Review and clarification on the Program's relationships with the UCLA, Horticultural Program and the UCLA, School of Architecture and Urban Design. She provided that the responses were received on October 5, 2020 and the subcommittee prepared a report and recommendation regarding Board approval of the Program. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the LATC was being asked to consider the subcommittee's recommendation and take possible action to recommend to the Board approval of the Program through December 31, 2023.

Ms. Rodriguez updated the Committee with the status of the regulation package for CCR section 2620.5 stating that it has been approved by the Board and it is

currently under review by DCA. She explained that the new language should be adopted and implemented by the Program by the end of the proposed three-year approval and will be used by a site review team at that time.

Ms. Trauth requested additional information regarding how the extension program fit into the university framework. Ms. Landregan explained the UCLA Extension Program is part of the University and under that connection they get their Academic Senate Approval through the Department of Architecture and Urban Design. She continued that all Program class curriculums and instructors were approved through the Academic Senate. Ms. Trauth further questioned whether there was interaction between the Program and the Department of Architecture and Urban Design. Ms. Landregan explained that the Department's Chairperson would attend, and jury, the Program's shows so they were aware of the quality of work being produced. She continued that the Department Chairs rotate, and the Program attempts to engage them as much as possible in order to keep the connection between the Program and the Department.

Mr. Wreschinsky explained that within the three years of the proposed approval, there would be another formal review of the Program once the new regulations are enacted. He further pointed out that, although it is not the primary goal of the Program, many potential candidates will be relying on this education and experience to qualify for licensure. Mr. Wreschinsky also pointed out that, currently, all elective units must be taken within the Program and cannot be taken at any of the nearby universities. He requested that the Program consider expanding acceptable units to include those from other programs or alternatives to assist with satisfying the electives requirements for graduation. Ms. Landregan explained that the Program allows for the review and transferring of up to 20 units from the core requirements and confirmed that the program does not accept the transfer of elective units. She explained the reason is because the Program does not have many students to take the electives and the Program's electives address the areas felt the students have weaknesses in and need improvement. Ms. Landregan further pointed out that very few universities transfer student's elective units from another area once a program has been started.

Ms. Landregan thanked LATC for reviewing the Program's SER and added that it takes approximately a year for the Program to gather and prepare the materials for the SER and respond to the Committee. She opined that it would be unnecessary to reduce the approval process because after the new language goes into effect it would be an estimated one to two years for the Program to be updated with the new requirements. Ms. Landregan encouraged the Committee to approve the Program as presented in the SER and expressed interest in continuing to maintain dialogue with LATC and its observations of the Program.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked if the Committee could extend the December 31, 2023 approval expiration date. Ms. Rodriguez responded that she did not believe there was anything prohibiting LATC from extending the approval expiration. Ms. Welch confirmed and suggested the Committee consider extending the tentative approval of the Program. Mr. Wreschinsky agreed with the suggestion due to not knowing exactly when the revised regulation would be enacted. He further requested a review of the significant changes that would be occurring with the new

requirements. Ms. Welch confirmed the proposal would add a curriculum requirement for current California statutes and regulations covering the environment, landscape architecture, and water conservation. She further explained the regulation would provide a new process for applying for Board approval in terms of what needed to be submitted, the type of report, and how the Program could appeal a denial.

