



## Minutes

### CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting

November 4, 2022

Davis

#### Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC/Committee) Members Present

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

#### Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager  
Nicholas Barnhart, Licensing Coordinator  
Blake Clark, Examination Analyst  
Kourtney Nation, Special Projects Analyst

#### Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Staff Present

Judie Bucciarelli, Board and Bureau Relations  
Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, Attorney III  
Michael Kanotz, LATC Counsel, Attorney III  
Matt Nishimine, Regulatory Specialist, Fiscal Operations/Budget Office

#### Guests Present

Mavi Arias, President, University of California, Davis (UC Davis) National  
Association of Minority Landscape Architects  
Madeline Laun, Vice President, UC Davis Student Chapter of the 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 10:30 a.m. and Vice Chair, Pamela Brief 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 announced that Agenda Item F, Discuss and Possible Action on Proposal to Amend the Committee's Fee Schedule, would be discussed after lunch. He reminded members that votes on all motions will be taken by roll call.

## **C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda**

Mr. Wreschinsky invited members of the public to address the LATC. There were no guests present at this time. Trish Rodriguez shared that Donna Tylor emailed the LATC the day before the meeting in support of the proposed regulatory language to amend California Code of Regulations section 2615 (Form of Examinations).

## **G. Review and Possible Action on August 2, 2022 LATC Meeting Minutes**

- **Susan M. Landry moved to approve the August 2, 2022 LATC Meeting Minutes as presented.**

**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.**

## **H. Program Manager's Report – Update on Committee's Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs**

Ms. Rodriguez presented the October 1, 2022 Program Manager's Report. She shared that LATC staff are working with the business modernization vendor to transition the Eligibility and California Supplemental Examination (CSE) Applications to the new platform. She added that the project started in May and is expected to be fully implemented in 18 months with incremental releases to the public. Ms. Rodriguez added that project cohorts continue to meet monthly with DCA and the vendor to view demos, provide feedback, and discuss any issues. She expanded that the first project release, which will allow use of the Eligibility and CSE Applications, is expected in early 2023.

Ms. Rodriguez reminded the Committee members that the Board met via teleconference on September 16, 2022 and approved the LATC's 2022-2024 Strategic Plan. She added that the next Board meeting will be held on December 9, 2022, at Stanford University.

Ms. Rodriguez shared that staff continue to follow state-wide guidelines for COVID-19 and employees continue to telework and work in the office as needed.

Ms. Rodriguez shared that an outreach presentation was provided in-person by LATC staff and landscape architect Christine Anderson on October 20, 2022, at UC

Davis for students enrolled in the Professional Practice course. She added that the presentation included an overview of LATC's mandate, examination registration process, and updates to the various pathways to licensure.

Ms. Rodriguez also provided updates on LATC's social media activity, website changes, pending legislative and regulatory proposals, and examination program. She shared that the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) concluded a Job Task Analysis in August which resulted in changes to the content and structure of the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) beginning in December 2023. She added that the changes could impact some California candidates and will be discussed further under Agenda Item I. Ms. Rodriguez also provided an update on recent enforcement activity.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked if the citation issued to Kathleen McKernin was the full extent of the action taken for the violation. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that no further action was taken. Laura Zuniga added that the citation is disclosable to the public. Michael Kanotz explained that the citation process is an alternative to the traditional disciplinary process and that a citation was issued in this case in lieu of disciplinary action. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if the individual would be monitored after the citation. Mr. Kanotz explained that there is no monitoring method similar to probation for citations. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if further action would be taken if LATC receives a similar complaint about the individual in the future. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that prior violations are taken into consideration when determining enforcement actions. Andrew Bowden added that there are civil remedies available to a consumer aside from the LATC complaint process.

Mr. Bowden asked for clarification on the status of the legislative proposal to implement Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5659 (Inclusion of License Number – Requirement). Ms. Zuniga confirmed she resubmitted the proposal as part of an omnibus bill to the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee.

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

Judie Bucciarelli shared that the Governor recently appointed Melissa Gear as the new Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations and she joined DCA on October 3, 2022. Ms. Bucciarelli announced that DCA Director Kimberly Kirchmeyer established the Department's first Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Steering Committee (DEI Committee) which will hold its official kick-off meeting on November 9, 2022. She added that the new DEI Committee will inform the Department's strategic planning process and, by March 2023, DCA will begin implementing the revised processes and working with the programs to update existing strategic plans or developing new strategic plans.

