

## **SUMMARY REPORT**

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

May 22, 2013  
Sacramento, California

#### LATC Members Present

Stephanie Landregan, Chair  
Andrew Bowden, Vice Chair  
Nicki Johnson  
Katherine Spitz

#### LATC Member Absent

David Allen Taylor, Jr.

#### Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer, California Architects Board (Board)  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer, Board  
Don Chang, Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC)  
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC  
Claire Chung, Examination Coordinator, LATC  
Matthew McKinney, Enforcement Officer, LATC  
Ken Miller, Licensing Coordinator, LATC

#### Guests Present

Christine Anderson, Chair, University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force  
Pamela Berstler, President, California Chapter, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)  
Eddie Chau, Program Director, University of California (UC) Berkeley Extension Landscape Architecture Program  
Dalton LaVoie, California Council/American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA)  
John Nicolaus, CC/ASLA  
Tom Roy, Facilitation Specialist, DCA, Strategic Organization, Leadership and Individual Development  
Taylor Schick, Budget Analyst, DCA  
Raul Villanueva, Personnel Selection Consultant, DCA, Office of Professional Examination Services

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

Chair Stephanie Landregan called the meeting to order at 9:58 a.m. and Andrew Bowden called the roll. Four members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

**B. Approve January 24-25, 2013 LATC Summary Report**

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the January 24-25, 2013 LATC Summary Report.**

**Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.**

**C. Program Manager’s Report**

Trish Rodriguez presented the Program Manager’s Report. She stated that implementation of the BreEZe Project has been delayed and the phase one release is currently in the User-Acceptance Testing stage. She noted that LATC is included in the phase three release of BreEZe, which is expected to reach completion in 2014.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the members that on February 26, 2013, an outreach presentation was delivered at UC Davis, which had 24 attendees. She also said that an outreach presentation was provided at UC Berkeley on April 25, 2013, which had 15 attendees. She noted that schools will be contacted in fall 2013 to schedule additional presentations.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the regulatory package for California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 2614 (Examination Transition Plan) was approved on April 8, 2013, and the regulatory package for CCR section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) is currently under review. She continued that the LATC website was recently updated with the latest regulation changes, upcoming administration dates for the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE), and current list of active licensees. She also mentioned that staff began compiling a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) as requested at the January 24-25, 2013 LATC meeting, and the FAQs will be posted to the website once approved.

Ms. Rodriguez discussed the issues surrounding a testing anomaly experienced during the December 2012 administration of section 4 of the LARE. She explained that Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) informed LATC that all issues are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and CLARB has resolved any issues from the December 2012 administration of the LARE. She noted that if candidates have further questions regarding the testing anomaly, they should contact CLARB directly.

Ms. Rodriguez indicated that development for the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) began in March 2013 and the last development workshop will be June 3-4, 2013. She explained that the workshops have been going well; however, it has been difficult to recruit a sufficient number of subject-matter experts who have been licensed less than five years. She noted that the first occupational analysis (OA) workshop will occur on May 30-31, 2013.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the members that an update will be provided on the University of California Extension Certificate Program Task Force site reviews under Agenda Item I. She also announced that LATC recently entered into a contract with a new technical expert, for a combined total of three contracted technical experts who will assist with enforcement case review. She provided a personnel update to the members and acknowledged that Erika Vaca was hired as a limited-term Office Technician, effective April 1, 2013, to assist with administrative tasks. Ms. Rodriguez concluded her report by notifying the members that an update will be provided under Agenda Item K on the legal opinion for Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5641 (Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions), along with an update on the annual enforcement statistics.

#### **D. Review and Approve July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 Draft Strategic and Communications Plan**

LATC and staff discussed and made edits to the July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 draft Strategic and Communications Plan with Tom Roy facilitating the discussion. LATC proceeded to review the Strategic Plan objectives and adjust their target dates as necessary.

