



Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting

April 29, 2021
WebEx Teleconference

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC/Committee) Members Present

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

California Architects Board (Board) Members Present

Tian Feng, LATC Liaison, Board President
Ronald A. Jones

Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager
Michael Kanotz, LATC Counsel, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs
(DCA)
Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, Attorney III, DCA
Ryan Perez, Manager, DCA Board and Bureau Relations
Stacy Townsend, Enforcement Analyst
Blake Clark, Examination Analyst
Kourtney Nation, Special Projects Analyst

Guests Present

Brandon Roosenboom, Water Resource Control Engineer, California State Water
Resources Control Board
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 10:01 a.m. and called roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

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

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.

Mr. Wreschinsky thanked the meeting participants for their attendance and introduced LATC's new legal counsel, Michael Kanotz.

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Mr. Wreschinsky invited members of the public to address the LATC. There were no comments from the public.

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

Ryan Perez provided an update on DCA's accomplishments and recent activities. He shared that Boards and Bureaus are considering permanent changes for efficiency and employee wellbeing such as telework and eliminating paper processes. Mr. Perez also informed the Committee of current DCA initiatives launched to enhance service to all Boards and Bureaus, including establishing an Executive Officer Cabinet and the commencement of the Enlightened Licensing Project.

E. Review and Possible Action on December 2, 2020 LATC Meeting Minutes

- **Susan Landry moved to approve the December 2, 2020 LATC Meeting Minutes.**

Andrew C. N. Bowden seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

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

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

Trish Rodriguez announced changes to the format of the Program Manager's Report provided within the meeting materials to better align with the LATC meeting schedule. She informed the Committee that an out-of-state travel request for the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards' 2021 Annual Meeting was submitted to DCA and includes the Program Manager, LATC Chair and Executive Officer. Ms. Rodriguez shared that DCA's Business Modernization project recently received approvals from the Department of Technology and Department of Finance to proceed to Stage 3 of the Project Approval Cycle. She continued that LATC Examination Analyst Blake Clark recently coordinated an online student outreach presentation with former LATC Member Christine Anderson for students in the landscape architecture program at the University of California, Berkeley. Ms. Rodriguez continued her report with updates on the program's retention

schedule, social media outreach efforts, personnel training requirements, website modifications, proposed law changes, examination administration, and enforcement activity.

Susan Landry asked why the proposal to amend Business and Professions Code (BCP) section 5659 was resubmitted. Ms. Zuniga explained that legislators chose to pursue the proposal separately next year to eliminate need for review by two committees this year.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired if the proposal to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2671 would grant a grace period for licensees to transition to the new requirement. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that licensees would be required to meet the new requirements of 2671 by the regulatory change effective date. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if future reports could include Landscape Architect Registration Examination pass rate data from previous years. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that recent pass rate data could be included in the next Program Manager's Report.

Stephanie Landregan questioned the justification for the proposal to amend BPC section 5659 and inquired if other professions encounter similar issues regarding licensure acceptance. Ms. Rodriguez clarified that licensees continue to have trouble submitting landscape architectural plans in certain local jurisdictions and that LATC staff previously assisted by directing licensees to a legal opinion to help educate local officials. She added that the intention of the current proposal is to provide further clarification to local jurisdictions in order reduce rejection of landscape architecture plans.

Tracy Morgan Hollingworth commented that CCASLA did not take a formal position on the proposal to amend BPC section 5659, however, CCASLA members noted that it did not provide for a grace period. LATC Enforcement Analyst Stacy Townsend explained that LATC staff would attempt to educate licensees of the new provisions prior to issuing a citation.

G. Review and Possible Action on Proposed Regulation to Adopt California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2651, Regarding Waiver of Fees for Licensure, Renewal, or Replacement of License Upon Declaration of Emergency

Ms. Rodriguez directed the Committee members to the regulatory proposal included in the meeting materials. Ms. Landry inquired if the proposal could be retroactive since the related law change took effect January 2020. Ms. Rodriguez explained that authority to promulgate regulations was effective January 2020, however, proposed regulatory language would go into effect once approved by the Office of Administrative Law. Ms. Landry added that she wanted to assist individuals who struggled over the last year. Ms. Rodriguez explained that staff intends to implement the regulation as soon as possible in case of another emergency. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if anyone had already applied for a fee waiver. Ms. Rodriguez shared that a couple of individuals impacted by the last fire wanted to know if there were provisions in place, however, LATC is not currently able to waive fees or assist in any way. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned the length of time the waiver would apply and the process for verifying financial hardship. Ms. Rodriguez

