

Meeting Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee

January 17-18, 2017
Sacramento, California

Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) Members Present

Patricia Trauth, Chair
Marq Truscott, Vice Chair
Andrew Bowden

LATC Member Absent

David Allan Taylor, Jr.

Staff Present

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Gretchen Kjose, Interim Program Manager
Rebecca Bon, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Tremaine Palmer, Special Projects Analyst
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator

Guests Present

Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, California Council of American Society of Landscape Architects
(CCASLA)
Shelly Jones, DCA
Dustin Maxam
Shawn Rohrbacker
Martin Schmidt, Environs, CCASLA
James Schubert, Landscape Architect

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

On January 17, 2017, LATC Chair Patricia Trauth called the meeting to order at 10:32 a.m. and Vice Chair Marq Truscott called roll. Three members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

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

Ms. Trauth welcomed everyone to the meeting, and stated that she is looking forward to a productive year.

C. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda

Other than brief introductions, there were no comments from the public.

D. Review and Possible Action on November 4, 2016 LATC Meeting Minutes

Ms. Trauth asked for comments concerning the November 4, 2016 LATC Meeting Minutes. There were no comments from the Committee members.

- **Andrew Bowden moved to approve the November 4, 2016 LATC Meeting Minutes. Marq Truscott seconded the motion. Members Bowden, Truscott, and Chair Trauth voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 3-0.**

E. Program Manager's Report on Administration, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement

Gretchen Kjose presented the Program Manager's report. She reported that former Program Manager, Trish Rodriguez, accepted a promotion at the California Board of Pharmacy effective November 18, 2016. She continued that recruitment efforts to fill both the Program Manager and Enforcement Analyst positions are underway.

Ms. Kjose reported that the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE) was administered on December 5-17, 2016, and that examination results would be released in late January 2017. She noted that LATC continues to update the website and publish current "Licensee Search" lists monthly.

Ms. Kjose advised that LATC submitted its Annual Report to DCA on November 30, 2016, which included a summary of regulations, major studies, new program developments, and all final data summaries of licensing and enforcement activities.

Ms. Kjose reported that LATC proposed extending the renewal fee reduction for one more renewal cycle ending June 30, 2019 due to excess months of funds in reserve. She continued that the rulemaking file to implement the extension was sent to DCA in December 2016 for signature, after which it will be forwarded to the Department of Finance and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for signatures before being filed with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). Ms. Kjose added that the regulations should take effect on July 1, 2017 if approved by OAL. She also reported that CCR 2620 (Education and Training

Credits) (a)(13) which expanded eligibility requirements to allow credit for teaching under a landscape architect, took effect on January 1, 2017.

Ms. Kjose updated the Committee on the Strategic Plan objectives to “*Create and Disseminate Consumer’s Guide*” and “*Review Expired License Requirements*”. She reported that the Board met on December 15-16, 2016 in Sacramento, which included a Strategic Planning session on the 16th. She continued that the Board considered a number of enforcement issues, such as enhancing written contract requirements and updating citation regulations.

Ms. Kjose updated the Committee on LATC’s *Disciplinary Guidelines*. She reported that the additional revisions to the *Guidelines* and proposed regulatory language were approved by the Board at its December 15, 2016 meeting, and that LATC staff is updating its *Guidelines* to include the changes recently approved by the Board that are appropriate to LATC.

Ms. Kjose reported that monthly examination development workshops were conducted from August through December 2016 for the purpose of updating the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) and that questions developed were added to the examination item bank and would be incorporated into the CSE beginning in September 2017.

F. Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)

Ms. Kjose reported that the LARE was administered on December 5-17, 2016, and that results would be released in mid to late January 2017. She advised that the next LARE administration would be held March 27-April 8, 2017.

Ms. Trauth advised that she had reconsidered and did not wish to be nominated for Region 5 Director at this time. Staff will notify CLARB of her decision.

G. Discuss and Possible Action on Strategic Plan Objective to Review Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2620 (Education and Training Credits) to Expand Credit for Education Experience to Include Degrees in Related Areas of Study

Ms. Kjose began the discussion by reporting that prior to January 1, 1997 CCR 2620 (Education and Training Credits) included a provision to grant credit for any bachelors or associate degree towards the required six years of training and educational experience, allowed eligibility to applicants with six years of training experience under the direct supervision of a licensed landscape architect in lieu of requiring education, and granted up to one year of training credit for experience as, or under the supervision of, a licensed architect, registered civil engineer, licensed landscape contractor, or certified nursery person.