- **Katherine Spitz made a motion to adopt the draft Strategic Plan with edits as discussed, extend the effective date through June 30, 2015, and change future Strategic Plans to be effective for two fiscal years with annual environmental scans.**

**Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.**

#### **J.\* Review and Possible Action on Requirements for Reciprocity**

Ms. Rodriguez explained that LATC recently received a letter from Jon Pride, a licensed landscape architect in Washington who does not meet California's minimum education requirements to qualify for licensure. She said that Mr. Pride requested LATC to consider his request for licensure in California despite not meeting the education requirement.

Mr. Bowden asked the members if they believe Mr. Pride would pose a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public if he were to be granted licensure without meeting California's education requirement, in light of his experience. Ms. Landregan responded that according to current California law, he would pose a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Don Chang added that there is nothing preventing the LATC from proposing a change to the regulations if they deem a change appropriate. He stated that some jurisdictions allow a certain amount of licensed experience to supplement deficiencies in obtaining a license, recognizing that there is a supplemental value to licensed experience. He stated that under current California law, the examination requirement may be waived if the applicant is currently licensed as a landscape architect in another jurisdiction, has passed a written examination equivalent to that which is required in California, and has submitted proof of job experience equivalent to that required in California. He noted that according to CCR section 2620 (Education and Training Credits), training credit may only be granted after meeting the education requirement first. Mr. Chang concluded that the LATC should consider whether they want to substitute licensed experience for education in some manner.

Christine Anderson cautioned the members to consider the potential for increased staff workload when discussing changing reciprocity requirements. Ms. Landregan asked if the phrase in CCR

section 2615 (Form of Examinations) which states, “the written examination may be waived” only applies to the examination requirement for licensure and not the education or experience requirements. Mr. Chang confirmed that only the written examination may be waived; however, the LATC could potentially adopt a regulation which would grant educational equivalence for licensed experience.

Mr. Bowden asked if the LATC could make a decision regarding changing reciprocity requirements at today’s meeting. Mr. Chang replied that LATC could begin the process by determining if they would like to explore granting educational equivalence for licensed experience in other jurisdictions and then defer the question to a subcommittee to evaluate appropriate equivalencies. Vickie Mayer noted that a current Strategic Plan objective is to “Review reciprocity requirements of other states to determine possible changes to California requirements to improve efficiencies.”

Ms. Spitz stated that she is uncomfortable changing reciprocity requirements for one person, and would like to explore the long-term ramifications of such a change. Mr. Bowden stated the purpose of licensure is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of Californians, and he is unsure that denying Mr. Pride’s request for licensure accomplishes this. He explained that Mr. Pride has already demonstrated to another state that he is minimally competent for licensure in that jurisdiction. He clarified that he understands there are different laws regulating the practice of landscape architecture in other states; however, regardless of what is decided for educational equivalencies, reciprocity candidates would be required to take and pass the CSE before obtaining licensure.

Ms. Landregan stated she is willing to amend education requirements to allow experience equivalencies for licensed experience in other jurisdictions. She directed staff to provide information at the next meeting regarding how other jurisdictions handle equivalencies of education and experience, so that LATC can consider modifying reciprocity requirements to include educational equivalence for training. Ms. Anderson said that licensure is a combination of education, experience, and examination, and all three factors should be considered when reviewing reciprocity requirements. Ms. Mayer asked for clarification as to whether staff will gather information on educational equivalencies or the reciprocity requirements of other states. Ms. Landregan responded that staff should gather data on both educational equivalencies and reciprocity requirements, because reciprocity requirements may already have educational equivalencies contained within them. Mr. Chang summarized that staff will research whether other jurisdictions allow licensed experience to supplement deficiencies in education for the purpose of reciprocity, and that staff will report to LATC at the next meeting.

#### **F. Discuss and Possible Action on Recommendations Regarding LATC Fund Condition**

Ms. Rodriguez provided an overview of recommendations to address the LATC fund condition. She explained that, at the January 24-25, 2013 LATC meeting, DCA Budget Office staff presented the current fund condition, at which time there were 19 months of funds in reserve. She explained that staff was asked to evaluate the possibilities of a license fee reduction and a negative budget change proposal (BCP) to address the fund condition. She noted that after further discussion, it was recommended that LATC implement a negative BCP of \$200,000, and temporarily reduce license renewal fees from \$400 to \$220 for one renewal cycle. She indicated that the temporary license fee reduction would be implemented in fiscal year (FY) 2015/2016 due to competing priorities such as BreEZe implementation and Sunset Review.

