



SUMMARY REPORT - DRAFT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee

January 26-27, 2011
Berkeley, California

LATC Members Present

Stephanie Landregan, Chair
Christine Anderson, Vice Chair
Andy Bowden
David Allen Taylor, Jr.

Board Liaison Present

Iris Cochlan

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)
Don Chang, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)
Carmen Alexander, Examination Coordinator, LATC
Marina Karzag, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC
Terri Villareal, Enforcement Coordinator, LATC
Angelica Franco, Licensing Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, Association of Professional Landscape Design (APLD)
Denise De Anza, University of San Diego School of Law's Center for Public Interest Law
Maureen Decombe, Past President, APLD California Chapter
Janet Enright, President, APLD California Chapter
Matt Kondolf, Chair, Department of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning and Urban Design, University of California, Berkeley (UCB)
J.C. Miller, Landscape Architecture Program Director, Department of Art and Design, UCB Extension
Dave Mitchell, Secretary, California Council of the American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA)
Louise Mazingo, Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning and Urban Design, UCB
LaVonne Powell, Senior Advisor to the DCA Director

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

Chair's Remarks

Public Comment Session

The LATC Chair Stephanie Landregan called the meeting to order on January 26, 2011 at 9:33 a.m. Ms. Landregan then called roll. Four members of the LATC were present, thus a quorum was established. Public Comment Session was taken after Agenda Item B.

B. Department of Consumer Affairs Director's Report and Enforcement Update

LaVonne Powell noted that DCA Director Brian Stiger was asked to remain in his position by the new Administration but his tenure is uncertain at this time.

Ms. Powell advised that the state's hiring freeze is still in affect but some state agencies have received exemptions.

She also noted a recent executive order issued by the Governor to all state agencies to reduce their cell phones by fifty percent. She added that all DCA boards, bureaus and programs were required to submit a cell phone reduction plan to the DCA Executive Office, which resulted in a fifty percent reduction for the Department.

Ms. Powell said that all boards and bureaus are now tracking performance measures for enforcement and reporting data to the Executive Office.

Ms. Powell suggested that the LATC look into web casting for its public meetings and posting its meeting packets online. Ms. Landregan advised that the LATC is currently looking into this option.

Ms. Powell provided an overview of the BreEZe Project, which is DCA's new licensing and enforcement database to replace the current Applicant Tracking System and Consumer Affairs System. She pointed out that a Request for Proposal will be distributed soon and includes a number of milestones that must be met by the vendor that is awarded the contract. She explained that the new system will be able to meet all of the boards' and bureaus' reporting and data collection needs.

Ms. Powell noted DCA's transition to a new payment method for expert consultants. She reported that expert consultants must now be contracted rather than prior invoicing methods, but DCA is looking into new legislation to expedite this contract process for boards and bureaus.

Andy Bowden asked Ms. Powell if the LATC could be moved higher on the BreEZe implementation list. Ms. Powell responded that Debbie Balaam, with the DCA Office of Information Services, could better answer that question and could possibly attend a future LATC meeting to review the transition to BreEZe.

***A. Public Comment Session**

Ms. Landregan asked if any members of the public would like to address the Committee.

Pamela Berstler commented that she would like to continue to bring landscape designers to LATC meetings in an effort to familiarize the Committee members with active landscape designers.

The other two members of APLD at the meeting introduced themselves to the Committee and provided a brief overview of their educational and professional backgrounds.

C. Approve November 22, 2010, LATC Summary Report

Committee members did not have any comments on the November 22, 2010, LATC Meeting Summary Report.

- **David Taylor moved to approve the November 22, 2010, LATC Meeting Summary Report.**
- **Andy Bowden seconded the motion.**
- **The motion passed 3-0-1 (Stephanie Landregan abstained).**

D. Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)

Christine Anderson noted that she was not able to participate in the CLARB Annual Meeting via telephone due to a conflict with the time zone.

Ms. Anderson reported that she attended a CLARB task analysis workgroup in Portland, Oregon, in October, where she participated in discussions regarding the meaning of welfare as part of a landscape architect's responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Ms. Anderson also reported on her participation in a conference call with CLARB in the prior week regarding the final results of the task analysis survey that was distributed.