Ms. Kjose reported that in March 1994, the California Board of Landscape Architects (BLA) began discussing the possibility of increasing the maximum amount of credit allowed for experience as a licensed landscape contractor. She also reported that the BLA reviewed CCR 2620 and determined that, in order to grant additional credit for landscape contractor experience, the education requirements should be changed. Ms. Kjose continued that in November 1994, the BLA finalized revisions to CCR 2620 that would allow up to four years of

training credit for landscape contractor experience and require all applicants to hold either a degree or approved extension certificate in landscape architecture in order to qualify for the licensing examination, and ultimately licensure. She advised that those regulatory amendments took effect on January 1, 1997.

Ms. Kjose reported that in August 2004, LATC established an Education Subcommittee charged with evaluating California's eligibility requirements for taking the national examination to ensure that applicants have appropriate educational and training/work experience before taking the examination. She continued that the Subcommittee was to determine appropriate levels of experience as they relate to public health, safety, and welfare; and successfully preparing applicants for the examination.

Ms. Kjose reported that the Subcommittee met between October 8, 2005 and February 27, 2007. She stated that the Subcommittee discussed the acceptance of various "related" degrees that were recognized by other states and identified by Subcommittee members or LATC staff, but ultimately recommended that, other than a degree in landscape architecture, an accredited degree in architecture should be accepted and credited with one year towards the six-year experience and education requirements. She advised that no other degrees were recommended as acceptable.

Ms. Kjose stated that many states accept related degrees and only require a bachelor's degree combined with a varying number of years of experience to take the licensing examination. She indicated that the number of years of experience required ranges from 4 to 12 years, with an average of 6-8 years.

Ms. Kjose reported that LATC staff has researched the number of states that allow related degrees, any bachelor's degree, and combined years of education and experience. She concluded by indicating that at today's meeting, the Committee is asked to review the information provided and determine if additional degrees should be considered for credit toward California's education requirement.

Ms. Trauth inquired on LATC's reasoning for restricting the education requirement to only landscape architecture and architecture degrees. Ms. Kjose responded that according to the Subcommittee report, the reasoning was to allow landscape contractors to count their experience towards the requirements for becoming licensed landscape architects. She continued that the Subcommittee considered curriculums that were similar to landscape architecture that included critical thinking, technical, and scientific aspects; however, with the low pass rates occurring on the national examination, there was concern as to whether people could pass the examination with a related degree and still have the technical skills needed to be a landscape architect.

Mr. McCauley referenced the Subcommittee Report and stated that the original charge was to ensure LATC's standards were appropriate to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare. He continued that the Board's charge is to make sure standards are appropriate, and that the examination is the only valid measure of a candidate's competence.

Mr. McCauley stated that the world views occupational licensing differently at the National and State level. He noted a White House Report on occupational licensing in which a major theme was looking at the standards for education and experience and determining whether they are

appropriate or represent a barrier that could be problematic. Mr. McCauley also noted a report from the Little Hoover Commission that conveyed the same theme.

Mr. Truscott asked Mr. McCauley how the Board handles reciprocity candidates. Mr. McCauley responded that, in general, the requirement is to hold a license in another state and pass the CSE. He continued that a candidate has to meet a total of eight years of experience (five being education experience) and then, if subject to the requirement, a structured internship program. Vickie Mayer advised that if a candidate has completed eight years of experience, then the internship program is waived provided the candidate has been licensed in another US jurisdiction for at least three years. She continued that reciprocity candidates are able to submit verification of eight years of experience in pre or post-licensure work experience or a combination of both.

Ms. Trauth inquired if the Board has a requirement for education. Ms. Mayer responded that the Board allows experience only for initial licensure. Ms. Trauth inquired if a degree in architecture counts towards a candidate's experience. Ms. Mayer responded yes.

Mr. McCauley stated that the Board's internship program is the Architectural Experience Program, which is robust and prescriptive. He continued that it requires a candidate to attain a specified number of hours in work experience in prescribed practice areas. He stated that it ensures candidates receive the same type of experience regardless of their educational background.

Mr. Bowden stated that some believe the LARE is the means to test competency, but education is important and would not necessarily object to an experience only pathway as long as there are provisions that protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. He explained that when he received his license, a degree was not required as there was a pathway to licensure with experience only. Mr. Bowden also cautioned the members on accepting any degree; however, he suggested that the Committee research related degrees and include degrees in the field of Earth Science.