Ms. Landregan inquired whether a negative BCP would permanently reduce the spending authority for LATC, because she is concerned that it will be difficult to increase budget appropriation if the need arises. Taylor Schick responded that a negative BCP will permanently reduce budget authority; however, this reduction will adjust the LATC budget to an appropriate level. He explained that the LATC budget experienced a large cost savings in FY 2009/2010 when the administration costs of the LARE were assumed by CLARB. He said that nearly \$200,000 was appropriated in the LATC budget for administration of the LARE that was no longer needed, resulting in a budget surplus. He suggested that LATC consider a negative BCP to address the budget surplus. He also noted that the projected fund conditions presented in the meeting packet assume that the LATC will fully expend their allotted funds during a given FY. He said that most agencies do not fully expend their budget each year and typically experience a 5-10% reversion rate. He noted that LATC has experienced a 40-50% reversion rate in recent years due primarily to the LATC no longer administering the LARE. He stated that even with the proposed negative BCP, the LATC budget will likely still experience a 10-20% reversion rate, allowing LATC sufficient funds to operate and address unanticipated situations. He noted that the Department of Finance (DOF) reviews fund conditions on an annual basis and it appears unusual that LATC has been reverting approximately 40% of the budget for nearly five years. Ms. Landregan asked if funding for the 2016 Sunset Review is considered in the proposed negative BCP. Doug McCauley replied that increased staff time is considered when reviewing the proposed budget change; however, it is not a budget line item. He opined that LATC should consider the proposed negative BCP as a modest and cautious approach rather than having a different, more severe proposal forced upon it.

Ms. Landregan expressed that she wants to ensure the proposed negative BCP will not place the LATC in a compromised budget position. She asked if there are any trends with candidate applications to consider, such as increases or decreases, when reducing LATC budget appropriation. Mr. Schick said that the budget office has software that can analyze past trends, show previous reversion rates, and project scenarios based upon different situations. He said that the budget office will work with the LATC to generate such documents in an expedient manner.

Mr. Bowden asked how a negative BCP will be perceived during Sunset Review by the reviewing agencies. Mr. Schick responded that if it is executed properly, it should be viewed as properly managing the appropriation and fund of the LATC. Mr. Bowden asked if funds could be redirected to other areas of the budget, rather than pursue a negative BCP, so that LATC does not receive criticism during the next Sunset Review for possibly being deficient in areas that funds could have been redirected to support. Mr. McCauley said that there would be a greater chance of criticism in the next Sunset Review if LATC does not pursue the proposed negative BCP. Ms. Landregan asked if the funds in the budget are generated from licensing fees. Mr. McCauley responded that the funds are generated from both licensing and examination fees.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to reduce the license renewal fee from \$400 to \$220 for one renewal cycle beginning in FY 2015/2016, at the end of which the renewal fee will revert back to \$400.**

**Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.**

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to authorize staff to prepare a negative BCP to reduce the LATC budget spending authority \$200,000.**

**Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.**

#### **G. Discuss and Possible Action on Occupational Analysis**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that LATC will begin the OA process on May 30-31, 2013. She explained that the purpose of this agenda item is to provide an opportunity for LATC to offer input before the first workshop. Raul Villanueva explained that the OA will begin with a focus group that will identify the principal areas that will be explored during the OA. He said that past OAs and input provided by the LATC during today's meeting will serve as a starting point for the focus group discussion.