She also noted that CLARB is preparing for its spring meeting in Denver, Colorado.

Mr. Bowden asked if out of state travel was still restricted and Doug McCauley affirmed that it was. Mr. Bowden then asked if Committee members could attend out of state meetings via teleconference and Mr. McCauley responded that this option was allowed. Ms. Anderson explained that one of the problems with not being able to attend CLARB meetings is that members must be physically present at the meeting in order to vote in the event of a tie.

Don Chang suggested that CLARB may want to consider amending its bylaws to allow virtual voting in these circumstances because other states have the same issue with attendance and restricted out of state travel. Ms. Anderson pointed out that changing CLARB's bylaws has been an ongoing discussion and was brought up at the last region five meeting but nothing has changed yet. Mr. Chang also suggested that the Committee make this issue a strategic plan objective in order to try and work with CLARB to make this change.

Ms. Landregan pointed out the negative affects of not having LATC representation at CLARB meetings, especially due to the high number of landscape architects in California compared to other states. She also reported that she submitted her name as a candidate for the 2011 CLARB elections as either Board of Directors Vice President or a Nominating Committee member. Ms.

Anderson noted that CLARB requires board candidates to have attended a specific number of CLARB meetings over a certain number of years, which likely makes LATC members unqualified for CLARB Board elections. Ms. Anderson suggested that LATC members try to volunteer as much as possible for CLARB activities in order to maintain a presence at CLARB. Ms. Landregan added that Committee members should also try to be proactive in engaging other member boards.

E. Program Manager's Report

Trish Rodriguez presented the Program Manager's Report. Ms. Rodriguez advised that Ms. Landregan was re-appointment to the LATC and Mr. Bowden's one year grace period ends on June 1st this year. She also noted that there is still one vacancy on the LATC.

Ms. Rodriguez mentioned that the BreZE Project team asked boards and bureaus to provide a subject matter expert to attend meetings, so Angelica Franco attended planning meetings held in October on behalf of the LATC.

Ms. Rodriguez noted a student outreach presentation was given by staff and Ms. Anderson at UCB Extension Program on November 30, 2010. She also noted that staff continue to schedule more outreach dates for the spring semester and are adding community colleges and the NewSchool of Architecture and Design in San Diego on its list of outreach locations.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the regulation package for California Code of Regulations sections (CCR) 2615 and 2620 was put on hold for Sunset Review and excess workload but is now pending final review. Ms. Landregan suggested informing schools of the expected implementation date of these regulations because they directly impact students.

Ms. Rodriguez provided an update on the Web License Lookup (WLL) project. She explained that the LATC currently posts licensee reports monthly on its website but once it has transitioned to the WLL, anyone will be able to look up a licensee's license status and full address of record, rather than just the licensee's city, state and zip code, as is currently displayed in the monthly reports. She noted that LATC staff will notify the licensees of this transition prior to implementation of the WLL.

Ms. Rodriguez reported that the DCA Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) is currently redeveloping the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) and has already completed three of the five scheduled workshops. She noted that the next workshop is scheduled for February 9, 2011, in Sacramento and the redevelopment is expected to be completed in June.

Ms. Landregan asked if staff could report the number of licenses issued after each Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) administration at future meetings and Ms. Rodriguez acknowledged that such a report could be prepared at a future date.

Ms. Rodriguez provided an overview of the LATC's enforcement activities, such as its continuing dialogue with APLD, updating its enforcement statistics, and focusing on closing cases.

Mr. Bowden requested that staff add a column on the California and National LARE Historical Passage Rates chart (Attachment E.2 of the Program Manager's Report) to show the titles of

each exam section. Mr. Bowden asked when LATC could expect to receive results from the December exam administration and Carmen Alexander responded that she would probably receive the results around March.

Ms. Landregan inquired about CLARB posting exam results immediately after the exam and Ms. Alexander clarified that candidates can check their unofficial scores online after the exam, but these scores are not finalized until ten days after the exam.

Ms. Rodriguez announced that three LATC staff members have accepted positions at other DCA boards or departments. Ms. Landregan asked Ms. Powell if the LATC could get exemptions for filling these vacancies and Ms. Powell said that transfers do not require an exemption and the Governor may provide exemptions for smaller boards.