Ms. Bucciarelli reminded the LATC of the upcoming "Our Promise: California State Employees" donation campaign, current COVID-19 safety measures, and Board member travel policies. She also announced an upcoming partnership between DCA and the State Controller's Office to share information with consumers and certain licensees about the Unclaimed Property Program.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked if the members of the DEI Committee have already been selected and if the meetings will be open to the public or board members.

Ms. Bucciarelli responded that an announcement should be made prior to the kick-off meeting on November 9, 2022. Ms. Zuniga added that the meetings will not be open to the public.

Patricia Trauth asked how the DEI Committee will be funded. Ms. Zuniga explained that any work the Department does is funded through pro-rata by licensing fees from all DCA programs. She added that DCA does not receive General Fund support.

## **I. Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards**

### **1. Update on California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2614 (Examination Transition Plan)**

Ms. Rodriguez reminded the Committee members that CLARB has proposed changes to the LARE format and, due to the time sensitivity of the change, amendments to CCR section 2614 (Examination Transition Plan) were presented to the Board on September 16, 2022. She explained that the Board approved the amendments to incorporate the new LARE format within the examination transition plan and the related Notice of Proposed Regulatory Action was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) to start the 45-day public comment period on November 11, 2022. Mr. Bowden asked if California is the only state where candidates are allowed early entrance to LARE Section 1 (Project and Construction Management) prior to being eligible for Section 4 (Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation). Ms. Rodriguez responded that California is a pre-approval state and one of the approved pathways is early entrance to LARE Sections 1 (Project and Construction Management) and 2 (Inventory and Analysis), however, CLARB's position is that candidates should be allowed to take all LARE sections upon completion of an approved landscape architecture degree. She reminded the members that LATC previously decided that candidates must verify training experience prior to taking LARE Sections 3 (Design) and 4 (Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation). Mr. Wreschinsky stated that he questions CLARB's suggestion that candidates are more successful on the exam right out of school. He reminded the members that LATC has expressed to CLARB that it is a disservice to let candidates take all sections of the LARE right out of school, before obtaining training experience.

### **2. Discuss and Possible Action on Proposed Regulatory Language to Amend CCR Section 2615 (Form of Examinations) as an Emergency Rulemaking**

Ms. Rodriguez explained that some California candidates have passed Section 1 (Project and Construction Management) and may not have sufficient time to qualify for Section 4 (Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation) prior to the LARE transition. She explained that the emergency rulemaking would amend CCR section 2615 to allow opportunities for those candidates to take Section 4 (Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation) prior to the LARE transition. She added that the proposal would also rescind the pathway for early entrance to the LARE without training experience, effective September 1, 2023.

- **Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to recommend to the Board approval of the attached Emergency Proposed Regulatory Language to amend 16 CCR section 2615 regarding Form of Examinations, direct staff to submit the text to the Director of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review, and direct the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or non-substantive changes to the rulemaking package, and set the matter for hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 5-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at 16 CCR section 2615 as noticed.**

**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. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Wreschinsky recommended the Committee revisit this issue after the LARE transition in December 2023 to determine if California candidates should be able to take certain sections of the new format upon graduation. Karen Halbo added that the emergency regulation would allow candidates opportunities to take LARE Section 4 (Grading, Drainage and Construction Documentation) for 180 days and can be extended for an additional 90 days. Mr. Bowden asked how many candidates are affected by the transition. Ms. Rodriguez explained that approximately 200 candidates have been approved for LARE Sections 1 (Project and Construction Management) and 2 (Inventory and Analysis).

**J. Discuss and Possible Action on Modified Proposed Regulatory Language to Amend CCR Title 16, Division 26, Article 1, Section 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines)**

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the final rulemaking package for CCR section 2680 (Disciplinary Guidelines) was submitted to OAL, where the reviewing attorney had questions surrounding license surrender and continuing education course providers. She added that the package was withdrawn from OAL review to make necessary changes, a 15-day Notice of Modified Text was issued on October 15, 2022, and no public comments were received.

- **Pamela S. Brief moved to recommend to the Board approval of the attached proposed Modified Text to amend 16 CCR section 2680, and delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file and to adopt the proposed Modified Text.**

**Andrew C. N. Bowden 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.**

**F.\* Discuss and Possible Action on Proposal to Amend the Committee’s Fee Schedule**

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the Committee was presented with the program’s revenues and expenditures at the August 2, 2022, LATC meeting. She reminded the members that the LATC fund condition indicates a structural imbalance due to expenditures outweighing revenue that would cause the fund to become insolvent by fiscal year (FY) 2023-24. Ms. Rodriguez explained that staff and the Budget Office conducted a fee study to help guide the Committee in making sure it can fulfill its mandate to provide oversight and enforcement of the Landscape Architects Practice Act.

