



## Minutes

### CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Teleconference Meeting

September 5, 2019  
Sacramento, California  
&  
Various Teleconference Locations

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

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

#### Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer (EO)  
Vickie Mayer, Assistant EO  
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager  
Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)  
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator  
Deborah Dulay, Special Projects Analyst

#### Guests Present

Christine Anderson, Past President, Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)

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

LATC Chair Marq Truscott called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and called roll. Mr. Truscott announced his location as 2420 Del Paso Road in Sacramento, and he also requested that each member identify their respective teleconference locations for the record. Andrew C. N. Bowden stated that he was located at 5620 Friars Road in San Diego. Susan M. Landry affirmed her location as Campbell City Hall located at 70 North First Street. Patricia M. Trauth confirmed her location as 5620 Friars Road in San Diego. Jon S. Wreschinsky stated that his location was 4100 Normal Street in San Diego. Five members of the LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

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

Mr. Truscott announced that a voluntary sign-in sheet was located near the entrance to the meeting room, and if attendees were to sign-in, they would be recorded in the official minutes of the meeting.

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

Mr. Truscott invited a member of the public to introduce herself. Christine Anderson stated that she is a licensed landscape architect and is the past president of CLARB. Ms. Anderson continued that her purpose in attending the meeting was to provide information and answer questions regarding the CLARB agenda items. Trish Rodriguez announced the LATC staff present at the meeting: Tara Welch, DCA Legal Counsel; Laura Zuniga, EO; Vickie Mayer, Assistant EO; Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator; and Deborah Dulay, Special Projects Analyst.

**D. Review and Possible Action on May 29, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes**

**Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to approve the May 29, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes.**

**Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.**

Mr. Wreschinsky identified two corrections: (1) misspelling on page 8, and (2) proper name of Southwestern College on page 13.

**Andrew C. N. Bowden amended the motion to approve the May 29, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes with the corrections to pages 8 and 13.**

**Susan M. Landry seconded the amended motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

**E. Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)**

Mr. Truscott stated that Mr. Bowden and Ms. Rodriguez and Zuniga will attend the CLARB Annual Meeting, and if members of the LATC had any items for the meeting to contact Ms. Rodriguez. Mr. Truscott said that Mr. Bowden participated on a conference call for the election of the CLARB Region 5 Director. Mr. Bowden elaborated that the LATC cast their vote for Joel Kurokawa, current Region 5 Director. Ms. Rodriguez advised that the CLARB Annual Meeting will be held September 26-28, 2019 in St. Louis, Missouri and directed members to the agenda included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Truscott prompted the Committee to address the following items: (1) approve the Letter of Delegate Credentials for the 2019 CLARB Annual Meeting, and (2) complete the elections ballot with the LATC's selections. Ms. Rodriguez explained that Mr. Bowden would be represented as the Member Board Member in attendance, and she and Ms. Zuniga would be Member Board

Executives in attendance. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether LATC will get only one vote, per the bylaws, regardless of how many individuals are in attendance, and Mr. Truscott confirmed Mr. Wreschinsky's inquiry.

Mr. Truscott initiated discussion regarding the elections ballot, and the Committee members proceeded to discuss the candidates and shared their knowledge of their backgrounds. Ms. Anderson commented that members may review candidate video biographies on CLARB's website for additional information, and she proclaimed that all candidates have been thoroughly vetted and satisfy the experience requirements to qualify for the post to which they were nominated. Mr. Bowden expressed concern that the candidates on the ballot were disproportionately from CLARB Region 5 jurisdictions, which undermines the overall objective of having diverse geographic representation among elected leadership. Ms. Anderson responded to Mr. Bowden's concerns about overrepresentation by individuals from Region 5 jurisdictions, and she stated that only two candidates on the ballot were from Region 5: (1) Cary Baird, and (2) Deb Peters. Ms. Anderson explained that Ms. Peters was running for the Committee on Nominations, a non-board position, and therefore Region 5 was not disproportionately represented among the board candidates. Ms. Landry observed that some candidates did not have CLARB certification listed on their candidate biographies. Ms. Anderson explained that the primary reason to be CLARB certified is when an individual holds credentials or licenses from more than one state.