Ms. Landregan thanked LATC staff for their work on the Sunset Review Report and commented that the report looked excellent and staff did a great job.

F. Update on Sunset Review

Mr. McCauley reported that the first Sunset Review hearings have been scheduled for either March 14th or 21st. He noted that LATC has been asked to meet with the DCA Executive Office to review the report prior to the hearing in order to prepare for any possible critical issues that may be discussed at the hearing. He also mentioned that he has asked the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development staff, which will be conducting the Sunset Review hearing, to meet with him and Ms. Rodriguez prior to the hearing. Mr. McCauley said he would go over major issues that could be discussed at the hearing with Ms. Rodriguez and Ms. Landregan before the hearing. He noted that the Legislature will submit a list of questions to LATC prior to the hearing in response to the Sunset Review Report. He said the LATC will have to respond to these questions at the first hearing. He further explained that DCA provides feedback and questions for the LATC at the second hearing and finally, the Legislature provides recommendations to the LATC at the third hearing.

Ms. Powell mentioned that it would be helpful if the LATC submitted any updates to the information included in the Sunset Review Report prior to the hearing. She also noted that DCA is offering mock hearings for additional preparation for boards.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that Ms. Landregan's recent re-appointment to the LATC is not included in the Sunset Review Report and should be added. Mr. Chang added that any updates to the Sunset Review Report could be approved by a Committee vote.

Ms. Landregan asked Dave Mitchell if he had any comments and he responded that he also thought that LATC staff did an excellent job completing the Sunset Review Report.

***G. Discussion with University of California Berkeley Faculty on Current Activities**

Ms. Landregan postponed this agenda item until the arrival of the UCB faculty members.

H. Discuss and Possible Action on Local Jurisdictions Refusing to Accept Plans Prepared by Landscape Architects

Mr. Chang explained that an issue was brought to the attention of the LATC where a city refused to accept the landscape architect stamp on plans that were part of a larger project and the question posed to the LATC was whether or not the city's refusal was permissible. Mr. Chang further explained that he determined that the city's refusal was not permissible because the plans fell within a landscape architect's scope of practice, as defined in the Landscape Architects Practice Act. He said the city was relying on the scope of practice of engineers, as defined in the Engineers Practice Act and an exemption for architects also defined in the Engineers Practice Act. He pointed out that the city incorrectly determined that a lack of exemption for landscape architects in the Engineers Practice Act meant they could not accept the plans stamped by the landscape architect. Mr. Chang explained that the scope of the plans fell within the definition of the practice of a landscape architect as stated in law. He also noted that prior legal cases show that when scopes of practices overlap, either practice can perform the service. He explained that this implies that landscape architects can provide the services allowed under the law without an exemption in the Engineers Practice Act. Mr. Chang also pointed out that Business and Professions Code section (BPC) 460 prohibits a city or county from barring a profession from performing services that are authorized by their professional license.

Mr. McCauley asked Mr. Chang if BPC section 460 could be applied to state agencies that do not accept the landscape architect stamp and Mr. Chang replied that section 460 only applies to cities and counties.

Mr. Bowden asked Mr. Mitchell, the CCASLA representative, if CCASLA has met with the Division of the State Architect regarding its refusal to accept plans stamped by landscape architects. Mr. Mitchell replied that CCASLA has not met with the Division of the State Architect regarding this issue because it was waiting for the official opinion of the LATC. Since Mr. Chang explained that state agencies do not have to adhere to the requirements under BPC section 460, CCASLA will try to discuss other solutions to this issue with the Division of the State Architect.

Ms. Anderson inquired as to whether or not anyone had received any feedback from the City of Torrance regarding the initial letter and Ms. Landregan replied that she heard that the City of Torrance decided to accept the plans stamped by the licensed landscape architect.

***G. Discussion with University of California Berkeley Faculty on Current Activities**

Louise Mozingo and Matt Kondolf from UCB's Department of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning and Urban Design, introduced themselves.