Matt Nishimine thanked Ms. Rodriguez, Ms. Zuniga, and LATC staff for their time and effort on the fee study project. He provided an overview of the October 2022 Fee Analysis Report and explained how the three proposed fee models were calculated. Mr. Nishimine explained that the DCA Legislative Affairs and Budget Offices would assist LATC in proposing a legislative change to amend the Committee’s fee schedule during the 2022-23 legislative session to be effective January 1, 2024.

Mr. Nishimine advised that the projected costs related to LATC’s business modernization project would decrease as the project changes from procurement and implementation to ongoing system maintenance. He also recommended that LATC request a presentation from the DCA Office of Information Services for further details on the business modernization system.

Mr. Nishimine directed the Committee members to the three proposed fee model options outlined in the October 2022 Fee Analysis Report. He explained that the presented fee models are sufficient to keep the LATC fund solvent and to ensure existing programs continue through FY 2029-30. He added that the fee increases are necessary to align revenues with expenditures and are not intended to cause barriers to licensure or hardship.

Ms. Landry asked about the projected amounts listed on Appendix 3 for costs related to “consulting and professional services (external)”. Mr. Nishimine explained that those costs are related to business modernization and were calculated with the assumption that the project is on track to fully expend this year. Mr. Bowden expressed that the Committee does not have control over the cost of staff and asked if LATC costs are tied to the costs of living. Mr. Nishimine responded that members are entitled to personnel costs information. He explained that the annual budget process does not account for inflation or cost of living increases. Ms. Trauth asked if the Assistant Executive Officer position is vacant. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed and explained that the position is part of the Board budget. Ms. Zuniga explained the position is being held vacant for salary savings. Ms. Trauth asked if costs related to DCA’s DEI Committee are integrated in the projected budget. Ms. Zuniga explained that funding for the DEI Committee would be included under existing pro

rata costs. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired about the LARE administration cost to LATC. Nicholas Barnhart responded that the most recent annual fee paid to CLARB was approximately \$6,000. Ms. Brief asked if the temporary staff position is expected to be filled. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the temporary position is not expected to be filled at this time. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if all the DCA costs are paid for by the boards and programs. Mr. Nishimine confirmed that centralized services are paid through the DCA pro rata assessment. Mr. Wreschinsky asked which state department sets staff salary levels and negotiates benefit packages. Mr. Nishimine explained that those costs are under the purview of the Governor and the legislature. He added that the proposed fee models were calculated based on historical employee compensation and benefit adjustments.

Mr. Nishimine explained that the proposed fee models are starting points and the members could determine to offset some costs by increasing others. Ms. Brief opined that the Committee intends to encourage new potential licensees and could consider increasing fees for reciprocity or other categories. Mr. Nishimine explained that increasing the initial license or renewal fees could allow the Committee to set a lower Eligibility Application fee. Ms. Brief asked the Committee members if they would like to decide how many months in reserve is reasonable and if any adjustments should be made to the proposed fees. Mr. Wreschinsky noted that the third fee model would provide one to two months in reserve. He added that the Committee must keep in mind that a lot of licensees will pay out of pocket. Mr. Bowden expressed that licensees could be willing to pay \$700 or \$800 for renewal. He added that LATC has not been charging enough and the license fee should have been higher than \$400. Ms. Trauth reminded the members that LATC recently had a surplus in reserve. Mr. Bowden explained that while there was a surplus in reserve LATC's costs still outweighed revenues at that time. He added that he was not aware there was an imbalance until the fee study was initiated. He suggested all fees, aside from the Eligibility Application, should cover the direct costs associated with those fees. Mr. Wreschinsky stated that LATC will need to explain how the new fees align with the actual costs to the program. Ms. Trauth suggested that LATC charge more for a Reciprocity Application since those individuals typically want reciprocity so they can participate in the California market. She added that doing so could keep the Eligibility Application fee down. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if there is any way to set up a payment plan for license fees. Ms. Rodriguez responded that LATC could shorten the license renewal period so licensees would pay a smaller amount more frequently. Mr. Bowden suggested that LATC increase the Eligibility Application fee to \$100. Ms. Brief asked if LATC receives an average of 29 Reciprocity Applications annually. Mr. Nishimine explained that LATC received an average of 29 Reciprocity Applications over the last four years.