Mr. Wreschinsky questioned whether the proposed changes to the approval process was intended to make it easier for the Program to gather the required items to resubmit for approval or was it to require additional information beyond what the Program had been providing. Ms. Rodriguez explained the new regulation would clearly outline the approval process to avoid any underground regulations. Ms. Welch added that even though it was not in the current regulation, a three-day site review of the Program had been a requirement for many years, however, since there was not a site review this year (due to the Pandemic), the Program only needed to submit a SER complying with the regulation. The new proposal would add a one-day site review which would reduce what the Program had been having to do for approval. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned whether there was an estimated date of when the regulation would be approved. Ms. Rodriguez explained that staff estimated the package would be submitted to OAL in early 2021 and once it has been submitted to OAL it would take approximately one year before the regulation is adopted. LATC Regulatory Counsel, Karen Halbo confirmed Ms. Rodriguez's estimated timeframe and added that the regulation could be adopted by January 2022. Mr. Wreschinsky opined that the expiration should be changed from 2023 to a later date. Ms. Trauth agreed that the Committee should extend the approval expiration. Ms. Welch explained that the proposal was to approve the current Program for three years and prior approvals varied due to an approval deadline or expiration not being in regulation, however, the proposed rulemaking would provide for a six-year approval. Ms. Landry requested clarification on if it was a six-year approval from the date of approval or from the date the Program started the application. Ms. Welch explained that the proposed language states that the Board approval period is six years, and what the Committee needed to decide on was whether they wanted the current Program to be approved for three years or something longer and why. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned if the Committee voted on a three-year approval then could the Committee extend the approval in three years without the Program having to go through the approval process. Ms. Welch explained that if the new regulations were in effect then the Program would have to go through the approval process to comply with the regulation as written. Mr. Wreschinsky recommended approving the current Program for five years to December 31, 2025 which would provide sufficient time for the Program to implement any new requirements prior to having to resubmit for reapproval. Ms. Landry inquired whether the Committee could approve the current Program to three years from the date of the approval of the regulations. Ms. Welch did not recommend doing that and agreed with the five-year approval. Ms. Landry questioned why the current Program approval should be for five years and not six. Mr. Wreschinsky stated that he was not opposed to six years, however, felt that since there will be new regulations adopted soon, five years would give the Program more incentive to start thinking about operating under the new regulations. Ms. Welch pointed out that the last time there was a site review of the Program was four years ago and since they did not get one this year, with a five-year approval, it

will be a nine-year span between site reviews and advised the Committee to consider that. Ms. Landregan suggested the Committee extend the three-year approval with the requirement of having a site visit in three years. Mr. Wreschinsky opined that since there will be a site review requirement under the new regulations then there would not be a need for a site review until that time.

- **Patricia M. Trauth moved to recommend to the Board approval of the Program and it is effective through December 31, 2025.**

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the Public.

Members Trauth, Landry, and Chair Wreschinsky voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

- L. Discuss and Possible Action on 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objectives to:**
- 1. Research the Need for Continuing Education for Licensees through LATC, the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), or Another Organization, to Better Protect the Health, Safety, and Welfare of Consumers.**

Ms. Townsend explained that currently, SB 1608 (Chapter 549, Statutes of 2008) requires architects to complete five hours of continuing education (CE) on disability access requirements prior to the renewal of their license. She continued that the American Institute of Architects (AIA) California will pursue legislation in 2021 to require architects obtain an additional five hours of CE in Zero Net Carbon Design. Ms. Townsend clarified that the Board requires CE, however, it was not something the Board chose to require, but rather they were mandated to do so.

Ms. Townsend informed the Committee that she conducted research and found, from fiscal year (FY) 2015/2016 through FY 2019/2020, five citations were issued to licensees for violations of the contract requirements and rules of professional conduct, and 10 letters of advisements were issued for violations of the rules of professional conduct, negligence, and contract requirements. She continued that no actions were taken against licensees for incompetence in the practice of landscape architecture.

Ms. Townsend explained LATC was recently contacted by the ASLA, Sierra Chapter requesting that a discussion begin on requiring landscape architects to complete CE prior to renewal of their license. She continued that she did additional research regarding CE requirements of other landscape architectural jurisdictions and found approximately 72% require CE, varying between 12 and 32 hours, prior to license renewal. Ms. Townsend informed the Committee the jurisdictions with CE require a varying minimum number of hours to be completed in health, safety, and welfare of the public while the remaining hours could be completed in other topics relating to the profession. She explained that jurisdictions either conducted an audit of a random sample of licensees or required licensees to submit a log of their CE course completion and hours, to verify satisfactory completion of CE.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on whether CE courses addressing contract requirements or professional ethics would fall under the category of health, safety, and welfare. Ms. Townsend confirmed that she felt those topics would fall under that specific category.