Mr. Truscott noted that while instructing at the University of California (UC), Davis last year, he noticed many of the senior class were not United States citizens and would be returning to their countries after graduation, which would diminish the pool of potential landscape architects. He also stated that the LARE is the gate to becoming a landscape architect, and that education is the best way to create quality landscape architects; however, it is not the only way. He expressed the need for additional pathways to qualify for examination.

Mr. Truscott stated that he is in favor of aligning with the Board in licensure requirements, as well as exploring opportunities for candidates to sit for the examination. Ms. Kjose noted that LARE results for the last two years show California candidates' pass rates for Sections 3 and 4 are consistently below the national average. Mr. Bowden stated that the Committee has discussed pass rates in the past and that, in his opinion, allowing experience only for entry to the examination could have an even larger impact on them.

Mr. McCauley noted that pass rates reflect how well a particular pool of candidates performed. He stated that candidates from smaller states might have higher pass rates because large firms compete for a limited number of graduates and guide them through the licensing process. As an aside, Mr. McCauley stated that he conducted a review of the Board's past citations and found no

measurable difference in those issued against individuals who possess a degree in architecture and those who do not. Mr. Bowden commented that the Committee would need to determine how much credit should be given for degrees outside of landscape architecture and how much experience would then be required.

Mr. Truscott inquired if the Committee could discuss the issue further with public comment during the Strategic Planning session. Legal Counsel, Rebecca Bon responded that, although public comment can be made, the purpose of Strategic Planning is to review and implement organizational goals. Mr. McCauley suggested that LATC hold a special public forum to obtain additional input on acceptable related degrees.

Mr. Maxam opined that it is not financially feasible for all individuals to earn a degree in the proper subject, and that it is appropriate to accept related degrees. He indicated that the LARE was not difficult to pass due to his educational background and work experience. He continued that he is in favor of the public forum, and that the Committee should consider degrees in geography, natural resources, environmental sciences, urban planning, and interior design. Mr. Maxam acknowledged the difficulty in selecting related degrees. He stated that the Committee could evaluate a candidate's education, but then that would lead to the Committee's interpretation; and, it may be subjective.

Mr. Maxam suggested, out of concern with the length of the rulemaking process, that the Committee direct staff to prepare proposed language for review at the next meeting. Ms. Mayer commented that staff would need direction from the Committee in order to draft and develop language.

Mr. McCauley reminded the Committee that degree types must be specified in regulation, and that staff cannot be empowered to employ an in-house analysis, approving some degrees and disapproving others. Mr. Truscott stated that he would like to explore a special meeting in order to gain additional input from the industry as a whole. He continued that he was not prepared to make a decision.

Mr. Schubert disagreed with the notion of exclusion or competitiveness being considered as the reason for accepting related degrees. He stated that the conversation should be whether accepting a related degree would still protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Mr. Schubert also disagreed with the notion of the LARE being the only means to test competency. He added that a candidate's education is also important. Mr. Rohrbacker expressed the importance of experience criteria, and added that the Board allows an experience only pathway. He continued that engineer requirements are less stringent as well, and that the liability architects and engineers encounter is larger; however, they do not require an educational background.

Mr. Bowden asked Ms. Kjose if staff is able to obtain data on related degrees accepted by other states. She responded that staff would contact other states, but noted that many states do not have their accepted degrees set in regulation.

- **Marq Truscott moved to direct staff to schedule, prepare, and execute a public forum to receive input on specific changes to CCR 2620 (Education and Training Credits) in terms of related degrees before the next scheduled meeting. Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.**

Mr. Schubert stated that workshops are great if there is a turnout that represents the industry. Mr. Maxam stated that he is in favor of the special public forum and that it should consist of a discussion rather than an opportunity to collect information.

Members Bowden, Truscott, and Chair Trauth voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

H. Discuss and Possible Action to Recommend to the Board to Adopt Originally Proposed Language or Approve Modified Text to Amend Reciprocity Requirements of Title 16, CCR Section 2615 (Form of Examinations)

Ms. Kjose reported that in December 2012, the LATC received a letter from a potential candidate regarding California's current reciprocity requirements. She continued that as a result, the LATC began discussing the issue of reciprocity due to numerous requests from potential candidates licensed in other jurisdictions where a degree in landscape architecture or architecture was not required.