Ms. Landregan asked the faculty members what they see as the role of the landscape architect license and Ms. Anderson also asked if there has been a shift in that role in the last year. Ms. Mozingo replied that she thinks it is more difficult for newly licensed landscape architects to get an entry level position in the workforce and there is a greater awareness that students are interested in starting their own practice. She added that students are aware of the difficulty of getting an apprenticeship, which can delay the licensure process. Ms. Mozingo further explained that even though the Bay Area has a large concentration of landscape architects, the economic climate has made licensure difficult. However, she thinks that apprenticeship availability has improved over the last six months. Mr. Kondolf added that all students assume they will get a license because most want to practice.

Mr. Bowden asked how many UCB staff are licensed landscape architects and Ms. Mozingo replied that approximately ten faculty within the core curriculum are licensed.

Ms. Anderson asked the faculty members what they see as a trend in landscape architecture and how do the students perceive that trend. Ms. Mozingo replied that many students are working internationally and even small firms are now doing international work. She also noted that California has seen a trend in water quality and climate change issues and the local implementation. She added that many students are interested in Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design [LEED] certification.

Mr. Taylor commented that LATC has increased its outreach to California universities but has not received any feedback from the faculty after visiting the campuses. Mr. Taylor asked if the UCB faculty have ever received feedback from students on LATC's outreach efforts. Ms. Mozingo replied that they have not heard any feedback from students but suggested that the LATC incorporate real stories about the challenges of projects into the outreach presentation. She noted that their Department brings guest speakers to classes to talk about projects and case studies.

Ms. Landregan noted that landscape architecture education does not usually focus on policy advocacy and asked the UCB faculty members how this could be part of the education and how the LATC can be involved. Ms. Mozingo responded that she thinks the best way to convey a focus on policy is by having presenters discuss how their projects implement policies and affect policies. She noted that their Department has started putting alumni profiles on their website so that students can see the different career paths. Ms. Mozingo pointed out that Mr. Kondolf worked on an environmental advisory committee, which influenced policy. Mr. Kondolf commented that some of the instructors are very involved in the San Joaquin Delta issues as well. He also mentioned that faculty members will bring students to project meetings and presentations.

Ms. Anderson commented that CLARB has begun discussions on the definition of "welfare" and asked the faculty members whether or not there has been any discussion with students on this issue. Ms. Mozingo replied that she is not sure there has been any discussion among students on this issue but that the faculty members have been discussing this issue as to how it will affect the curriculum.

Mr. Bowden asked the faculty members whether or not they place a level of importance on the LARE subject matter. Ms. Mozingo responded that the program curriculum includes a full semester of grading and drainage; a full semester of construction detail; and two semesters of planting and technology. She said this equals a full academic year of course work. She noted that faculty try to cover the sections that are the most difficult to pass. She said the faculty also encourages students to form study groups and take refresher courses.

Mr. Bowden asked which portions of Section B of the LARE are covered in UCB's program and Ms. Mozingo replied that the Professional Practice course has three parts: Part 1 focuses on professional practice and Section B of the LARE; Part 2 requires a professional practice portfolio; and Part 3 consists of an internship with once a week attendance.

Mr. Bowden asked if the Department keeps records of the percentage of students that obtain a license and Ms. Mozingo replied that the Department does not track those numbers but are currently working on creating a database of all students.

Ms. Landregan mentioned that the faculty members could provide feedback after the meeting, if desired, and Ms. Mozingo also offered to take a survey. Ms. Landregan said that the LATC could provide a survey and would also appreciate feedback on the student outreach presentation. She explained that she would like to know if the presentation focuses enough on consumer protection and clearly explains to students the profession's responsibility for public safety. Ms. Mozingo suggested that the LATC include in the outreach presentation examples of critical failures in service and how these failures can be resolved. She explained that the implications for these failures and how to remedy them could be presented as a positive aspect of the profession.

***H. Discuss and Possible Action on Local Jurisdictions Refusing to Accept Plans Prepared by Landscape Architects**

Ms. Landregan noted that the Committee did not take an action earlier on Agenda Item H, Discuss and Possible Action on Local Jurisdictions Refusing to Accept Plans Prepared by Landscape Architects.