Ms. Landry pointed out that the agenda title stated that CE could be through LATC, ASLA, or other organizations, and inquired on whether a licensee would have to be a member of ASLA. Ms. Townsend opined that it would be determined by ASLA if they required membership. Mr. Wreschinsky provided he did not believe a licensee had to be a member and that anybody could sign up for ASLA's courses. Ms. Landry requested that CE not be required to be taken through any agency that required a membership. She also requested that further research be conducted to include additional possible CE providers and topics.

Mr. Feng inquired on whether LATC ever had a CE requirement in the past. Ms. Rodriguez answered that landscape architects have never been required to complete CE. Mr. Feng pointed out that there is some inconsistency between the Board, which requires CE, and LATC, which never had and inquired on if there was a need for consistency across the Board. Ms. Zuniga agreed that there was inconsistency across the Board but reiterated that the architect's CE requirements came from stakeholders outside of the Board and perhaps at the time they felt that CE was not necessary for landscape architects. She continued that if the Board decided to establish a CE requirement, it would first need to go to the Legislature for statutory authority because LATC does not have authorization to create CE requirements, and the problem that exists would need to be explained and how it would be fixed by the proposed CE.

Ms. Trauth inquired on whether something has changed because she was under the impression that the state would not support CE and inquired on whether the legislature would support it. Ms. Zuniga clarified that former Governor Jerry Brown was firmly against any new CE requirements, however, it is unsure on what Governor Newsom's opinion on CE requirements is so it is unknown if the Board would have the legislature's support. She continued that, should it be determined to require CE for landscape architects, the new requirements could be included in the next Sunset Report which would allow for a greater discussion of the issue.

Mr. Bowden referred to whether a licensee had to be a member of ASLA in order to take their CE courses and he believed that a membership was required. He explained that some providers may require a membership to take their courses, however there are many licensees who are members of the various organizations to which the courses would be considered member benefits and there are other providers that do not require memberships. Mr. Feng questioned whether ASLA does require a membership to take their courses or if they charge a fee to take the course so that a membership would not be required. Ms. Landry reiterated that she would like additional research to be conducted in order to justify the requirement, especially since in the past the state wasn't favorable towards CE. She also requested there not be a requirement to take the CE through a specific organization to prevent requiring licensees to join a member organization to take a CE course.

Mr. Wreschinsky requested additional research be done, specifically, contacting the jurisdictions requiring CE to inquire on their need for CE and whether they have done an analysis to identify specific areas of concern they were seeing with their licensee population. He also requested that additional discussion occur regarding LATC's areas of concern and which topics should be required for CE.

Ms. Brief pointed out that the agenda title could be interpreted as ASLA being the regulating body of CE and she felt that is not something ASLA would do and that regulating CE requirements would fall under the state. She opined that although it is not a requirement, many landscape architects are taking CE courses to better themselves within the profession. Ms. Brief continued that requiring CE and forcing those licensees that are not taking CE on their own accord would not only make the licensees better within the profession but would also protect the public.

Mr. Wreschinsky added there may be practitioners that are unaware of changes in regulations or contractual matters and it would be important for licensees to be made aware of their obligations as practitioners.

Mr. Feng and Ms. Landry suggested the focus should not be on the providers of the CE but rather on the need for CE requirements. Ms. Trauth suggested, when conducting additional research on the need for CE, that staff reach out to the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists since they do not currently require CE. Mr. Wreschinsky opined that if CE does become a requirement then the topics should be incorporated into the California Supplemental Exam (CSE).