Mr. Villanueva asked the members to discuss and respond to the questions listed on the agenda item attachment entitled "LATC 2013 OA Questions." Ms. Landregan responded to the question, "In what areas of practice have you recently seen or do you anticipate changes in law?" by explaining that California has made frequent changes to water laws and has seen many changes to rainwater and wastewater harvesting restrictions in recent years. She said that issues surrounding the handling of waste on job sites are undergoing modifications by various California jurisdictions. She also anticipates changes in areas such as soil management, and maintaining native soils, native plants, and native ecosystems. She said that in regards to climate change, creating sustainable and resilient landscapes is an area that is possibly changing. She further explained that addressing how landscapes affect public health and mitigation of sites that have been degraded are some other emerging areas of law. She summarized that, in her opinion, handling of wastewater, climate change, and resilient landscapes are some of the most prominent emerging areas of practice.

Ms. Spitz concurred with Ms. Landregan's comments and added that many civil engineers are currently doing things that, in her opinion, landscape architects should be doing. She stated that some emerging areas of practice are the mitigation of stormwater at construction sites and using graywater for irrigation. She explained that currently, civil engineers are being tasked with using sandbags at construction sites to temporarily mitigate stormwater during the duration of construction, and that this should fall under the purview of landscape architects. She said some other emerging areas of practice are low-impact development, soil remediation, climate change and selecting vegetation to clean and percolate water. Ms. Landregan added that another emerging area of focus within the practice is the overuse of plants that can cause disease, and creating performance landscapes that work well with natural systems. She also said that irrigation, water conservation, and erosion are changing areas within the practice.

Ms. Johnson agreed that stormwater mitigation, irrigation, and water conservation are changing topics that should fall within the purview of landscape architects. Mr. Bowden said that it is important for landscape architects to have knowledge of Assembly Bill 1881, the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Ms. Spitz said that the LARE does not test extensively on how to select the proper plant for the climate, and that basic knowledge of California plants is very important. Ms. Landregan responded that plant selection is not evaluated extensively on the LARE because proper plant selection varies greatly across the nation. Mr. Bowden said that

recent changes to accessibility standards should be tested for on the CSE, along with fire zoning in high fire danger areas. Ms. Anderson said that the LATC should evaluate how the recent CLARB study on welfare has been incorporated into the LARE, and how much of it is California-specific.

Ms. Johnson opined that after six to ten years of licensure, the nature of licensure focuses more on project management. Ms. Landregan added that as a licensee's experience increases, how to combine knowledge and experience becomes a skill that also increases. Ms. Spitz said that inexperienced licensees should be able to identify when they do not know something and be able to consult the proper resources to find solutions. Ms. Landregan stated that having an understanding of how other professional licensees integrate into a project team is not something that is currently tested for on the LARE and should possibly be addressed in the OA.

Mr. Villanueva concluded by asking for any other possible areas of input for the OA to be sent to Ms. Rodriguez by May 31, 2013, and thanked the members for their input.

#### **E. Discuss and Possible Action on LATC's 2014 Sunset Review Process**

Mr. McCauley provided an overview of the Sunset Review process for the members. He explained that the Legislature provided a "BP&ED (Business, Professions and Economic Development) Oversight Review Questionnaire" and it is included in the meeting packet for review. He said that the questionnaire poses new questions that have not been sought in previous Sunset Reviews, such as committee member attendance at meetings, fingerprinting requirements for enforcement, and webcasting for meetings. He stated that staff will review the questions and start working on the report in the near future. He explained that one year is budgeted to complete the report because the LATC will need to review it at least twice before it is submitted to the Legislature by October 31, 2014. He said that the former Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee was sunsetted, and two policy committees now lead the Sunset Review process: the Senate Business and Professions Committee and the Assembly Business and Professions Committee. He added that there were no findings that needed to be addressed on an ongoing basis in the last Sunset Review, which is considered a very desirable outcome.

#### **H. Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards**

Ms. Anderson provided an update on recent CLARB activities. She stated that at the recent Spring meeting CLARB explored the strategic planning process. She said that Ms. Landregan is the incoming CLARB President and an inauguration ceremony will be held in September 2013. She also said that she herself has been nominated for Treasurer. She explained that the CLARB Nominations Committee updated their nominations process and is expected to release the slate of nominees in July 2013.