Ms. Landry opined that some licensees may not maintain their license if the fee is increased by \$300. Ms. Brief explained that a license is needed to work as a landscape architect in California and the fee increase would not cause many people to give up their career. Ms. Landry asked if LATC could cut any expenses. Ms. Trauth noted that LATC must absorb costs related to business modernization and DCA's DEI Committee. She added that Committee members should be included in the decisions to fund these projects. Ms. Brief agreed and stated that members are tasked with a job that they can not fulfill without sufficient information.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked why the costs related to initial licensure and license renewal are similar. Ms. Rodriguez explained that there are similar questions on those applications and staff must complete a similar review process. Mr. Wreschinsky asked if the CSE cost is fixed. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that the cost is fixed and is paid to the examination vendor, PSI. Ms. Landry asked if individuals licensed through reciprocity must pay the same renewal fee as other licensees. Ms. Rodriguez confirmed they pay the same renewal fee amount.

Mr. Wreschinsky proposed raising the Eligibility Application fee to \$150 or \$200. Ms. Brief suggested setting the Eligibility Application fee at \$100 and doubling the proposed fee for a duplicate license. Ms. Rodriguez asked if LATC could charge more than the actual cost for each service. Mr. Nishimine explained that exam related fees should be aligned with actual costs. He added that costs for initial licenses and license renewals can be increased as a policy decision to shift costs from other line items. Mr. Bowden and Ms. Landry suggested increasing the CSE fee to \$400.

Mr. Nishimine shared that DCA has not proposed any increase to costs as a result of the new DEI Committee. He added that LATC allocations of department-wide proposals do not significantly impact the LATC budget. Ms. Trauth asked if the business modernization costs were something LATC did not have control over. Ms. Zuniga explained that LATC could have chosen not to move forward with business modernization but that would not benefit the program.

Ms. Landry repeated the member's suggestions to set the Eligibility Application fee at \$100 and the CSE Application fee at \$400. Ms. Brief opined that if the Eligibility Application fee is set at \$100, then the Reciprocity Application fee should be increased to adjust revenue. Mr. Wreschinsky asked the members for input on the license renewal fee. Ms. Landry suggested the renewal fee should be at least \$766 to cover costs. Ms. Brief suggested that the renewal fee be raised to \$780 as proposed in the third fee model. She added that LATC should explain to licensees that the increased renewal fee will cover costs and ensure the fund is solvent. Mr. Wreschinsky asked about the renewal fee for an architect license. Ms. Zuniga responded that the architect license renewal fee is being raised to \$400. She added that the licensing population of architects is larger than landscape architects so the renewal fee can be lower. She explained that the Board will go through a similar fee study as LATC and increase fees in the future. Ms. Brief noted that professional landscape architects should encourage their peers to become licensed. Mr. Wreschinsky opined that LATC costs may increase in the future, so it is reasonable to set the renewal fee at \$800. Ms. Brief asked Mr. Nishimine if he could update the fee model to determine if the member's suggested fee changes would cover expenditures. Mr. Nishimine asked if the Committee would like to set both minimum and maximum fees in statute. Mr. Bowden asked if it would be possible to set the fee in statute as the cost to LATC plus fifteen percent. Mr. Kanotz explained that could violate the constitution since appropriations must be in fixed amounts. Ms. Landry asked if the budget would be balanced if LATC increased the maximum fees for the Eligibility Application to \$100, CSE Application to \$400, Reciprocity Application to \$800, Initial License Application to \$800, license renewal to \$800 and duplicate license to \$300. Mr. Nishimine calculated the projected revenue and confirmed that those proposed fees would be more aligned with the third fee model.



Mr. Bowden asked if there would be a way to start with lower fees and increase over time. Mr. Nishimine confirmed that LATC could adopt the first fee model as the floor effective January 1, 2024, and then within the next two years the Committee could meet and decide to implement regulations to increase the renewal fee to \$800. Ms. Landry suggested that the minimum fees should be set at \$100 for Eligibility Application, \$350 for CSE Application, \$700 for Reciprocity Application, \$700 for Initial License Application, \$700 for renewal, and \$300 for duplicate license. Ms. Brief asked when Mr. Nishimine could provide an updated projected fund condition statement based on the member's proposed minimum and maximum fees. Mr. Nishimine responded that he could update the statement and check back in with the Committee in about thirty minutes.

#### **E.\* Presentation on the University of California, Davis Landscape Architecture Program**

Mavi Arias, President of the UC Davis National Association of Minority Landscape Architects, and Madeline Laun, Vice President of the Student Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects, provided an update on current UC Davis landscape architecture degree program courses and activities. They shared that the program helped fund a trip for a group of students to attend the 2022 American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) Annual Conference in San Francisco.

