



SUMMARY REPORT

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD **Landscape Architects Technical Committee**

March 20, 2014
Sacramento, California

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Members Present

Andrew Bowden, Chair
David Allan Taylor, Jr., Vice Chair
Nicki Johnson
Stephanie Landregan
Katherine Spitz

Staff Present

Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager, LATC
Don Chang, Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Rebecca Bon, Legal Counsel, DCA
John Keidel, Special Projects Coordinator, LATC
Gretchen Kjose, Examination Coordinator, LATC
Matthew McKinney, Enforcement Officer, LATC

Guests Present

Christine Anderson, Chair, University of California (UC) Extension Certificate Program Task Force
David Binsacca, University of San Diego School of Law's Center for Public Interest Law
Cheryl Buckwater, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)
Elisa Chohan, Facilitation Specialist, DCA, Strategic Organization, Leadership and Individual Development (SOLID)
Corrine Fishman, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, DCA Board and Bureau Relations
Dalton LaVoie, California Council/American Society of Landscape Architects (CC/ASLA)
Amelia Lima, APLD
Sean O'Connor, BreEZe Project Manager, DCA
Robert de los Reyes, Budget Manager, DCA Budget Office
Tom Roy, Facilitation Specialist, DCA SOLID

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

Chair Andrew Bowden called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and David Allan Taylor, Jr. called the roll. Five members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established. Mr. Bowden noted that Agenda Item I will be addressed after Agenda Item C to accommodate a guest speaker. Trish Rodriguez noted that three additional public comments regarding Agenda Item I were received after the meeting packet was assembled, and the comments have been included as handouts in the meeting packet.

B. Approve November 7, 2013 LATC Summary Report

Mr. Bowden called for comments on the November 7, 2013 LATC Summary Report. Ms. Rodriguez noted that on page eight of the Summary Report under Agenda Item I, the phrase “Assembly Bill 637 (Atkins),” should instead read, “Assembly Bill 630 (Holden).” The Committee concurred with this revision.

- **Stephanie Landregan moved to approve the November 7, 2013 LATC Summary Report with the corrections on page eight, as noted.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

C. Program Manager’s Report

Ms. Rodriguez announced that Don Chang will be retiring and this will be the final LATC meeting he will attend before retiring from State service. The Committee members thanked Mr. Chang for his contributions to the Board and LATC, and wished him well during his retirement. Mr. Chang expressed gratitude to the Committee members and commented that it has been a pleasure for him to serve as the Committee’s legal counsel.

Ms. Rodriguez presented the Program Manager’s Report. She said that the terms of office for Ms. Landregan, Ms. Johnson, and Mr. Taylor will expire on June 1, 2014, after which a one-year grace period will begin.

She addressed the status of the BreEZe Project, stating that staff will meet with the BreEZe Team in March 2014 to discuss preparations for the upcoming BreEZe transition, and to assess the workload associated with integrating the Workaround System (WAS) and LATC’s existing Legacy systems. She noted that a more detailed update on the status of the BreEZe Project will be provided under Agenda Item L.

She updated the Committee on outreach efforts, explaining that Ms. Landregan provided presentations at the University of Southern California on November 22, 2013, and California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (Cal Poly Pomona) on March 10, 2014. She said that Linda Gates provided a presentation at UC Davis on February 25, 2014, and staff are seeking a volunteer for an outreach presentation at UC Berkley on April 24, 2014.

Ms. Rodriguez updated the Committee on the status of LATC's proposed regulatory changes. She said that the "Notice of Proposed Changes to the Regulations" for Title 16, Division 26, California Code of Regulations section (CCR) 2610 (Application for Examination) was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on March 18, 2014, and staff anticipate OAL publishing the Notice on March 28, 2014. She reported that staff continues to redevelop the regulatory package for CCR 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) that was previously disapproved by OAL in July 2013. She explained that staff met with Christine Anderson on February 21, 2014 to discuss justifications for the proposed changes to CCR 2620.5, and a new rulemaking file is being developed. She stated that the Notice for CCR 2649 (Fees) was published by OAL on February 7, 2014, and a public hearing regarding the proposal will be held on March 24, 2014. She reminded the Committee members that the regulatory proposal to amend CCR 2649 would implement a temporary reduction of the license renewal fee to comply with Business and Professions Code section (BPC) 128.5 and address LATC's fund condition.

Ms. Rodriguez reported that staff devoted a substantial amount of time to update the Records Retention Schedule (RRS) which was approved by the California Records and Information Management (CalRIM) Program on December 4, 2013. She noted that CalRIM is the agency that monitors and maintains all State agency records, and the new RRS expires on December 5, 2018.