#### **I. Update on University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program Task Force**

As the Program Administrator for the UC Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Program, Ms. Landregan recused herself from participation in discussion and voting on Agenda Items I.1, I.2, I.3, and I.4 due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Bowden advised he is on the UCLA Guidance Committee. Mr. Chang said that there is a possible conflict of interest for Mr. Bowden to participate in the voting on Agenda Items I.1, I.2,

I.3, and I.4; however, since there are four members of the LATC present, if both Ms. Landregan and Mr. Bowden recuse themselves, the items cannot be voted on. Mr. Chang asked the members if it is necessary to vote on these agenda items at today's meeting, or if it could possibly wait until the following meeting. Mr. Bowden stated that it is necessary to vote today on the items as the extension certificate programs are waiting on an approval decision from LATC, and they need to be able to prepare for the upcoming school year. Additionally, he said that there is no guarantee that there will be a quorum at the next LATC meeting if the members were to postpone action. Ms. Anderson added that both extension certificate programs have been given draft recommendations and cannot officially take action on them until the LATC approves the recommendations. She also said that if discussion waits until the next meeting, it will not be fresh on the minds of the pertinent people.

- **Nicki Johnson made a motion to proceed with discussion and voting on Agenda Items I.1, I.2, I.3, and I.4 at the May 22, 2013 LATC meeting.**

**Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 3-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.**

Mr. Chang said that the "rule of necessity" allows Mr. Bowden to participate in the discussion, even though there is a potential conflict of interest; however, if he were not to participate in the discussion, it would preclude the Board from taking action on this matter because there would not be a quorum. He said that, under the "rule of necessity," a member who has a potential conflict of interest is allowed to participate in the discussion, if not doing so would prevent LATC from moving forward. Mr. Bowden temporarily assumed the Chair's duties.

### **I.1. Approve Appointment of UC Los Angeles Site Review Team Member**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the UCLA Extension Certificate Program site review was conducted in April 2013. She explained that one of the initially appointed site review team members was unable to participate in the site review and that she received a reference for Joseph Ragsdale to substitute for the absent member. She said that the LATC is asked to approve the appointment of Mr. Ragsdale to the UCLA site review team.

- **Nicki Johnson made a motion to approve Joseph Ragsdale to the UCLA site review team.**

**Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 3-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.**

### **I.2. Discuss and Possible Action on Extension Certificate Program Review/Approval Procedures**

Ms. Rodriguez explained that the Review/Approval Procedures were previously approved by the LATC at their November 14, 2012 meeting. She explained that, after the April 2013 site reviews were conducted, staff identified the need to refine some of the processes outlined in the procedures. She noted that proposed edits to the Review/Approval Procedures were provided in Attachment I.2.1.



Ms. Rodriguez directed attention to the sentence on page 20 of the Review/Approval Procedures which stated “The LATC will vote on whether to grant a program candidacy status at its next regularly scheduled meeting by reviewing the program’s SER (Self-Evaluation Report) and the Visiting Team Report.” She said that the Visiting Team Report already provides a concise summary of the SER and felt it is not necessary to review the SER during an LATC meeting. She also noted that a program’s institutional response and Advisory Recommendation to the LATC should be reviewed along with the Visiting Team Report, as they contain information that is pertinent to an approval decision. Ms. Rodriguez recommended that this section should instead read “The LATC will vote on whether to grant a program candidacy status at its next regularly scheduled meeting by reviewing the program’s Visiting Team Report, Advisory Recommendation to the LATC, and institutional response.”

Ms. Rodriguez also directed attention to the sentence on page 25 of the Review/Approval Procedures which stated “The team report and institutional response are sent to the LATC members at least three weeks before the next scheduled LATC meeting.” She explained that requiring the team report and institutional response to be submitted to the LATC members three weeks prior to the next scheduled meeting is problematic if these documents are not available for distribution at that time. She recommended that this section should instead read “The team report and institutional response are sent to the LATC members prior to the next scheduled LATC meeting.”