Ms. Rodriguez asked the Committee to be as specific as possible in the direction they would like staff to go with this objective. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on when the next Strategic Planning session would be and if the Committee would be voting to ensure that this objective was on LATC's next Strategic Plan or would it be to direct staff to conduct research beginning immediately. Ms. Rodriguez explained the Committee could vote to conclude the objective due to the research being done or the objective could be reinvented as the research is presented and the Committee becomes clearer on the direction they would like to go. She continued she would be providing status updates of the objectives on LATC's current Strategic Plan which is through the end of 2021 and anticipated the Committee's next Strategic Planning session would take place in early 2022.

- **Susan M. Landry moved to direct staff to research the need for continuing education for licensees to better protect the health, safety, and welfare of consumers with the focus on three areas: (1) what other states are doing and why; (2) what regulations have changes; and (3) the requirements for California architects and civil engineers.**

Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.

Ms. Landregan commented that this objective should include CE courses from Universities, Cities, and other providers with experts that present on current topics. She continued to explain that the CE requirement for architects came about because of a lawsuit for failure to respond to the ADA community.

Ms. Landregan explained that typically CE requirements were based upon a failure

to perform and she did not see any failure to perform in the research conducted by staff to support CE requirements. She continued that the CE requirement could be based upon the CSE and if there were any new areas of practice.

Ms. Landregan pointed out that the Committee should also consider whether licensees would be audited and if there would be any extra costs for the licensees. Ms. Landregan felt that it was good that the Committee was discussing a CE requirement, however, it may not be something that LATC would want to implement.

Ms. Hollingworth informed the Committee that the Governor recently made an executive order where he would be reviewing policies that impact climate change and felt that the Committee might want to consider requiring CE in climate change and any specialty areas that would be impacted.

- **Susan M. Landry amended the motion to direct staff to research the need for continuing education for licensees to better protect the health, safety, and welfare of consumers with the focus on four areas: (1) what other states are doing and why; (2) what regulations have changes; (3) the requirements for California architects and civil engineers; and (4) the fiscal and time impact on staff.**

Patricia M. Trauth seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Bowden pointed out that staff had already conducted research on the jurisdictions that require CE which was provided in the meeting materials and it showed that some of the jurisdictions left the CE topics to the discretion of the licensees without specific reasoning for requiring CE. He continued that he is not against requiring CE for licensees but that it should be required for the right reasons by attempting to address a specific issue. Mr. Bowden reminded the Committee that the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) was mandated by the Governor in 2015 requiring landscape architects to adhere to it, however, there has not been any CE effort regarding this mandate. He opined that if the Committee decided to require CE then there needs to be a rational reason and the number of hours required needs to be manageable. Mr. Wreschinsky agreed with Mr. Bowden's opinion and opined that LATC would follow the Board's procedures. Ms. Landry explained that part of the motion was that the CE requirement pertain to the health, safety, and welfare of the public and MWELO could be considered within that topic area. Ms. Brief opined that if the Committee decided to research what other jurisdictions were doing then it needed to be taken into consideration that other jurisdictions may have different reasonings and issues to address whereas California holds unique circumstance and there needed to be the health, safety, and welfare component.

Ms. Trauth expressed some concern regarding moving forward with a motion and opined there should be additional discussion at the next LATC meeting, specifically, after the discussion of Zero Net Carbon Design at the Board meeting. She felt that at LATC's next meeting, the Committee could be more definitive on the direction to provide to staff.

- **Patricia M. Trauth withdrew her second of the motion.**
- **Susan M. Landry withdrew her motion.**

2. Develop an Online Tutorial to Clarify the Licensure Process for Candidates

Ms. Rodriguez explained that this item was a follow-up item from LATC's February 2020 meeting where the Committee directed staff to make minor changes to the presented tutorial videos in three areas: (1) to further clarify the process candidates must follow to apply for exam approval; (2) to remove a scene that could be misconstrued with landscape contracting; and (3) to include actors that better represent the current diversity of landscape architecture applicants as well as incorporate additional imagery.