She updated the Committee on efforts towards strategic plan objectives explaining that, in addition to the work staff has conducted on regulation changes, staff conducted extensive research on the reciprocity requirements of other states, and this topic will be further discussed in Agenda Item J. She said that staff also researched the topic of allowing training credit towards the eligibility requirements for the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) for teaching under a licensed landscape architect. She advised this topic is scheduled to be addressed at a future Committee meeting in Southern California to make more accessible for schools to attend. She also noted that staff are dedicating substantial resources towards working on the upcoming Sunset Review.

Ms. Rodriguez reported on updates to the LATC website, noting that in February 2014, staff sent a letter to licensees advising them that, per BPC 27, LATC will begin posting their complete address of record on the website in March 2014. In response to the letter, she said that staff received numerous address change requests, and LATC began posting the full address of record on the website on March 11, 2014.

She updated the Committee on efforts in the Examination Program, stating that the next LARE administration will occur on March 31, 2014 through April 12, 2014. She provided an update on the status of the Occupational Analysis (OA), noting that the last OA workshop convened in February 2014 and the Committee will further discuss the OA process under Agenda Item G.

She announced that John Kresha was recently hired for the Licensing/Administration Coordinator position and noted that recruitment efforts continue for the full-time Examination Coordinator position. She reminded the Committee that they are required to complete Defensive Driver Training and asked for the members to forward their certificates of completion to staff.

Ms. Rodriguez recalled that, at the November 7, 2013 LATC meeting, the Committee requested staff to include an update on the most recent Board meeting, and the agenda for the Board

meeting on February 26, 2014 at Cal Poly Pomona is included in the meeting packet. She reported that, at the last Board meeting, members of architectural schools participated in a discussion regarding a potential alternative pathway to licensure that would allow students to complete education and experience requirements concurrently, thus expediting the licensure process. Ms. Landregan remarked that such an alternative pathway to licensure would signify a major change in how the education component of licensure is viewed. She explained that one of the issues facing the profession of architecture is a fear among practitioners that licensure is not being encouraged in the academic sector, as evidenced by a significant amount of architecture program graduates who wait for a considerable amount of time after graduation before becoming licensed. She said that she recently attended an American Institute of Architects Interprofessional Council on Regulation meeting where the topic of allowing internships to be integrated into architecture educational programs was discussed, and summarized that allowing students to gain education and experience concurrently could assist candidates in becoming licensed in a timely manner. She noted that if architecture schools implement internship programs that operate concurrently with their educational programs, related academic programs such as engineering and landscape architecture may want to consider implementing similar programs. Mr. Bowden said that he also attended the February 26, 2014 Board meeting, and observed that there seems to be many similarities between issues facing the Board and the LATC regarding topics related to education. He emphasized the importance of recognizing that the traditional educational model may not be as relevant as it used to be, due to the drastic way technology has changed the world. Ms. Landregan noted that educational programs should include curriculum that addresses the mandate for licensees to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, and educators should be encouraging students to pursue licensure. She suggested this topic be further discussed at the future LATC meeting to be held in Southern California, in conjunction with the discussion regarding training credit for teaching under a licensed landscape architect, in order to garner increased participation from educators in the discussion. The Committee members concurred with Ms. Landregan's suggestion.

I.* Review and Possible Action on University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Extension Certificate Program Site Review Team's Recommendation Regarding UCLA's Annual Report and Proposed Curriculum Change From Four to Three Years

Mr. Bowden directed the Committee to address Agenda Item I in order to accommodate the guest speaker, Christine Anderson. As the Program Administrator for the UCLA Extension Certificate Program (Program), Ms. Landregan recused herself from participation in discussion and voting on Agenda Item I due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Chang stated that although Ms. Landregan recused herself as a Committee member, she is still allowed to participate in the discussion in a public capacity. As a member of the UCLA Guidance Committee, Mr. Bowden also recused himself from participation in discussion and voting on Agenda Item I due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Taylor temporarily assumed Chair duties.