Ms. Kjose reported that originally, staff researched reciprocity requirements in other states and found that 26 states accept any baccalaureate degree when combined with experience (ranging from 3 to 7 years) and 28 allow initial/reciprocal licensure on the basis of experience only, with an average of 8 years of required experience.

Ms. Kjose reported that at the February 10, 2015 LATC meeting, the Committee discussed the data presented and LATC's current six-year education and training/experience requirements that candidates must complete for licensure. She continued that the Committee's determination was that a substantial number of years of post-licensure experience in another state would compensate for educational deficiencies, even though they may not have met California's educational experience requirements. Ms. Kjose reported that the Committee suggested a regulatory amendment to allow reciprocity to individuals who do not meet California's education requirement but are licensed in another jurisdiction, have 10 years of practice experience, and have passed the CSE. She continued that LATC directed staff to review the reciprocity requirements of Arizona and New York and draft proposed regulatory language for the Committee's consideration.

Ms. Kjose reported that based on LATC's direction, staff prepared proposed regulatory language to amend CCR 2615 (Form of Examinations). She continued that the proposed amendment included provisions that would require a candidate for reciprocal licensure to either submit verifiable documentation of education and experience equivalent to that required of California applicants at the time of application, or submit verifiable documentation that the candidate has been actively engaged as a licensed landscape architect in another jurisdiction for at least 10 of the last 15 years.

Ms. Kjose reported that the Committee approved the proposed regulatory language at its November 17, 2015 meeting, followed by the Board's approval on December 10, 2015. Ms. Kjose noted that during the public comment period, 296 comments were received; of which, 291 were substantially similar, expressing concern that requiring 10 years of post-licensure experience was excessive. She stated that the public comments offered proposed language that would allow reciprocity if the "candidate possesses education and experience equivalent to that required of California applicants at the time of application; or, candidate holds a valid license or registration in good standing, possesses a bachelor's degree from a recognized accredited institution, and has been practicing or offering professional services for at least 2 of the last 5 years; or, candidate holds a valid license or registration in good standing, and has been practicing or offering professional services for at least 6 of the last 10 years."

Ms. Kjose reported that at the Committee's November 4, 2016 meeting, the LATC discussed the proposed regulation and heard from several members of the public expressing opposition to the amount of post-licensure experience that was proposed. She continued that after discussion, the LATC agreed to discuss the topic again at its next meeting with the intent of allowing sufficient time to consider the submitted comments and determine whether changes to the proposed regulatory language is warranted.

Ms. Kjose reported that staff verified that both Arizona and New York accept any baccalaureate degree combined with additional years of experience for initial license and reciprocity candidates. In addition, they accept 10 years of licensed experience in lieu of meeting the examination requirements. She concluded that at today's meeting, the Committee is asked to consider the information presented and determine if changes should be made to the proposed regulatory language attached to this agenda item.

Mr. Truscott expressed difficulty in connecting CCR 2615(c)(1) to an educational requirement. Ms. Kjose stated that CCR 2615(a)(1) has to be taken into consideration. She noted that the authority for CCR 2615(c)(1) comes from BPC section 5651 (Examination of Applicants). Ms. Kjose also noted that the words "experience" and "education" are used interchangeably, stating that the regulations were written under the notion that training consists of education and experience.

Ms. Trauth inquired on why the timeframe of professional services rendered is at least 10 of the last 15 years. Ms. Kjose responded that that is the average required by Arizona and New York. Kourtney Nation added that 10 years was specified in both states' (New York and Arizona) regulations for experience in lieu of education.

Ms. Trauth stated that the issue the Committee had with the proposed language from the last meeting was the "10 of the last 15" years of experience needed to sit for the examination. She inquired if the Committee had any other issues with the terminology. Mr. Bowden stated that, in retrospect, 10 years is excessive. He recommended that the proposed language be changed to 2 of the last 5 years instead of 10 of the last 15 years. Ms. Mayer inquired if his proposal two of the last five years would require post-licensure experience in the jurisdiction in which the license was issued. Mr. Bowden responded yes and stated that if the individual does not have a degree that meets California's education requirement, the reciprocity candidate would have to work in his/her licensing jurisdiction for two of the last five years and pass the CSE.

Ms. Mayer commented that Mr. Bowden's suggestion was not equitable to in-state candidates who are unable to use that pathway to licensure. Mr. McCauley agreed with Ms. Mayer and added that the logic of obtaining licensure through reciprocity should connect with initial licensure. Ms. Mayer asked Mr. Bowden if he meant for experience to be post-licensure experience under one's own firm and practice. Mr. Bowden responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Trauth inquired if the Committee needs to address the issue of education before addressing reciprocity. Ms. Mayer responded that reciprocity candidates may be applying for licensure with different educational backgrounds than what California allows for in-state candidates. She continued that educational requirements, related degrees, and reciprocity are all related.