explained that the individual's address would determine if they were impacted. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired if penalty fees would not apply under the waiver. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that the waiver would not apply to enforcement related fees. Karen Halbo advised that the allowances of the fee waiver are outlined in the proposed text. Mr. Wreschinsky questioned how Boards and Bureaus would be notified of an emergency and when it's lifted. Ms. Rodriguez advised that staff would notify individuals on the LATC's interested parties email distribution list. Pamela Brief requested clarification on the waiver time period. Ms. Halbo explained that the waiver would apply as long as the declared emergency is ongoing. Ms. Landregan opined that the proposal as written would not cover an ongoing emergency and asked if the Committee could change the language. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the proposal was drafted based on a template provided by DCA for consistency across Boards and Bureaus, and that the Committee could make changes. Ms. Landry opined that she would like to make the waiver retroactive to the start of the current emergency. Ms. Halbo advised that the language of the authority-granting statute requires that a fee waiver application be made within one year of the date the emergency is proclaimed or declared, and the regulations must align with the statute.

- **Susan Landry moved to approve the proposal to adopt CCR section 2651.**

Andrew C. N. Bowden seconded the motion.

There were no comments from the public.

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

H. Review and Discuss 2021 Legislation

1. Assembly Bill (AB) 107 (Salas) Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA): Boards: Temporary Licenses: Military Spouses

Laura Zuniga provided an update on AB 107, regarding temporary licenses for military spouses. She explained that under existing law certain boards are required to issue temporary licenses, however, architects and landscape architects are not included. She added that the provision would not apply to Boards that have an expedited reciprocity licensure pathway available to military spouses.

2. AB 225 (Gray) DCA: Boards: Veterans: Military Spouses: Licenses

Ms. Zuniga explained that AB 225 requires certain boards to issue temporary licenses to veterans within a certain amount of time after they have separated from the military. She clarified that this bill does not apply to the LATC.

3. AB 252 (R. Rivas) Department of Conservation: Multibenefit Land Repurposing Incentive Program: Administration

Ms. Zuniga shared that AB 252 establishes an incentive program to provide grants to groundwater sustainability agencies and counties to fund local programs supporting or facilitating multibenefit land repurposing.

4. AB 564 (Gonzalez) Biodiversity Protection and Restoration Act

Ms. Zuniga explained that AB 564 would revise current policy to state that all state agencies, boards and commissions utilize their authorities to further biodiversity purposes and goals.

5. AB 646 (Low) DCA: Boards: Expunged Convictions

Ms. Zuniga reported that AB 646 would require licensing boards to update or remove online information about a revoked licensee within 90 days of receiving an expungement order related to that conviction.

6. Senate Bill 607 (Roth) Professions and Vocations

Ms. Zuniga explained that this bill pertains to implementation of the upcoming fingerprint requirement which is expected to become effective next year.

I. Presentations by the California State Water Resources Control Board

1. Review and Discuss Exam Process, Content Areas, and Requirements of Landscape Architects for Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Developer (QSD) Certification

Ms. Townsend reminded the members that at the November 8, 2019 meeting, they discussed the Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Developer (QSD) certification requirements and process for landscape architects. She added that at the Committee's request, California State Water Resources Control Board staff member, Brandon Roosenboom, provided a presentation during the September 4, 2020 LATC meeting regarding the extent of the QSD certification training program, requirements to become QSD certified, importance of being QSD certified, and how landscape architects can become QSD certified and at the conclusion of the presentation, the members expressed interest in receiving more information on the examination process, examination subject areas, and stormwater requirements of landscape architects for QSD certification. She explained that Mr. Roosenboom returned to provide another presentation to the Committee addressing the additional information requested as well as a presentation on the proposed language amending the Construction General Permit.

***J. Update on Intra-Departmental Contracts (IDC) with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) for Landscape Architects Technical Committee California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Written Examination Development**

Ms. Rodriguez informed the Committee that following postponement of the upcoming CLARB task analysis, OPES staff recommended that LATC amend the current IDC for CSE Development to include Examination Outline Development and

Passing Score workshops. Ms. Landregan commented that diversity, inclusion, and equity should be considered and that it is important that California exams are equitable and inclusive.

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

Ms. Rodriguez announced upcoming Board and LATC meeting dates and noted that LATC's next strategic planning session is tentatively scheduled as a one-day meeting in November.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired when the LATC would elect a new Chair and Vice Chair. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that LATC positions are normally discussed during the last meeting of the year and become effective at the following meeting. Ms. Landregan requested that LATC continue telecommunication opportunities for public meeting participation.