Ms. Rodriguez introduced Agenda Item I, explaining that in October 2013, LATC received a letter from the Program requesting LATC to approve their proposed curriculum change from four to three years, in accordance with the requirements of CCR 2620.5. In response to UCLA's request, she said that LATC reconvened the UCLA Site Review Team via teleconference on February 18, 2014 to review the proposed curriculum change. She said that after the Site Review Team met, staff reviewed the proposed curriculum change, conferred with DCA legal counsel, and determined the Program would still meet the requirements of CCR 2620.5 if the curriculum

change were to be implemented as proposed. She noted that LATC received public comments both supporting and opposing the proposed curriculum change. Mr. Taylor asked Ms. Anderson to advise the Committee on the discussion and concerns of the UCLA Site Review Team. Ms. Anderson recalled that on February 18, 2014, the UCLA Site Review Team consisting of Joseph Ragsdale, Jon Wreschinsky, and herself, held a meeting via teleconference to discuss the proposed curriculum change to the Program. Upon reviewing the proposal, she said the Team questioned the necessity for LATC to pre-approve such curriculum changes since the Program already received LATC approval through December 31, 2020. She explained that when the UCLA Site Review Team performed a site visit of the Program in April 2013, the Program representatives advised the Team that they were considering transitioning from a four-year to a three-year curriculum. In response, she said the Team told the Program representatives that the proposed curriculum change appeared to be acceptable and asked for further information regarding the transition, which the Program subsequently provided. She stated that it was appropriate for the Program to notify LATC of the proposed curriculum change because of its substantive nature; however, there is no data to evaluate the outcome of the proposed transition. She suggested that LATC should review the outcomes of curriculum changes, and not curriculum change proposals. She emphasized the importance for extension certificate programs to remain relatively autonomous from the LATC, and the Committee should not dictate how schools accomplish their goals. She advised that an appropriate response to the proposed curriculum change should be to acknowledge receipt and review of the proposal, and that LATC's approval of such changes is not required since the Program meets the requirements outlined in CCR 2620.5. The Committee thanked Ms. Anderson for her input.

As the Director of the Landscape Architecture Program at the UCLA Extension, Ms. Landregan provided public comment regarding the proposed curriculum change. She reiterated that the proposed curriculum change to the Program would continue to meet the requirements of CCR 2620.5 once implemented, and provided an overview of the voluntary annual report submitted by the Program to LATC in early 2014. She explained that the annual report describes how the Program has addressed the recommendations of the UCLA Site Review Team from the 2013 review, and provided further details on the proposed curriculum change. She said that in the past, when the Program found that students were having difficulty in achieving various learning outcomes, the Program addressed the problem by adding more classes rather than reviewing the coursework for potential problems. She said that after holding many meetings with various UCLA staff, students, and graduates, the Program restructured its "design" courses resulting in practical coursework for the landscape architecture profession. She also said that the Program reviewed the final sequence in the four-year curriculum, consisting of a thesis project lasting approximately one year, and noted that many students were apprehensive of the thesis process. She explained that UCLA reviewed the thesis portion of the Program for possible improvements and in doing so, condensed the process from one year to six months conducted over one quarter with two classes per week. She provided details on other changes to the Program, noting that several classes were combined to improve efficiency, and expressed confidence that the changes will strengthen the Program and reduce its attrition rate. She said that the three-year curriculum was created in consideration of the recommendations of the UCLA Site Review Team, and believes it is a significant improvement over the four-year curriculum. She drew attention to the section of the proposed three-year syllabus entitled "Capstone Project Studio," and explained how the Program modified the previous syllabus to improve student success. Ms. Landregan summarized that the new syllabus will enable students to more easily understand the expectations of the Program and standardize the learning outcomes required for academic success. She acknowledged that there is opposition to the curriculum change. She

said that the four-year curriculum was originally developed by three of the individuals, including the previous Program Director, who wrote letters to LATC in opposition of the three-year curriculum. She conveyed great respect for the previous program directors who expressed concerns regarding the transition; however, she explained that there are many factors currently affecting the Program that did not exist prior to her tenure as Program Director. She said that despite her efforts to convey the benefits of the transition, some opposition remained. She maintained that the position to implement the proposed curriculum change is necessary in order to accurately assess its effectiveness, and thanked the Committee for its consideration.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that one of the proposed amendments to CCR 2620.5 is to remove the restriction preventing extension certificate programs from revising their curriculum until it is approved by LATC; however, CCR 2620.5 currently requires LATC to approve curriculum changes, despite the proposed amendment. Mr. Taylor summarized that UCLA's proposed curriculum change has been thoroughly reviewed and found to be in accordance with the curriculum requirements in CCR 2620.5. Ms. Spitz expressed support for the curriculum change, viewing it as an overall improvement. Ms. Johnson also expressed support for the change, viewing it as potentially improving the Program's efficiency. Mr. Taylor conveyed appreciation for all of the public comments received and also expressed support for approving the curriculum change. He said that LATC can evaluate the effectiveness of the transition to a three-year curriculum during the Program's next site review.

- **Katherine Spitz made a motion to approve the UCLA Extension Certificate Program's proposed curriculum change from four years to three years.**

Nicki Johnson seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0. Andrew Bowden and Stephanie Landregan recused themselves.