- **Andy Bowden moved to accept DCA's legal opinion on local jurisdictions refusing to accept plans prepared by landscape architects.**
- **Christine Anderson seconded the motion.**
- **The motion passed 4-0.**

I. Discuss and Possible Action on LATC Public Disclosure Procedures for Enforcement Actions

Ms. Rodriguez commented that part of the LATC Strategic Plan is to adopt public disclosure procedures. She said that these procedures are being drafted by staff and will be presented at the next meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the LATC received a call from a licensee asking about how long enforcement citations are posted on the LATC website. In order to address this issue, Ms. Rodriguez further explained that the LATC would like to mirror the Board's five year disclosure policy and discuss with the Committee members the appropriate length of time to keep enforcement actions on the LATC website. Ms. Rodriguez clarified that LATC does not currently have internal formalized disclosure procedures, so she would like to use the Board's standards as a baseline. Mr. McCauley further clarified that there are public disclosure laws, but Ms. Rodriguez is specifically referring to internal public disclosure procedures for specific information provided on its website. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the Board's five year disclosure policy for citations is not in regulation, but was agreed upon at a Board meeting.

Mr. Chang noted that retention is different from disclosure. He explained that retention refers to keeping records while disclosure refers to information provided in the LATC website.

Maureen Decombe commented that APLD has done its own analysis of the information on the LATC website and would like to inquire into the possibility of obtaining information on older enforcement cases that are not disclosed on the website. She pointed out that none of the people listed on the LATC's Enforcement Actions Web page are APLD members, so they would like to inquire into older enforcement actions that may involve APLD members.

Ms. Landregan asked Ms. Decombe if she thinks all violations and violators should be disclosed on the website for five years once LATC has adopted a disclosure policy and Ms. Decombe responded that the APLD does not have an official position on the LATC's web content but does think that information older than five years should be available upon request.

Mr. Taylor asked if the LATC should have specific disclosure timelines for specific types of citations, such as longer timelines for more serious citations and Mr. McCauley responded that in the interest of public safety, serious enforcement actions against licensees would be Accusations. He further explained that DCA has a policy, which requires all Accusation documents to be linked to a licensee's profile on the website.

Mr. Bowden asked if a member of the public wanted to look up a landscape architect online, but did not see any Accusations linked to the licensee's profile, then would the member of the public have to go to a different website to see if the licensee had any citations. Mr. Chang responded that the five year policy would only be applied to citations and DCA already requires all Accusations to be posted indefinitely. Mr. Bowden asked Mr. Chang what would be an example of a citation and Mr. Chang responded that a citation could be a minor malpractice issue. He further explained that a citation is usually the result of a consumer complaint where the investigation led to a violation of the Landscape Architects Practice Act, such as a failure to notify the LATC of an insurance claim.

Mr. Bowden asked if citations have varying degrees of severity, where it may not need to be disclosed on the website and Mr. McCauley replied that there are not varying degrees of citations and it would be difficult to classify all types of citations and assign specific disclosure timeframes.

Mr. Bowden agreed that five years was an appropriate length of time for disclosure of enforcement citations on the LATC website.

- **Andy Bowden moved to approve five years as the length of time to disclose citations listed on the LATC website.**
- **Christine Anderson seconded the motion.**
- **The motion passed 4-0.**

Ms. Rodriguez clarified that the LATC would have an opportunity to change these procedures at the next meeting when the draft procedures are presented.

Mr. Bowden asked when the five year timeframe starts and Mr. Chang replied that five years starts when the citation becomes final.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that the motion specifically referred to enforcement citations on the website, but it would be helpful to have a motion for all medium in which citations may be disclosed.

Ms. Landregan suggested including a disclosure statement on the licensee query page that references the Enforcement Actions Web page.

J. Annual Enforcement Report and Update

Ms. Rodriguez reported that 10.4 months is the average time for LATC to close cases beginning this fiscal year. She noted that one of the handouts shows performance measures for the first quarter and the data will continue to be reported every quarter. Mr. McCauley explained that the quarterly performance measures are just a snapshot so the first quarter numbers may be high because they may only reflect one case. He further explained that these numbers will probably reduce over time. The data reported in the Sunset Review Report showed 50 percent of cases closed in one year or less.