***I. Presentations by the California State Water Resources Control Board**

1. Review and Discuss Exam Process, Content Areas, and Requirements of Landscape Architects for Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Developer (QSD) Certification

Mr. Roosenboom provided a brief review of the QSD program explaining that the 2009 Construction Stormwater General Permit requires a QSD to develop the SWPPP detailing the construction site's management of pollutant sources and construction activities with regards to stormwater. He continued that the Construction General Permit training team determined that landscape architecture licensure was one of the prerequisite underlying registrations, or certifications, for the QSD certification. Mr. Roosenboom informed the Committee that the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) and the Office of Water Programs at California State University, Sacramento are partners in administering the QSD program for the State Water Board.

Mr. Roosenboom explained there are four steps to earning QSD certification: complete a QSD training course, register for the QSD exam, pass the exam, and provide information on the underlying certification or registration held as a prerequisite. He outlined the QSD exam subject areas and stated the exam is a three-hour, 127-question, "open-book" exam hosted online through the Office of Water Program's website.

Mr. Roosenboom informed the Committee that landscape architects are expected to have fundamental knowledge of stormwater management such as erosion and sediment controls, hydrology, pollutant source controls, and soil science. He stated the QSD program is designed to direct landscape architect's experience towards complying with the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit.

Member of the public, Stephanie Landregan, requested clarification that engineers and surveyors do not have to take the QSD training program or exam.

Mr. Roosenboom explained that engineers, engineering geologists, and geologists do not need to take the QSD training or exam and they are able to self-register as

QSDs since they possess the experience and training as part of their licensure. Ms. Landregan inquired on what the qualifications are specific to engineers and geologists that are not specific to landscape architects. Mr. Roosenboom explained that engineers and geologists were most likely participating in the design efforts of the stormwater programs, but noted that if it was determined that there was not significant difference in the experience and education that engineers and geologists receive compared to landscape architects a change could potentially be made to allow landscape architects to self-certify.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on how professionals inform the public of their qualifications to provide these services. Mr. Roosenboom explained that once a professional becomes QSD certified they will be issued a license number certifying they are a QSD. Mr. Wreschinsky also inquired if there has been issues regarding insurers for errors and omissions, or similar, or lawsuits against a QSD and their qualifications. Mr. Roosenboom responded that he was not aware of any such issues, however, he did recall a case against a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP) in which it was determined that due to their negligence they were no longer able to practice as a QSP. He continued that the State Water Board and CASQA are discussing the best processes for handling when a QSD is not performing up to standards or expectations, however, the current approach has been to discipline the underlying certifications.

2. Review and Possible Action on Preliminary Staff Draft of the Statewide Construction General Permit (20XX-XXXX-DWQ) Reissuance

Mr. Roosenboom provided an overview of the proposed Construction Stormwater General Permit reissuance with a focus on QSD specific requirements as that relates to the potential responsibilities of landscape architects. He began by providing a brief background of the Construction General Permit (CGP) explaining that the Federal Clean Water Act prohibits certain discharges of stormwater containing pollutants to waters of the United States (US) except those that are in compliance with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit which is what the CGP is. He continued that the current permit expired in 2014 and has been administratively extended until the adoption of a new CGP and they are taking lessons learned to address some implementation concerns.

Mr. Roosenboom explained there are several topics of proposed changes including total maximum daily load (TMDL) implementation requirements, passive treatment technology use requirements, notice of non-applicability criteria, notice of termination process revisions, Statewide Water Quality Control Plan requirements, authorized dewatering activity requirements, demolition activity requirements, Sufficiently Sensitive Test Methods Rule, monitoring and reporting requirement revisions, removal of bioassessment monitoring requirements, and removal of rain event action plan requirements. He continued that the proposed passive treatment technology use requirements would prohibit the use of cation treatment chemicals, which can be detrimental to aquatic life, and limiting it to anion-type chemicals while also monitoring the chemical applications. Mr. Roosenboom added that another proposed addition to the CGP is authorized dewatering activity requirements which include mechanical pumping or syphoning of non-potable water from excavations, trenches, foundations, vaults, and the groundwater that accumulates. Additionally,

he provided that the proposed demolition activity requirements will include best management practices for the demolition of structures built, or renovated, between 1950 and 1980 as they may have PCB-containing materials which are considered a threat to water. Mr. Roosenboom provided that the implementation of the new Federal Sufficiently Sensitive Test Method Rule has been added to the CGP to incorporate the US Environmental Protection Agency's recently amended Clean Water Act regulations. He continued that revisions are being proposed to the existing CGPs monitoring and reporting requirements increasing the QSD and QSP's responsibilities. Lastly, Mr. Roosenboom explained that there is the proposed removal of bioassessment monitoring requirements, due to the biological integrity policy still under development and the intention to work with the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program, in addition to the removal of rain event action plan requirements, due to it being more of a "paper" exercise and being replaced with an action-based strategy with more QSD involvement.