Mr. Taylor returned Chair duties to Mr. Bowden.

D. Discuss and Possible Action on Legislation Regarding Assembly Bill 186 (Maienschein) [Military Spouses]

Ms. Rodriguez stated that existing law requires DCA boards and bureaus to expedite the licensure of applicants who supply evidence they are the spouse of an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States and are licensed in another state in the same profession which he or she seeks a license from the board. She said that Assembly Bill (AB) 186 (Maienschein) would allow DCA boards and bureaus to grant a provisional license to the spouses of such military personnel while the board or bureau processes their applications for licensure. She explained that the Board was concerned that AB 186 would allow candidates licensed in another state to bypass the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) requirement, which is a critical component of licensure in California. She said that the Board has taken a position to oppose AB 186, and sent a letter to Assemblyman Maienschein expressing this position. She asked the LATC to consider ratifying the Board's position on AB 186, and to direct staff to convey the Committee's position to Assemblyman Maienschein.

Mr. Chang summarized AB 186, explaining that the bill would allow reciprocity candidates with a spouse in the military to be immediately eligible for a temporary 12-month license without having to take the CSE, as long as the applicant passes a criminal background check and has not

been disciplined in another jurisdiction. He added that existing law requires expedited application processing for persons in military; however, AB 186 would waive the CSE requirement for 12 months and allow individuals to practice landscape architecture in California without having demonstrated minimal competency by passing the CSE. He cautioned that AB 186 requests boards to waive the CSE requirement for licensure, and that the Board believes this would not protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The Committee unanimously concurred with the Board's position on AB 186, and expressed support for writing a letter to Assemblyman Maienschein conveying opposition to the bill.

- **David Allan Taylor, Jr. moved to support the Board's position on AB 186, and to write a letter to Assemblyman Maienschein expressing opposition to the legislation.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

E. Budget Update

Robert de los Reyes presented an update on the Committee's budget and current fund condition. Mr. de los Reyes directed the Committee to review Attachment E.1, the LATC expenditure projection, and interpreted the various categories listed in the attachment. Ms. Spitz asked what the purpose is of the line item entitled "C/P Svcs-External Expert Administrative," and why only one percent of the \$408,144 allocated for it has been spent in FY 2013/14. Mr. de los Reyes responded that the line item is for the development and administration of examinations that the Committee no longer administers, and the budget allocation for this line item has not been updated to reflect this change. Ms. Spitz asked why the expenditure projection does not accurately reflect current budgetary realities. Mr. de los Reyes replied that when the LATC established its current budget, it requested specific amounts of funds to be allocated to the line items listed in the expenditure projection. Ms. Landregan added that budget projections must be submitted approximately one year prior to the start of a FY, and the most important aspect of these projections to focus on is the net surplus or deficit of the total fund condition. Mr. de los Reyes concurred with Ms. Landregan and said budget projections should be viewed as a guide on how the LATC's funds are being spent.

Mr. Bowden asked what expenses are encompassed in the line item entitled "Facilities Operations," and why the current expenditure projection shows LATC has overspent this line item by \$20,182. Mr. de los Reyes replied that the line item encompasses the building and maintenance costs for office space that LATC occupies, and when the budget was last reallocated, this line item was unmodified. He reiterated that the important aspect of the expenditure projection is the total net surplus or deficit, and emphasized that redirecting funds is a normal part of budgetary spending. Mr. Bowden said that LATC is proposing to reduce its spending authority by \$200,000, and stressed the importance of ensuring all factors are considered when reducing spending authority. He asked if the costs for "Facilities Operations" are expected to increase, and if such increases are accounted for during budget reallocation. Mr. de los Reyes confirmed that the DCA Budget Office always accounts for increases in facility costs before proposing the reallocation of funds.

Mr. de los Reyes directed the Committee to review the first page of Attachment E.2, entitled "Fund Condition Scenario #1." He explained that Scenario #1 is a projection of the fund condition over five years and assumes LATC will fully expend its budgeted funds. He noted that

Scenario #1 does not include the proposed temporary fee reduction or negative budget change proposal (BCP). He then directed the Committee to review “Fund Condition Scenario #2,” and explained that it provides a three-year average of actual expenditures to estimate future expenditures. In Scenario #2, he drew attention to the highlighted row labeled “Program Expenditures (State Operations),” noting that it clearly shows that LATC has been spending less than what was budgeted. He also noted that Scenario #2 was the result of a budget drill intended to determine if there are programs in DCA that will exceed 24 months of funds in reserve, in which case a program’s revenue and expenditures would need to be reassessed. Lastly, he directed the Committee to review “Fund Condition Scenario #3,” which provides an estimate of the fund condition that incorporates the proposed negative BCP of \$200,000 and temporary reduction of the license fee. He summarized that Scenario #3 results in a fund reserve that would allow sufficient funding to account for reasonably unexpected or increased costs.