***P. Review of Future Committee Meeting Dates**

Mr. Wreschinsky informed the members that he planned on attending the Board's upcoming meeting and inquired on whether any other members were interested in attending as well. Mr. Bowden expressed interest in attending. Mr. Wreschinsky acknowledged that Ms. Trauth would be interested in attending at least for the item regarding continuing education and both Ms. Brief and Ms. Landry expressed interest in also attending for the discussion on continuing education.

Mr. Wreschinsky pointed out there are only three meetings scheduled for 2021 and inquired on the member's thoughts on the reduction of meetings from four to three. Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that it would be possible to add more meetings if they would like. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if any of the members had conflicts with the three proposed meeting dates. Ms. Trauth suggested holding LATC meetings on Fridays because that is when she tends to have more availability. Mr. Wreschinsky agreed that Fridays would work better for him, as well. Ms. Rodriguez explained the meetings are held on different days to accommodate the public as well, however, if the Committee would like to change any of the dates, she could survey the members to identify alternate dates.

***L. Discuss and Possible Action on 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objectives to:** **2. Develop an Online Tutorial to Clarify the Licensure Process for Candidates**

After viewing the videos, Mr. Bowden opined the videos were good, there was a vast improvement from what they were previously, and all the necessary content was included. Mr. Wreschinsky agreed that the videos were well done. He noticed some minor edits needed that could wait to be fixed for the next iteration of the videos. Mr. Wreschinsky opined the videos would be a quick way of getting information to the candidates looking for a broad overview of the requirements. Ms. Brief inquired on whether closed captioning would be available for the videos in order to reach all possible candidates. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that closed captioning would be included so the videos would be made accessible for all candidates. Ms. Trauth also agreed that the videos were well made and should answer any potential questions that a candidate may have.

The television specialist from DCA explained that once the previews of the videos are placed on LATC's website, they would have closed captioning.

- **Andrew C.N. Bowden moved to approve the videos for posting on LATC's website.**

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

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

M. Discuss and Possible Action on *California Architects Newsletter

Ms. Rodriguez reminded the Committee that at its last meeting the members inquired about the Board's newsletter and the possibility of including LATC articles. She explained there are some common subjects of the Board's newsletters which include messages from the Board president, appointment of new board members (the most recent newsletter had an article on new Committee member Ms. Brief), license renewal reminders, enforcement actions, examination results and statistics, and legislation and regulations. Ms. Rodriguez added that LATC included similar information in the Program Manager's Report, in email announcements to interested parties, on LATC's website, and on LATC's Twitter page. She informed the members in 2018, LATC included an article in the Board's newsletter entitled "Landscape Architecture Scope of Practice" which expanded on the practice of landscape architecture in California, as defined in the Landscape Architects Practice Act, and included provisions for exceptions and exemptions.

Mr. Wreschinsky opined that LATC has typically been generating enough information for its website that could most likely be included in the Board's newsletter. He also felt that with the six broad areas of information provided in the newsletter, it should not be difficult for staff to provide articles as well as any information the Committee felt would be important for architects to know. Mr. Bowden requested clarification on whether the LATC's articles would be included in the Board's newsletter. Mr. Wreschinsky explained that LATC would have the opportunity to include any information that it deems important for architects to know. Mr. Bowden questioned whether LATC would have its own newsletter. Ms. Rodriguez clarified that LATC does not currently have a newsletter. Mr. Bowden acknowledged that LATC had a newsletter in the past, however, the newsletter stopped being generated due to difficulty obtaining content and the content that was provided seemed to be more in the direction of sharing professional organization information with licensees, rather than licensee and candidate specific information that LATC would be responsible for. Mr. Bowden suggested that if the Committee wanted to do its own newsletter then it would need to be sure that there was enough content and opined that licensees would find a newsletter informative. However, he acknowledged that including LATC articles in the Board's newsletter would be a start to potentially having its own newsletter. Ms. Trauth agreed and opined that if it was found that LATC had an abundance of information and articles to provide then it should be revisited on whether LATC

should have its own newsletter. Ms. Brief also agreed and added that LATC could start with including a few articles every quarter and if it is found that there was more information that could be provided then it could be revisited to have a more robust LATC newsletter.