Ms. Landry inquired if the permit requirements were carried over after construction. Mr. Roosenboom explained that the permit is necessary during construction, however, there are some post-construction requirements and opined that is where landscape architects would use their expertise in low impact development and green designs. Ms. Landry also inquired on whether the new revisions will change the requirements for chemicals such as herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers specific to the cannabis industry. Mr. Roosenboom explained that there may be some changes to the chemicals, but it would depend on the total maximum daily load for those chemicals which may not be established yet. However, he provided that the State Water Board has a Cannabis Order that regulates discharges from cannabis sites.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired if the Notice of Termination was mandatory and if it was typically the last step at the end of the construction project. Mr. Roosenboom clarified that a Notice of Termination needs to be submitted otherwise the requirements of the CGP would need to continue to be complied with. Mr. Wreschinsky also inquired on the QSD's timeframe to collect stormwater samples, assess them, and report on them, especially if they are working on multiple projects. Mr. Roosenboom explained that the QSD would be required to take three samples over the course of the 30 minutes and in the proposed draft there is a provision to be able to assign the task to trained personnel that are on site and the results must be reported within 10 days of receipt of the results.

Ms. Brief requested information on where the list of Total Maximum Daily Loads that were excluded could be found and how it was determined that they should be excluded from the CGP. Mr. Roosenboom offered to follow-up to provide the list to the members and he explained that they were excluded if a waste load allocation applied or if there were no implementation requirements for stormwater discharges. Ms. Brief inquired on how the trained personnel taking stormwater samples are monitored and Mr. Roosenboom explained that even though the task is being delegated to a trained professional, the QSD is still in responsible control. Lastly, Ms. Brief requested clarification on the CGP in that it only regulates water discharge that leave the construction site and not standing water that may seep into the ground. Mr. Roosenboom confirmed that the CGP is for water discharge leaving the construction site but there are groundwater permits.

Mr. Wreschinsky recognized that Mr. Roosenboom is encouraging comments during the official public comment period for the CGP. Mr. Wreschinsky also recommended that the more ideal individuals to provide public comments would be the landscape architects who are actively involved in the CGP process and requirements. Mr. Roosenboom stated that he thought it would be prudent to have a landscape architect representative from the LATC on the Construction Stormwater General Permit training team to have an individual who is aware of the training requirements and to ensure that the base knowledge that is expected of the QSDs is captured accurately. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on the time commitment that would be required to be on the training team. Mr. Roosenboom estimated that a full workday each month would be the time commitment. The members agreed that it would be beneficial to have a landscape architect involved with the training team, however, at this time none of the members are available. Mr. Roosenboom explained that it was an open invitation and if any of the members become available, they were welcome to become a part of the team. Mr. Wreschinsky suggested that perhaps a licensee not involved with LATC could potentially join the training team as the representative for landscape architects.

K. Discuss and Possible Action on 2019-2021 Strategic Plan Objective to 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 at the December Committee meeting, the members decided not to make a motion regarding continuing education (CE) for landscape architects and opted to discuss the matter further at another meeting. She reminded the Committee that in 2008 SB 1608 mandated architects to complete five hours of CE on disability access requirements prior to the renewal of their license. She continued that, most recently, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) California is sponsoring an Assembly bill to require architects obtain an additional five hours of CE in Zero Net Carbon Design in which the Board is in support of.

Ms. Townsend also reported that 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 to ensure licensed landscape architects would be current with the latest code and industry updates. She continued that through research regarding CE requirements of other landscape architectural jurisdictions it was found approximately 75% require CE, and they all require 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.