Ms. Landregan asked if “Fund Condition Scenario #3” would accommodate out-of-state travel (OST) requests, assuming travel restrictions would not otherwise prevent them.

Mr. de los Reyes responded that OST costs would be absorbable within existing resources.

Ms. Rodriguez noted that OST requests are still restricted to “mission-critical” travel.

Mr. Bowden pointed out that “Fund Condition Scenario #3” indicates the number of months of funds in reserve in FY 2016/17 would be reduced to 16.8, if the factors involved in the scenario were to be implemented. He asked if the fund condition could surpass 24 months again when the temporary license renewal fee reduction ends. Mr. de los Reyes responded that the fund condition should not surpass 24 months when the renewal fee returns to \$400 in FY 2017/18.

Mr. de los Reyes directed the Committee to Attachment E.3, entitled “Historical LATC Fund Condition,” and explained that it consists of line graphs displaying LATC expenditures, revenue, budget allotment, and fund balances from FY 2008/09 through FY 2012/13. He summarized that LATC’s budget surplus is the result of collecting more funds than are spent. Ms. Landregan said that LATC has been understaffed in previous years, and asked if the budget accounts for the costs associated with a full staff. Ms. Rodriguez responded that the LATC budget has sufficient funding for a full staff, in addition to temporary part-time staff. Ms. Landregan asked how LATC can ensure that it has a sufficient amount of staff who are compensated fairly.

Ms. Rodriguez responded that part of the challenge to obtaining sufficient staffing is that the budgetary allotment for staff is partly based on workload for the population of licensees served by LATC. She summarized that DCA guidelines determine appropriate staff positions based on the duties associated with each position. Mr. de los Reyes concluded his presentation and requested that the Committee members send any further budget-related questions to Ms. Rodriguez for consideration. The Committee thanked Mr. de los Reyes for his presentation.

F. Annual Enforcement Report

Matt McKinney provided the Committee with the annual enforcement report. He reported that during FY 2013/14, LATC maintained its goal of reducing the average time to complete an investigation to less than 18 months, and achieved this goal by averaging 344 days to complete investigations. He said that as of February 28, 2014, the LATC had 25 pending enforcement cases compared to 30 pending cases at the end of FY 2012/13. He noted that LATC contracted with an additional expert consultant in May 2013 to assist in reviewing the technical and more complex enforcement cases, which has expedited case review. Mr. Bowden asked if the majority of enforcement complaints filed with LATC involve unlicensed activity, and Mr. McKinney confirmed they do. He added that there are significantly more complaints regarding unlicensed

activity than those against licensees. He said that the majority of the complaints are against unlicensed persons for alleged violations of the title act. Mr. Bowden asked if enforcement cases regarding potential violations of the title act are resolved faster than other categories of cases, and Mr. McKinney confirmed they are because they usually do not require the review of an expert consultant. The Committee thanked Mr. McKinney for his presentation.

G. Review and Approve Intra-Agency Contract for National Examination Review and Linkage Study

Ms. Rodriguez reported that the OA workshops have concluded, and one of the next steps in the OA process is to perform a linkage study between the outcomes of the OA and the national examination. Raul Villanueva introduced himself and explained that when a national examination is used as part of a licensure program, BPC 139 and DCA policy require a review of the national examination and a linkage study. He said the purpose of the examination review is to determine if professional standards are being met, and the purpose of the linkage study is to identify areas of practice specific to California that are not evaluated on the national examination. He further explained that the purpose of a linkage study is to determine if any areas of practice that are not sufficiently evaluated on the national examination are essential to licensure, in which case a board will develop a California-specific examination to supplement such knowledge areas. He said that boards typically conduct a review of the national examination after completing an OA, since the OA establishes a description of the practice based on the tasks and knowledge areas associated with entry-level licensure. He stated that after he completes developing the final validation report for the OA, the next step will be to review the LARE. Ms. Spitz asked if the final validation report will be presented to LATC, and Mr. Villanueva confirmed that it should be presented to the Committee at its next meeting. He added that the OA forms the basis for establishing the examination plan, which then provides the basis for validating the exam, as well as establishing a description of current practice. Ms. Spitz asked if the CSE will be redeveloped once the OA and linkage study are complete. Ms. Rodriguez responded that LATC has ongoing examination development workshops that will continue upon completion of the OA. Mr. Villanueva added that the OA will provide information for the new test plan and establish the framework for the new CSE. Ms. Landregan asked if the purpose of the linkage study is to ensure there is no overlap between test questions on the LARE and CSE, and Mr. Villanueva confirmed that the linkage study will help minimize overlap. The Committee thanked Mr. Villanueva for his input.