Mr. Bowden used the agenda items for this meeting as an example of what could potentially be included in a newsletter and felt like there would be enough content that licensees and candidates would want to know. Ms. Landry pointed out that LATC already included information in its Program Manager's report, on its website, and on its Twitter page which could be considered a type of newsletter. She continued that what could initially be included in the Board's newsletter are action items from this meeting, introducing the new Committee member, and a message from the Chair. Mr. Bowden opined that licensees do not know to read the Program Manager's report unless it was emailed to the interested parties. Mr. Bowden inquired on the dissemination of the Board's newsletter and whether it was sent via email. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that the newsletter gets sent via email but no longer mailed. Ms. Trauth inquired on how often the Board published its newsletter. Ms. Zuniga explained that they attempt to send a newsletter four times a year, however, the Board may not always be successful in that. She also provided an option for LATC that if an article is submitted for the Board's newsletter then LATC could disseminate just that article to its email list rather than creating a separate newsletter. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on the difficulty of converting the Program Manager's reports, that are already being prepared, into a newsletter format to disseminate. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the two would be different because not everything that would be placed in the newsletter would necessarily be included in the Program Manager's report. She suggested another option would be to share with LATC's interested parties list a brief summary of the outcomes from the meeting such as the posting of the tutorials for candidates.

Mr. Wreschinsky provided another possibility of soliciting articles, or opinions on certain issues within the profession, from licensees. Ms. Brief opined that LATC should at least send out the information on the online tutorials to the email list for licensees and candidates. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that staff could do that as well as post the information on LATC's Twitter. She also stated that she could work with the Chair to include in the Program Manager's report any articles that have been sent to the interested parties list which could assist with generating future items.

***N. Discuss and Possible Action on New Committee Logo**

Ms. Rodriguez reminded the members that at LATC's February 5, 2020 meeting 12 draft logo designs developed by DCA's Office of Publications, Design and Editing (PDE) were presented and the members selected two logos for redesign. She continued that Ms. Trauth was appointed to work with staff to provide guidance to PDE on the variations of the two chosen designs.

After reviewing the newly presented designs, Ms. Landry suggested holding off on the discussion of choosing a new logo and opined that none of the designs incorporated the previously provided member suggestions. Ms. Brief opined that none of the provided designs best captured all that landscape architects do and suggested keeping the current logo. Ms. Trauth agreed with Ms. Brief that there

were no issues with the current logo. She also explained that she worked with staff and PDE to simplify the two chosen logos. Ms. Trauth opined that the Committee should decide on the logo sooner rather than later and to not have staff spend any more time and money on designing a new logo. Ms. Landry agreed. Mr. Bowden added that if he had to pick one of the presented designs, he felt that attachment N.2.6 was the best option however, he agreed that there was no real need to change the existing logo.

Mr. Wreschinsky summarized the discussion stating that the consensus of the members was to table the redesign of LATC's logo and potentially revisit it in a future meeting. Mr. Feng informed the members that the Board's current, and recently changed logo, is more abstract which is similar to LATC's current logo approach. Ms. Zuniga informed the members that if it was decided to not pick one of the provided logos and to revisit this item in the future, the Committee would not be able to ask PDE to make further revisions. Mr. Wreschinsky confirmed that would not be the intent of the Committee.

***O. Election of 2021 Committee Officers**

Mr. Wreschinsky informed the members that this meeting was his second meeting as Chair and would like to continue being the Chair.

- **Jon S. Wreschinsky moved to elect himself as 2021 LATC Chair**

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Bowden expressed interest in being the Vice Chair. Ms. Landry also expressed interest in being the Vice Chair. Mr. Bowden explained that he had been both Vice Chair and Chair many times and opined that each member should have the opportunity to be the Chair and Vice Chair.

- **Andrew C.N. Bowden moved to elect Susan M. Landry as 2021 Vice Chair.**

Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.

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

Q. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order due to technical issues. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*