Ms. Anderson asked about the target timelines shown in the performance measures quarterly report and Mr. McCauley explained that these target timeframes were established internally based on DCA's Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative, which sets an overall target timeframe for closing cases between 12 and 18 months.

Ms. Rodriguez reviewed the second handout, which shows enforcement statistics over the past ten years. Ms. Rodriguez asked the Committee members whether or not they would like to continue to have a ten year enforcement statistical report and Mr. Bowden responded that he thinks the information would be very useful for identifying trends over time. Ms. Anderson commented that even though having annual data is useful, they probably do not need to see ten years worth of data. Ms. Landregan agreed with Mr. Bowden that the full ten years of data would be useful to have.

Ms. Rodriguez asked the Committee members if they would like to continue to have an enforcement data chart on the cover sheet that shows BPC section 5641 cases and the Committee members agreed that they do not need this chart.

Ms. Decombe thanked Terri Villareal for her assistance with helping APLD and its members understand the case handling process. Ms. Decombe noted that APLD has tracked the cases against its members and believes the trend in unlicensed activity may be the result of changes to BPC section 5640, Unlicensed Person Engaging in Practice - Sanctions. Ms. Decombe commented that all of the cases against APLD members have been closed, which helps meet the LATC's case processing goals. She reported that these APLD members are happy to know that they are now in compliance and that APLD can move past this issue. She explained that APLD understands LATC must comply with privacy laws and APLD is just trying to educate its members on best practices. She noted that APLD encourages its members to get insurance coverage for errors and omissions to ensure professional responsibility can be documented for that designer.

Ms. Berstler suggested that the Enforcement Statistics by Fiscal Year chart include a breakdown of complaints by type under the Complaints Closed row.

Ms. Landregan thanked the APLD attendees for using the opportunity to educate its members so that landscape designers can comply with the exempt area of practice as defined in the Landscape Architects Practice Act.

The Committee members discussed Agenda Item C, Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates, scheduled for Day 2 of the meeting, but noted that they would ratify the tentative meeting dates at tomorrow's meeting according to the schedule listed in the meeting agenda.

K. Budget Update

Sean Cogan provided an overview of the budget process. Mr. Cogan explained that every year there are things that require budget adjustments, such as Executive Orders and Budget Change Proposals. He further explained that because the LATC is a special fund program, all fees come from the candidates and licensees.

Mr. Cogan noted that the Governor's budget was released in January so the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 budget is complete and next year's budget is almost complete.

Mr. Cogan pointed out that the LATC is always within budget, but may have to consider possible fee decrease due to a consistently high reversion. Mr. Cogan noted that he does not anticipate any other major budget changes in the near future.

Mr. Taylor asked if the Governor's budget is final and Mr. Cogan responded that the current year budget is final.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Cogan about the LATC's fund balance dropping to less than \$500 in FY 2013-14 from almost \$2 million dollars in FY 2009-10, as displayed in Attachment K.2, LATC Fund Condition chart. Mr. Cogan explained that usually a program wants to match its revenue with its expenditures and the LATC has experienced decreasing expenditures. He further explained that the LATC is budgeted for more than it actually spends and Attachment K.2 assumes the LATC will spend its full budget. He noted that in theory this would cause the fund balance to drop because the LATC's expenditures would be much higher than its revenue. However, Mr. Cogan pointed out that LATC's actual expenditures are much lower, which means the reserve will stay high, assuming a two percent growth in revenue and expenditures. Mr. McCauley commented that the Department of Finance assumes, when looking at a program's fund condition, that the program will spend its full budget.

Mr. Bowden inquired about the LATC's fund condition showing 21 months in reserve in FY 2009-10 and dropping to 4 months in FY 2013-14 on Attachment K.1, LATC Fund Condition. Mr. Cogan explained that 24 months is a ceiling for the reserve. He noted that the fund condition assumes the LATC will spend its full budget, but this will not actually happen. Instead, Mr. Cogan commented that he expected the LATC to spend around \$600,000 this year. He noted that with budget and expenditure cuts, the LATC will not be spending its full budget and \$800,000 for future fiscal years is more accurate and closer to the LATC's revenue level. He explained that this will cause the LATC's reserve to drop slowly over time.