- **Ms. Landregan moved to approve the Intra-Agency Contract with OPES to conduct a review of the national examination and perform a linkage study.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

H. Report on Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) and Presentation on New Landscape Architect Registration Examination

Ms. Landregan delivered a PowerPoint Presentation regarding CLARB's transition from the five-section LARE to the four-section LARE, implemented in September 2012. She provided an overview of CLARB's rationale for the LARE transition, displayed slides depicting the functionality of the new computer-based testing format, emphasized the benefits, and

demonstrated how test questions that were previously administered as graphic vignette sections were transitioned to the new format. She noted that the new examination vendor, Pearson VUE, has over 250 test centers where the LARE is administered, compared to the 50 test centers that were previously available, and this has resulted in increased accessibility for candidates to take the LARE. She explained that CLARB advises candidates to take Sections 1 and 2 of the LARE soon after graduating from a landscape architecture academic program, because CLARB's "Determinants of Success" research study found that people who wait five or more years to take the LARE after graduation may have increased difficulty in passing those sections. She noted that 85% of candidates who took all four sections of the LARE passed on their first attempt.

Mr. Bowden inquired if CLARB has data showing the LARE pass rates of candidates from states that allow licensure through experience only. Ms. Landregan responded that CLARB does not have such data available because there are very few candidates who take the LARE without education to be able to discern such a pattern. She added that CLARB's Council Record database stores information showing the LARE pass rates of candidates from states that allow licensure through experience only; however, CLARB has only been able to collect such data over the past three years. She said that in the future, CLARB may be able to discern such patterns once enough data has accumulated. Gretchen Kjose asked if CLARB plans to administer the LARE on an ongoing basis. Ms. Landregan replied that CLARB does not have plans to implement ongoing test administration, and said that it would be problematic. Ms. Spitz commented that when licensing examinations are offered on an ongoing basis, candidates lose the sense of camaraderie that develops among candidates who take the examination with a group. She asked how not answering a question on the LARE could affect the final score, and Ms. Landregan responded that since questions are weighted differently, the final score can vary depending on if questions are rejected after the test is over. She stated that the LARE consists of various questions considered to be critical to passing, and the examination is graded on a pass or fail basis; rather than by setting a discrete passing percentage. The Committee thanked Ms. Landregan for her presentation.

J. Discuss and Possible Action on 2013/15 Strategic Plan Objective to Review Reciprocity Requirements of Other States to Determine Possible Changes to California Requirements to Improve Efficiencies

Ms. Rodriguez recalled that, at the November 7, 2013 LATC meeting, the Committee members asked staff to revise the information that was presented regarding the reciprocity requirements of other states, and the resulting revision is included in Attachment J.1. She added that the Committee also requested legal counsel to research whether CCR 2620 (Education and Training Credits) provides a method to make reciprocity requirements less prescriptive, and that legal counsel is present to address the topic. She acknowledged that Ms. Kjose prepared the information included in the Attachment J.1, and noted that 31 states allow reciprocity through experience only. Mr. Bowden asked Ms. Landregan if CLARB is currently attempting to standardize reciprocity requirements among states. Ms. Landregan responded that CLARB does not have the authority to enforce uniform reciprocity among states and described some of the complexities that would arise in attempting to create such a standard, including the globalization of landscape architecture. Mr. Bowden recalled the reason the Committee decided to review the reciprocity requirements of other states was because an individual licensed in Washington contacted LATC seeking reciprocity in California, but he did not meet California's education requirement for licensure. He said that the Committee asked staff to research reciprocity information to determine if California is the only state that requires education and experience for

reciprocity. He summarized that, based on the data in Attachment J.1, California is not the only state that has such reciprocity requirements.