Ms. Bon stated that the issue is not about fairness or competitiveness in the marketplace, but about setting the same standards for practitioners. Ms. Kjose stated that a person licensed and practicing in their jurisdiction would have acquired some knowledge from practicing. She continued that an initial licensure candidate has not proved their competence to practice safely unlike the reciprocity candidate. Mr. McCauley stated that reciprocity candidates would have to pass the CSE as well.

Mr. McCauley asked Ms. Bon if it is possible to have a slightly different licensing standard for reciprocity and initial licensure candidates while protecting the public. Ms. Bon responded that licensing standards do not have to mirror each other, and that the Committee is able to approach licensure with a variety of methods as long as there is reason and the ability to substantiate them.

Mr. Truscott felt CCR 2615(c)(1) should be separated from CCR 2615(a)(1), so that a candidate who is licensed in another jurisdiction can qualify for licensure by taking and passing the CSE without having to meet California's education and experience requirements. Ms. Bon stated that separating subsections would require restructuring the regulation.

Mr. Maxam stated that the best solution would be to accept a CLARB certificate as a means for reciprocity licensure, because it would remove the LATC from having to decide how to meet specific education criteria. He also stated a concern of how one proves practicing or offering professional services out of state, and that he was under the impression that working under a licensed landscape architect in another state would meet the professional practice requirement.

Mr. Maxam stated that the proposed language, which is based on Arizona's and New York's requirements, is inappropriately applied, because they have additional pathways to licensure. Mr. Rohrbacker expressed his support for Mr. Maxam and inquired if it had been decided that 10 of the last 15 years of practicing or offering professional services would be in lieu of education. Mr. McCauley responded that it was undecided, and that the Committee had directed staff to draft modified language for consideration.

Mr. Maxam stated that it was explained that the education requirement applies to the CSE and in order to take the CSE a candidate has to meet the education and experience requirements. Ms. Kjose concurred, but stated that CCR 2615 (Form of Examinations) (c)(1)(B) would be in lieu of education. Ms. Mayer stated that when the Committee decided 10 years of post-licensure experience, they discussed how a candidate's experience could equate to an amount of education credit.

Mr. Schubert commented that a candidate's professional experience could be good or bad. Mr. Bowden stated that the goal is not to determine the quality of a candidate's professional experience but to determine how much education credit should be granted to a candidate who does not possess education training but has years of experience.

Mr. Truscott stated that reciprocity licensure should be streamlined. He continued that a reciprocity candidate with a CLARB certificate should be able to take the CSE. Mr. Bowden stated that the Committee does not control CLARB's standards, and therefore, the Committee should manage its own reciprocity candidates.

Mr. Bowden opined the possibility of two separate motions: 1) a pathway for candidates who hold a license in another jurisdiction and a degree, and 2) a pathway for candidates who hold a license in another jurisdiction but do not possess a degree. Ms. Bon stated that the motions do not have to be separated, and that CCR 2615 applies the educational requirements for initial licensure to reciprocity licensure. She continued that it is reasonable for the two populations of candidates, initial and reciprocity, to have different methods to obtain licensure.

Mr. McCauley stated that because reciprocity candidates are licensed and practicing in their jurisdiction and passed the national examination, the requirements could be more flexible than for initial licensure applicants.

- **Marq Truscott moved to allow licensees from any U.S. jurisdiction, Canadian Province, or Puerto Rico who have passed a written examination substantially equivalent in scope and subject matter required in California as determined by the Board to be eligible for licensure upon passing the CSE.**

Chair Trauth seconded the motion.

Messrs. Maxam, Rohrbacker, and Schubert stated that they were in agreement with the motion.

Members Truscott and Chair Trauth voted in favor of the motion. Member Bowden opposed the motion. The motion passed 2-1.

Ms. Mayer stated that the next step would be to modify the proposed language, which may include a 15-day notice and a public comment hearing. Ms. Bon stated that a new rulemaking file might be required in order to achieve the new goal; however, she would need to verify. She continued that either way, new proposed language would need to be presented to the Committee for approval.

Mr. McCauley asked Ms. Bon if the change would require a new rulemaking file, because the issue is germane. Ms. Bon stated that if LATC modifies the proposed language, then it could be part of the initial rulemaking file.