Ms. Landregan asked Mr. Cogan if he thinks the LATC will need to do a fee decrease and Mr. Cogan responded that due to LATC's reversion over the last two years and in the current year, the reserve will go over 24 months. He explained that the LATC may want to consider a fee decrease for one or two cycles, which would help balance out the reserve. He noted that a fee decrease is just something to think about but would not be immediate.

Ms Landregan pointed out that based on the economy and less candidates able to meet the eligibility requirements due to less firms hiring, the LATC has experienced a decrease in license applications. She also noted that once the economy improves, there may be an increase in the licensee population and we would have to take that into consideration. Mr. Cogan agreed that the LATC may see an increase in revenue once the economy improves, which could be an issue for its reserve in the future.

Mr. Taylor commented that he sees three options: 1) reduce exam fees; 2) reduce licensee fees; and 3) reduce both. He asked what the timeframe looks like for any of these options. Ms. Landregan asked if the LATC could offer a rebate if the Board accepts this option and Mr. Cogan replied that he was not sure. Ms. Landregan noted that by the time a fee reduction took affect, the LATC's fund condition could have changed. Mr. Cogan agreed that by the time the LATC implements a fee decrease, the situation could be different. Mr. Cogan projected a 2012 completion date, but noted that the LATC can make changes to the regulation proposal to decrease fees any time throughout the approval process. Mr. Chang commented that there are currently no provisions on rebates, only a provision that requires a program to reduce its fees if its reserve reaches a certain level.

Ms. Landregan noted that an exam fee decrease would be a good option since LARE fees have increased since CLARB started administering the exam.

Ms. Anderson asked if the LATC implemented a one or two year fee decrease, would the fee go back to its original amount at the end of the one or two years and Mr. McCauley confirmed that it would.

Adjourn

- **Christine Anderson moved to adjourn.**
- **Andy Bowden seconded the motion.**
- **The motion passed 4-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order to accommodate public participation and speakers. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*

January 27, 2011
Berkeley, California

LATC Members Present

Stephanie Landregan, Chair
Christine Anderson, Vice Chair
Andy Bowden
David Allen Taylor, Jr.

Board Liaison Present

Iris Cochlan

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, LATC
Carmen Alexander, Examination Coordinator, LATC
Marina Karzag, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC
Terri Villareal, Enforcement Coordinator, LATC
Angelica Franco, Licensing Coordinator, LATC

Guests Present

Ann Baker, Past President, Northern California Chapter, American Society of Landscape Architects
Pamela Berstler, Legislative Chair, California Chapter, APLD
Maureen Decombe, Past President, APLD California Chapter
Janet Enright, President, APLD California Chapter
Daniel Iacofano, Principal, Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.
Dave Mitchell, Secretary, CC/ASLA

**A. Call to Order – Roll Call – Establishment of a Quorum
Chair’s Remarks
Public Comment Session**

LATC Chair Ms. Landregan called the meeting to order on January 27, 2011 at 8:32 a.m. Ms. Landregan called roll. Four members of the LATC were present and thus a quorum was established.

Ms. Landregan reminded the Committee members to consider budget and staff constraints when updating on the Strategic Plan.

There were no public comments.

B. Strategic and Communications Planning Review Session

The LATC commenced its annual strategic planning session, facilitated by Daniel Iacofano of Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc. The LATC reviewed the accomplishments in 2010 and key trends in the profession. Mr. Iacofano reported on the issues raised by key stakeholders during the interviews conducted in preparation for the session. He then assisted the LATC as they

identified and established goals for the upcoming year(s). The LATC: 1) reviewed and updated the six goal areas of the Strategic Plan (Regulation and Enforcement, Professional Qualifications, Public and Professional Awareness, Organizational Relationships, and Organizational Effectiveness); 2) identified several objectives to meet these goals; and 3) established target dates for completion.

The strategic planning session discussion will be incorporated into the July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012 Strategic Plan and the LATC will meet in April 2011 to finalize the plan.

C. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

April 28, 2011, Los Angeles

July 21, 2011, Davis

October 27, 2011, San Diego

Adjourn

- **Andy Bowden moved to adjourn.**
- **David Taylor seconded the motion.**
- **The motion passed 4-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:42 p.m.