Mr. Bowden asked Legal Counsel Rebecca Bon if existing law allows LATC to make exceptions to reciprocity requirements for applicants with special circumstances. Ms. Bon responded that BPC 5650 explicitly requires both training and experience as prerequisites to take the LARE. She said that LATC regulations further specify the various ways of gaining education and experience credits; however, since BPC 5650 requires both education and experience, the definition of education would need to be further defined to allow for training to equate to education in some manner. The Committee briefly reviewed the existing ways in which one year of education credit can be earned. Ms. Landregan asked if CCR 2620 could be amended to allow licensed experience to supplement education credit. Mr. Chang summarized that the Committee could try to equate licensed experience with education credit by pursuing a regulatory amendment; however, LATC would need to demonstrate the factual basis for making such a determination and clearly show that licensed experience is equivalent to regular academic training. Mr. Bowden asked how frequently LATC receives requests for reciprocity through experience only. Ms. Rodriguez responded that questions are occasionally asked regarding how to determine the criteria for reciprocity in the Landscape Architects Practice Act. Ms. Kjose noted that CCR 2615 (Form of Examinations) states that the Board can grant a license if a person is licensed in another state, which is confusing for those applying for reciprocity because this is not the only criteria needed to qualify. Mr. Chang clarified that BPC 5650, in conjunction with CCR 2615, defines the criteria for reciprocity. He reiterated that if the Committee wishes to allow reciprocity through experience only, the challenge will be developing justification to characterize licensed experience as education. Ms. Spitz suggested the LATC should also consider broadening the definition of education to allow credit for degrees that are highly relevant to landscape architecture that do not currently qualify towards LARE educational credit. She suggested broadening the definition of education for all licensure pathways, including reciprocity. Ms. Landregan said that LATC's Education Subcommittee recommended removing the "experience only" pathway that previously existed because it was determined that the education component of licensure is critical to understanding natural systems, codes, advancements in technology, and the increasing sophistication of practice.

Ms. Spitz asked if the Committee wants to pursue a regulation amendment to allow for reciprocity through experience only. Ms. Rodriguez responded that she is not sure if LATC should pursue such an amendment since it was previously indicated that CLARB might pursue this task on a much broader scale. Ms. Landregan suggested that LATC ask CLARB if there are any licensing boards with data that supports equating experience to education for the purpose of obtaining reciprocity. Ms. Spitz agreed with Ms. Landregan's suggestion and emphasized that reciprocity is a topic that will continue to grow in importance. Ms. Landregan also suggested working with educators to see if they have information that might support granting educational equivalence to experience. Ms. Spitz added that, if the Committee reaches out to landscape architecture educators for their input, other related educational programs in the environmental sciences should also be contacted. Ms. Landregan concurred with Ms. Spitz, but cautioned that most environmental science degrees do not require the topic of protecting the public health, safety, and welfare, to be included in the curriculum. Ms. Rodriguez observed that the Committee's discussion appears to be evolving into a new objective and said that, due to the status of LATC's existing objectives, she is not inclined to add any new ones.

- **Ms. Landregan made a motion to continue discussing the possibility of expanding the definition of “education credit” to encompass a certain amount of licensed experience, and to consider granting education credit for degrees related to landscape architecture, at a future LATC meeting.**

Katherine Spitz seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

L.* Update on BreEZe Enterprise System by Department of Consumer Affairs

Sean O’Connor provided an overview of the BreEZe Project. He said that the BreEZe Project is an enterprise-wide licensing and enforcement database that DCA is implementing in three releases, and noted that LATC is in release three. He reported that release one is currently in production and includes ten boards, consisting of nine healing arts boards and the Board of Barbering and Cosmetology. He explained that the BreEZe licensing and enforcement database enhances existing Legacy databases by allowing candidates to apply online for initial licensure and examinations. He added that BreEZe allows licensees to perform online license renewals, name changes, and address changes. He acknowledged that not all kinds of applications can be fully-completed by submitting applications online; however, one of the benefits of allowing candidates to apply online is that it greatly increases efficiency on the back-office side of the process. He said that BreEZe also allows online complaints to be submitted. He noted another feature of BreEZe is the ability for any member of the public to subscribe to receive email alerts of a licensee’s status changes. He described a new feature of BreEZe that allows board or committee members to view and vote on disciplinary items online. He stated that one of the major reasons DCA pursued the BreEZe system is that it allows DCA boards in related professions to perform cross-board discipline checks for the first time in DCA’s history. He said that BreEZe greatly increases cross-board communication when it comes to enforcement matters, which is critical to DCA’s mandate of consumer protection. He said that LATC is currently scheduled for release three of the BreEZe Project, which is scheduled to “go-live” in late 2015, at the earliest. He said that a better estimate of the “go-live” date for release three will become available as the BreEZe Team continues to make progress on release two. He estimated that if the implementation date for release three of BreEZe is in late 2015, staff would begin working on the BreEZe project in early 2015. He stressed that the amount of staff time required to successfully transition to BreEZe is tremendous, and acknowledged that this poses a challenge for smaller boards and committees with limited staff resources. He encouraged leadership to solicit help from DCA if needed, and to be aware of the workload associated with the BreEZe Project when assigning tasks to staff. He said that DCA has 38 boards, bureaus, and committees, each with unique statutory and regulatory requirements, and the BreEZe Team will assign an individual from DCA to be LATC’s guide through the transition. He concluded his presentation by noting that the BreEZe Team will be working with staff in the near future for WAS integration with BreEZe.