Ms. Kjose commented that if LATC modifies the proposed language in the initial rulemaking file, then staff would have to respond to 296 public comments.

I. Review and Possible Action to Amend Title 16, CCR Section 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) and Add CCR Sections 2620.2 (Extension Certificate Programs – Application for Approval), 2620.3 (Suspension or Withdrawal of Approval), and 2620.4 (Annual Reports)

Mr. Bowden asked Ms. Bon if his membership on the UCLA Landscape Architecture Guidance Committee poses a conflict of interest for participation in the discussion and voting on this agenda item. Mr. McCauley asked Mr. Bowden if his membership on the Guidance Committee was uncompensated. Mr. Bowden replied that he is uncompensated. Ms. Bon asked Mr. Bowden how it was handled in the past. Mr. Bowden stated that, in the past, he was covered by the “rule of necessity” due to insufficient LATC members being present. Ms. Bon stated that she has seen this occur before on this issue in order to maintain a quorum, and that based upon the facts and circumstances, Mr. Bowden could participate in the agenda item discussion and vote.

Mr. Truscott began by referencing an email received from Stephanie Landregan, Director of the UCLA Extension Certificate Program, requesting time to review the information in order to participate in the discussion. Mr. Truscott inquired if the Committee should grant Ms. Landregan’s request. Mr. Bowden suggested tabling the topic until the next meeting.

Mr. Bowden inquired why LATC should not review and approve extension certificate programs since that is how they are currently validated. He added that if the Committee does not approve the programs, they would no longer be state validated.

Mr. McCauley stated that initially, LATC did not approve the UC Extension programs. He continued that due to the challenge of keeping the regulations consistent with the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board’s (LAAB) accreditation standards, staff questioned whether the review and approval process within the UC institutions was practical.

Mr. McCauley stated that LATC accepts and gives credit for associate degrees without accreditation from LAAB, as well as non-approved degree programs. Ms. Kjose stated that the terms “approved” and “non-approved” can be misleading. She continued that LATC would continue to give credit for extension certificate programs, but would no longer set the requirements for approval. She added that parts of CCR 2620.5 (Requirements for an Approved Extension Certificate Program) would remain in place.

- **Marq Truscott moved to table the agenda item until the next scheduled meeting.**

Andrew Bowden seconded the motion.

Members Bowden, Truscott, and Chair Trauth voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

J. Discuss and Possible Action on Draft *Consumer’s Guide to Hiring a Landscape Architect*

Ms. Kjose reported that at the November 4, 2016 meeting, the LATC was asked to review the revised *Consumer’s Guide to Hiring a Landscape Architect* and take action. She continued that

during the meeting, a member of the public expressed concern that the photographs and plant materials depicted in the draft *Guide* show water features, high water use plant pallets, and lawn dominated designs that do not support water conservation. Ms. Kjose reported that the LATC agreed that the publication should contain pictures of compelling low water landscapes with California plant material and asked staff to obtain images. Ms. Kjose stated that staff is continuing to review the images, and that a new draft of the *Guide* would be presented at the next meeting.

K. Review Tentative Schedule and Confirm Future LATC Meeting Dates

Ms. Trauth advised that the next LATC meetings are scheduled for April 5 in Los Angeles; July 13 in Sacramento; and November 1, 2017 in San Diego.

L. Recess

The meeting recessed at 1:59 p.m.

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

On January 18, 2017, the meeting was called to order at 8:33 a.m., and the following persons were present:

LATC Members

Patricia Trauth, Chair
Marq Truscott, Vice Chair
Andrew Bowden

Staff

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer
Vickie Mayer, Assistant Executive Officer
Gretchen Kjose, Interim Program Manager
Tremaine Palmer, Special Projects Analyst
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator
Stacy Townsend, Licensing Coordinator

Guests

Julie Kolaszewski, Strategic Planner & Facilitator, DCA SOLID
Brianna Miller, Strategic Planner & Facilitator, DCA SOLID
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth, CCASLA

N. Strategic Planning Session

Julie Kolaszewski and Brianna Miller from SOLID facilitated the LATC's strategic planning session and lead the LATC through its review of accomplishments for 2015-2016, its mission, values, and strategic goals, which assisted members in developing objectives for 2017-2018. SOLID will update the Strategic Plan with changes made during this session, and the Committee will review and finalize the plan at its next meeting.

O. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.