- **Katherine Spitz moved to approve the proposed revisions to the Review/Approval Procedures, as indicated in Agenda Item Attachment I.2.1.**

**Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 3-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.**

### **I.3 Review and Approve UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program Site Review Team Recommendation**

Ms. Anderson provided an update on the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program site review. She noted that each of the “Advisory Recommendation to the LATC” forms in the meeting packet marked with “initial approval” should be marked with “approval,” as initial approval only applies to a program applying for a first-time candidacy status.

The members discussed the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program response to the Visiting Team Report. Ms. Spitz was concerned that, in her experience, students graduating from extension certificate programs need to have more history, graphics, and drafting experience, and she does not want to eliminate them, as was possibly suggested in the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program response. Eddie Chau introduced himself as the incoming program director for the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program, succeeding JC Miller. He responded to Ms. Spitz by clarifying that the classes she mentioned are not being eliminated.

- **Katherine Spitz made a motion to approve the UC Berkeley Extension Certificate Program site review team recommendation, to approve the program for a period of six years, starting on January 1, 2014 and expiring on December 31, 2020.**

**Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 3-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.**

#### **I.4 Review and Approve UC Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program Site Review Team Recommendation**

Ms. Anderson provided a brief update on the UCLA Extension Certificate Program site review. She opined that the UCLA institutional responses to the recommendations in the Visiting Team Report were very good; however, she believes that each of the extension certificate programs should have a long-term strategic plan. She said that both site review teams mentioned that the programs do not have strategic plans; however, they understand that it will take time to develop strategic plans and the site review teams would like to see progress toward this objective by the next site review. She also mentioned that the UCLA Extension Certificate Program would like to change from a four-year to a three-year program, and the site review team felt strongly that this should not happen until the program has developed a draft strategic plan, at a minimum.

- **Katherine Spitz made a motion to approve the UC Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program site review team recommendation, to approve the program for a period of six years, starting on January 1, 2014 and expiring on December 31, 2020.**

**Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 3-0. Stephanie Landregan recused herself.**

Mr. Bowden returned Chair duties to Ms. Landregan.

#### **K. Review and Possible Action on Legal Opinion Regarding Business and Professions Code Section 5641, Chapter Exceptions, Exemptions**

Mr. Chang explained that on October 18, 2012, the Exceptions and Exemptions Task Force requested a legal opinion to clarify BPC section 5641. He said that, during the meeting, the Task Force discussed the term “as required by law” in the second sentence of the section, and also discussed the varying requirements of local ordinances. He explained that he thought perhaps BPC section 5641 was established to be ambiguous to allow local jurisdictions to further define the scope of practice for licensees, and conversely, restrict unlicensed persons from performing certain tasks. He said that the Task Force determined that further research be conducted and counsel write a legal opinion on the BPC section. He said that, upon further research, he had initially overlooked BPC section 5615 ("Landscape Architect" — Practice of Landscape Architecture) which clearly defines the scope of practice for landscape architecture. He stated that the practice of landscape architecture includes the design of tangible objects incidental to the practice of landscape architecture, and makes engaging in the practice a misdemeanor unless an individual is licensed. He said that the law clearly states that, with respect to tangible objects, one must be a landscape architect to design them. He concluded that the landscape architects’ law precludes unlicensed persons from designing tangible objects with respect to the design of landscape architecture projects.

Pamela Berstler said that during the October 18, 2012 Task Force meeting, the Task Force was discussing tasks that landscape designers and landscape architects perform, and categorizing them as conceptual designs, construction details, specifications, or drawings. She said that amidst this discussion, the Task Force decided to focus on the term “as required by law” in BPC section 5641, and the question of how to define conceptual drawings and specifications was still being discussed.

- **Andrew Bowden made a motion to accept Don Chang’s legal opinion on BPC section 5641.**

**Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.**

Ms. Landregan directed the Task Force to convene a final meeting to conclude their work on ensuring the provisions of BPC section 5641 protect the public, and bring the findings of their final meeting to the LATC at their next meeting.

**L. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates**

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

August 20, 2013 - Sacramento

November 7, 2013 - Orange County (tentative location)

**M. Adjourn**

- **Stephanie Landregan adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

*\*Agenda items were taken out of order to accommodate the flow of subject matter discussion and guest speakers. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*