Mr. Truscott directed the Committee to discuss their selection for President-Elect. Mr. Bowden addressed the qualifications of Michael Beresnak, suggesting that his Canadian background would give him a unique perspective on the profession and the diversity of his experiences and insights may be useful to CLARB given that the organization is primarily comprised of American professionals. Ms. Anderson commented that CLARB is made up of 54 member jurisdictions, including four provinces of Canada, and she continued that Mr. Beresnak was within his right to run for office. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether Mr. Beresnak was a CLARB director, and Ms. Anderson clarified that Mr. Beresnak was a former director and he previously ran for Vice President last year but did not receive enough votes. Mr. Wreschinsky continued that at-large directors will also need to be selected, and if LATC selected Mr. Baird for President-Elect, then perhaps Mr. Beresnak could be nominated to be a director. Ms. Anderson confirmed that the current ballot cannot be revised; however, Mr. Beresnak could be recommended for next year's election. Mr. Wreschinsky asked for clarification on how an at-large director nomination process would work, and Ms. Anderson responded that anyone who satisfied the CLARB qualifications may be nominated by any member jurisdiction, or they may self-nominate. Mr. Truscott suggested that the nomination of Mr. Beresnak as CLARB director in next year's election could be brought up by either Mr. Bowden or Ms. Rodriguez at the upcoming CLARB Annual Meeting.

**Susan M. Landry moved to support Cary Baird for President-Elect, Les Smith for Vice President, Allison Fleury for Treasurer, and Chad Danos and Deb Peters for Committee on Nominations.**

**Jon S. Wreschinsky seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Truscott discussed the Letter of Delegate Credentials for the CLARB Annual Meeting, and he stated that Mr. Bowden would serve as delegate, and Ms. Rodriguez and Zuniga would be representatives.

**Patricia M. Trauth moved to approve the Letter of Delegate Credentials for the CLARB Annual Meeting.**

**Jon S. Wreschinsky seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Truscott directed the Committee to discuss the CLARB resolutions, and he prompted Ms. Anderson to provide a high-level explanation of the issues. Ms. Anderson explained that the purpose of the resolutions to be voted upon at the Annual Meeting was to improve the nomination and election processes, and CLARB's objective was to expand the pool of qualified candidates. Ms. Anderson continued that jurisdictions have been consolidating boards and consequently the number of qualified professionals who may serve in CLARB leadership positions has declined. Furthermore, Ms. Anderson stated that the goals of CLARB were to increase the number of eligible candidates, with a focus on diversity, and to adapt to the ongoing trend of deregulation throughout the various jurisdictions. Lastly, Ms. Anderson commented that Resolutions #1 and #2 were considered in the previous year; however, there were not enough votes to pass the resolutions, which is why the same resolutions were being presented at the upcoming CLARB Annual Meeting. Ms. Anderson elaborated that resolutions must pass by 75% of the quorum present at the meeting, and last year's vote failed by one because inclement weather conditions did not permit the voting member to cast their vote. Mr. Truscott observed that the LATC had previously approved the language of the resolutions except for the newly proposed Indiana amendment and resolution. Ms. Rodriguez reminded the Committee that she provided handouts regarding the resolutions currently under discussion.

Ms. Trauth commented that the current resolutions had been discussed in the previous year, and she wanted to verify whether the resolution language had remained the same. Ms. Anderson confirmed Ms. Trauth's inquiry, and Mr. Truscott commented that Ms. Anderson would proceed in the discussion as an active participant. Mr. Bowden asked whether CLARB allowed proxy votes, and Ms. Anderson clarified that CLARB bylaws did not allow for them. Ms. Anderson continued that Resolution #1 would amend the bylaws to include proxy votes. Mr. Bowden commented that California had been under a travel ban in the previous year; however, Ms. Trauth recalled that last year's meeting and vote was conducted via conference call. Ms. Anderson replied that conference calls are permissible under CLARB rules when the organization anticipates that a quorum cannot be established without facilitating the vote via conference call, provided that the vote is taken in-person and live. Ms. Anderson further clarified that the locations of voting members also need to be identified per CLARB's parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether additional study group findings had been incorporated into Resolutions #1 and #2. Ms. Anderson replied that CLARB had reached out to member jurisdictions regarding their past bylaw vote, focusing on jurisdictions that voted against the resolution, and she continued that given the information gathered, it was not necessary to change the language in Resolutions #1 and #2. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired why Indiana submitted amendments to the resolutions, and Ms. Anderson replied that such amendments were permissible under CLARB bylaws. Mr. Wreschinsky expressed concern that there was nothing in the bylaws authorizing the Board of Directors to act, and he inquired about the Indiana amendment's language regarding how outcomes will be communicated and addressed at the CLARB Annual Meeting or any board meeting. Ms. Anderson replied that the purpose of this amendment was to implement a procedural item where outcomes in regional meetings would be conveyed to the Board of Directors. Ms. Anderson continued that this is already the current practice, but Indiana wanted to formalize the procedure by updating the bylaws. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether the Indiana amendment was meant to address an issue unique to its region, and Ms. Anderson commented that it was likely that Indiana felt more comfortable updating the bylaws to reflect the current procedural practice. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether regions are required to schedule a separate, special meeting in order to discuss issues they wanted to present at the annual meeting. Ms. Anderson replied that it is permissible under the bylaws for any region to establish their own meeting, and she continued that it is normal practice for regions to meet on an annual basis to discuss policies and practices relevant to their region. Lastly, Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether fewer landscape architects serving on state boards and agencies was the reason why the pool of eligible candidates had been shrinking. Ms. Anderson confirmed Mr. Wreschinsky's observation and elaborated that the pool of candidates to the examination was shrinking, which also contributed to the decline in the number of eligible candidates who may serve on CLARB. Ms. Anderson continued that in order to serve on CLARB, a candidate must be a licensed landscape architect and have experience serving on a jurisdictional board either at the state or local government level. Ms. Anderson observed that the overall trend is that fewer people devote their time to serving on such boards, which was another reason why the pool of eligible candidates has declined.