Ms. Landregan asked if complaints submitted online through BreEZe will be visible to the public. Mr. O’Connor responded that complaints submitted through BreEZe are only received by staff, and would only be disclosed to the public if they meet the criteria for disclosure required by law. Ms. Landregan asked what the annual cost of BreEZe will be to the Committee. Mr. O’Connor responded that he can follow-up with LATC’s budget analyst to provide annual BreEZe cost information to Ms. Rodriguez for discussion at the next meeting. Ms. Landregan

said that it would be beneficial to have annual BreEZe cost information provided at the next LATC meeting, and asked if the annual cost will include maintenance of the system. Mr. O'Connor confirmed the annual BreEZe cost includes a ten-year maintenance contract with the vendor. Ms. Landregan asked how flexible the BreEZe system software is, and Mr. O'Connor replied that BreEZe software is flexible in certain areas and inflexible in others. He said that the BreEZe Team hopes to identify potential issues far in advance of implementation of BreEZe for the Committee. Ms. Landregan asked if staff job descriptions will need to change when BreEZe is implemented, and Mr. O'Connor responded that job descriptions should not need to change because staff will simply be using a different database system to accomplish the same tasks. The Committee thanked Mr. O'Connor for his presentation.

K. Review and Possible Action on Response to Public Request for Consideration of Licensed General Contractor Experience Towards Landscape Architect Experience Requirements

Ms. Rodriguez said that in October 2013, LATC received a letter from Matthew Collar regarding LARE experience requirements. She said that in his letter, Mr. Collar explained that he has experience as a "B - General Contractor," which the regulations do not allow training credit. She said that Mr. Collar claimed that a "B - General Contractor" can perform the same duties as a "C-27 Landscape Contractor" and requested LATC to consider his experience. She said that at the November 7, 2013 LATC meeting, the Committee discussed Mr. Collar's letter and asked DCA legal counsel to provide a statement in response to Mr. Collar's public comment.

Ms. Bon responded to Mr. Collar's letter by explaining that LATC's laws allow for training credit to be granted for licensure as a "C-27 Landscape Contractor," and Mr. Collar does not meet this criteria. She said that if the Committee would like to consider allowing training credit for "B - General Contractors," sufficient justification would need to be provided. Mr. Bowden asked if general contractors can perform the same duties as landscape contractors. Mr. Chang replied that, if a contracting job involves only landscape contracting, then general contractors cannot perform the job unless they also have a landscape contractor license. He elaborated that a general contractor can only perform landscape contractor duties if the entire project requires two or more unrelated building trades or crafts. In addition, he advised that landscape contractors are specifically authorized to design systems and facilities for work to be performed and supervised by that contractor, whereas there is no similar design authority for a general contractor. He summarized that it is erroneous for Mr. Collar to say that a general contractor can perform the same work as a landscape contractor. Mr. Bowden asked if the Committee needs to write a response to Mr. Collar's letter, and Ms. Landregan recommended doing so.

- **Ms. Landregan made a motion to write a letter stating the determination of legal counsel to Matthew Collar.**

David Allan Taylor, Jr. seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

M. Review and Possible Action on Annual Environmental Scan Conducted for Fiscal Years 2013-2015 Strategic Plan

Ms. Rodriguez introduced Tom Roy and Elisa Chohan from SOLID, who facilitated the Committee's Strategic Plan discussion. Mr. Roy and Ms. Chohan led the Committee through a

review of its annual environmental scan, trends analysis, and the status of its Strategic Plan objectives.

At the conclusion of the session the Committee was advised that SOLID will summarize the information, and LATC will hold a full Strategic Planning session tentatively scheduled for January 2015.

N. Review Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

LATC meetings tentatively scheduled:

June 25, 2014 – Sacramento

October 2014 – Southern California

Ms. Johnson said she will attend the June 12, 2014 Board meeting in Sacramento (note: meeting location changed to San Francisco after the meeting), and Mr. Taylor said he will attend the September 10, 2014 Board meeting in San Diego.

O. Adjourn

- **Andrew Bowden adjourned the meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

** Agenda items were taken out of order to accommodate guest speakers. The order of business conducted herein follows the transaction of business.*