Ms. Townsend reminded LATC that at its last meeting, the members expressed the need for additional research regarding CE requirements in other jurisdictions, recently amended regulations, and the fiscal and time impact on staff. She explained that she conducted the additional research and found the majority of landscape architect registration boards requiring CE made the decision as a Board, rather than by a legislative mandate. She continued that it would be difficult to determine the fiscal and time impact CE requirements would have on staff,

however, factors would include whether LATC would approve courses or providers, the auditing of licensees for compliance, and enforcement of non-compliance. Ms. Townsend also acknowledged that it was requested to reach out to the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyor, and Geologists (BPELSG) to inquire on why they did not require CE of their licensees, and she was informed that BPELSG could never justify requiring CE since studies conducted did not demonstrate a correlation between requiring CE and a reduction in complaints, or enforcement actions, however, BPELSG encourages its licensees to maintain their professional competency by remaining current with any changes.

Mr. Bowden acknowledged that CE would be a good idea, however, he feels that in order for it to be mandated it would require for there to be a demonstrated need and inquired if there were complaints against landscape architects in certain areas of practice that would lead to requiring CE in those aspects of the profession. He continued that in terms of the practice and guidance from legislature has been in Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo) and opined that if CE were to be required a viable option would be in MWELo rather than allowing licensees to whichever courses they choose. Ms. Brief agreed that landscape architects should have to complete CE and it should not be so broad. She suggested considering the practice within the state and identifying the significant issues that landscape architects should be educated on. Ms. Brief provided a few examples, such as MWELo, stormwater mitigation, and resiliency against natural disasters. Ms. Landry also expressed support of requiring CE for landscape architects and agreed with Ms. Brief that CE should be limited to certain categories and added ADA as a potential category.

Ms. Townsend acknowledged the members' support of requiring CE but reminded them to determine if there is a need for CE. Ms. Landry pointed out that there are so few complaints against licensees that it would be best to consider legislative changes, as well as, the minimum qualifications to pass the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) versus what is required in the submission of drawings for approval, to justify the need for CE.

Mr. Bowden opined that although MWELo changes from time to time, once it has been learned, it does not need to be learned again and it may not be a necessary requirement for licensees to relearn it every two years.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired on whether the CSE was robust enough and addresses the important aspects of the profession within California to establish minimum competency for licensure. He opined that establishing a need for CE could not be addressed without also reviewing the CSE. He also agreed with Mr. Bowden that it is important to encourage licensees to continue to educate themselves within the practice however, he was unsure if it can be mandated to require CE due to the profession being diverse and not all licensees may be involved in the areas that could potentially become the CE requirement. Mr. Bowden suggested reaching out to ASLA, Sierra Chapter to inquire on if they had any specific topics that they felt landscape architects would benefit from CE. He also agreed with Mr. Wreschinsky with the importance of reviewing the CSE due to the older licensee population not having any experience with the exam and could potentially benefit from CE on some of the tested topics. Ms. Landry informed the Committee that prior to being a

member she assisted with the development of the exam and found that the participants who had been in the profession longer were not doing well with answering the questions due to there being several new topics being addressed. She also pointed out that licensed architects are required to take CE in disability access due to new regulations and opined that new regulations would justify requiring CE. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that licensed architects are required to complete five hours of CE in disability access and reminded LATC that the requirement was not requested by the Board or industry but by other sources through legislation. She continued that it is more common for an association to push forward for CE rather than the licensing program which licenses for a minimal level of competency whereas CE is a way to elevate the profession beyond the level of minimum competency.

- **Jon S. Wreschinsky moved to direct staff to reach out to ASLA chapters throughout California to inquire on if they feel there is a critical need for CE; assess if there is any enforcement issues around specific areas of practice; reach out to the landscape architect registration boards that require CE to inquire on if there is an association between CE and enforcement or health, safety, and welfare issues; and asses the CSE and determine if there are specific areas of practice that could be a potential CE requirement.**

Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.

Mr. Bowden agreed with Mr. Wreschinsky's direction and added that a future discussion would need to be had regarding the number of required hours and where the CE courses could be taken.

- **Jon S. Wreschinsky amended his motion directing staff to reach out to the California Counsel of ASLA rather than to the individual chapters and to also send a survey to the licensee population to inquire on if they are currently taking CE and, if so, what types of providers are they taking the CE from.**

Susan M. Landry seconded the amended motion.

Ms. Brief cautioned when reaching out to the licensee population to make the survey less about the preferences of the licensees and more about the protection of the public.

Member of the public, Ms. Hollingworth explained that the ASLA San Diego chapter attempted to partner with their American Institute of Architects chapter in the requirement of CE in disability access. She explained that there were five parts to the requirement and only two sections were applicable to landscape architects, however she feels that CE on disability access would be beneficial for landscape architects.

Members Bowden, Brief, Landry, and Chair Wreschinsky voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

M. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 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.*