#### **F.\* Discuss and Possible Action on Proposal to Amend the Committee's Fee Schedule**

Mr. Nishimine asked if the members wanted to set the new fees at \$100 for Eligibility Application, \$350-\$400 for CSE Application, \$700-\$800 for Reciprocity Application, \$700-\$800 for Initial License Application, \$700-\$800 for renewal, and \$300 for a duplicate license. Mr. Wreschinsky noted that the fee for a Reciprocity Application should be lowered since a reciprocity applicant must pay both the Reciprocity and Initial License Application fees. He suggested the Reciprocity Application fee could be set at \$250-\$300. Mr. Nishimine confirmed the fees proposed are projected to cover LATC's expenditures.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that currently the Reciprocity and CSE Application fees are the same. Blake Clark added that the fees for both the Reciprocity and CSE Applications go toward review of the application and registration for the CSE. Ms. Landry suggested increasing the proposed Reciprocity Application fee to \$350-\$400.

- **Susan M. Landry moved to recommend to the Board fee increases at a floor and ceiling as presented on the view screen by Matt Nishimine.**

**Andrew C. N. Bowden 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. Review and Discuss 2022 Legislation**

### **1. Senate Bill (SB) 1237 (Newman) Licenses: Military Service**

Ms. Zuniga shared that both bills listed have been signed by the Governor. She explained that existing law already provided renewal fee waivers for active duty military members and this bill changed the definition of active duty.

### **2. SB 1443 (Roth) The Department of Consumer Affairs**

Ms. Zuniga explained that this was an omnibus bill that extended the sunset date for both the Board and LATC for an additional year, to January 1, 2025.

## **L. Discuss and Possible Action on 2022-2024 Strategic Plan Objectives to:**

### **1. Explore the Etiquette of Social Media and Develop a Messaging Plan, Such as Celebrating New Licensees, to Reach Out to the Public and Practitioners**

Ms. Rodriguez directed the members to the Social Media Messaging Plan included in the meeting materials and explained that it identifies target audiences and includes examples of messages that could be shared on LATC's social media.

Ms. Trauth asked if additional staff are needed to work on social media.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that existing staff would work on the social media messaging and could coordinate with the Board and DCA as needed. She added that input from the Committee is encouraged and appreciated. Mr. Bowden asked if there are any additional social media platforms that the LATC would like to use.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the Committee considered other platforms during its strategic planning session and decided to join LinkedIn. Ms. Landry expressed that the images used on social media should show low-water landscapes.

Ms. Rodriguez shared that staff worked with DCA to prepare social media graphics which Ms. Brief reviewed to ensure water usage was taken into consideration.

Ms. Brief added that Instagram is a great platform for landscape architecture. She explained that Facebook seems to have a decrease in engagement for organizations and that Twitter and LinkedIn are better options. Ms. Brief suggested that LATC write a letter to local ASLA chapters to request assistance with sharing LATC's social media accounts.

- **Pamela S. Brief moved to approve the Social Media Messaging Plan as presented.**

**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. The motion passed 5-0.**

## **2. Explore Linking LATC’s Website Directly to Other Jurisdictions’ and Licensing Boards’ Websites for Increased Licensee Awareness of What Other States are Doing and to Promote Dialogue**

Ms. Rodriguez directed the members to the contact lists provided in the meeting materials and explained that the included links have been posted to the LATC website. Ms. Brief thanked staff for collecting the website addresses. Ms. Landry advised that the list should be updated to reflect the new Campbell City website address.

### **M. Election of 2023 Committee Officers**

Ms. Landry nominated Mr. Wreschinsky for LATC Chair. Ms. Brief shared that she would like to be Vice Chair again.

- **Susan M. Landry moved to elect Jon S. Wreschinsky as 2023 LATC Chair.**

**Pamela S. Brief 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.**

- **Susan M. Landry moved to elect Pamela S. Brief as 2023 LATC Vice Chair.**

**Andrew C.N. Bowden 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.**

### **N. Review of Future Committee Meeting Dates**

Ms. Rodriguez reminded the members that she sent out a poll to determine which dates would work for the 2023 LATC meetings. Mr. Wreschinsky shared that the next Board meeting is on December 9, 2022, at Stanford University. Ms. Landry offered to attend the upcoming Board meeting.

### **O. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

*\* Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate presenters of items. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*