Ms. Trauth inquired about the organizational structure of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) for comparison, and Ms. Zuniga stated NCARB has non-licensed individuals in leadership positions. Ms. Anderson added that the structure of NCARB is not the same as CLARB, and she elaborated that NCARB has a larger board of directors. Ms. Anderson continued that because of their inherent differences, the organizational structure of NCARB and CLARB should not be confused with each other. Ms. Zuniga described the structure of NCARB in further detail, adding that there are two non-licensees who hold leadership positions. Ms. Trauth inquired about the eligibility requirements to serve on CLARB, and Ms. Anderson described the purpose of Resolution #2, stating that at least half of the full board must be comprised of licensed landscape architects and about 5 of the 12 board members may be non-licensed individuals. Ms. Trauth inquired about the qualifications for non-licensed individuals, and Ms. Anderson commented that the Nominating Committee's purpose is to implement best practices when identifying, recruiting, and vetting possible candidates who may serve on CLARB. Ms. Trauth asked whether the Nominating Committee may decline nominees who do not possess the requisite qualifications, and Ms. Anderson confirmed the inquiry and commented that the purpose of Resolution #2 was meant to memorialize the nominating process by updating the bylaws to reflect the current best practices.

Mr. Truscott prompted the LATC to further discuss or take possible action on Resolution #1.

**Susan M. Landry moved to support Resolution #1 General Updates, Voting & Meetings, Leadership Advisory Council and Board of Directors' Structure and Process.**

**Jon S. Wreschinsky seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Truscott directed the LATC to discuss Resolution #2, including the Indiana amendment. Mr. Truscott described the deliberation process, and Ms. Anderson commented that the voting member who attends the CLARB Annual Meeting needs to have flexibility to address any possible modifications to the resolutions that may occur during the parliamentary process. Ms. Welch added that the LATC may decide to accept or reject the Indiana amendment, and then instruct Mr. Bowden regarding how to proceed at the Annual Meeting if the language to the resolutions or amendment is modified during the parliamentary process.

Mr. Truscott prompted the LATC to specifically discuss the Indiana amendment to Resolution #2. Mr. Wreschinsky requested clarification on: (1) whether a director of CLARB also represents their respective region, and (2) whether CLARB had recommended to reject the Indiana amendment. Ms. Anderson began by replying to the second prong of Mr. Wreschinsky's inquiry and said that CLARB recommends the Indiana amendment to Resolution #2 because it memorializes in the bylaws the current procedural practice. Then, Ms. Anderson addressed the first prong of Mr. Wreschinsky's request and stated that under the current bylaws the organizational structure of CLARB is not representational. Ms. Anderson clarified that each of the member board members are representatives of their respective jurisdictions whereas directors are not representatives for any state, region, or jurisdiction, and the purpose of the director is to facilitate discussion for Region 5 at the meetings. Ms. Trauth commented that the Indiana amendment to Resolution #2 was overly restrictive, and she recommended that non-licensed landscape architects who serve on the board should at least be licensed professionals and possess an understanding of licensing. Mr. Truscott suggested that Mr. Bowden could inquire on Ms. Trauth's behalf at the Annual Meeting regarding the qualifications for non-landscape architects who occupy board positions within CLARB, and Ms. Trauth confirmed. Mr. Bowden stated that he did not support the Indiana amendment to Resolution #2 because it did not address the underlying issue of the declining pool of qualified candidates.

**Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to reject the Indiana amendment to Resolution #2 Eligibility Requirements to Serve on the Board of Directors.**

**Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Truscott prompted the LATC to further discuss or take possible action on Resolution #2.

**Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to support Resolution #2 Eligibility Requirements to Serve on the Board of Directors.**

**Jon S. Wreschinsky seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Truscott commented that modifications to the resolutions or the Indiana amendment could take place during the parliamentary process at the CLARB Annual Meeting, and therefore, the voting member, Mr. Bowden, needed flexibility and authority to vote accordingly. Ms. Anderson added that several hypothetical outcomes could occur depending on how the parliamentary process progresses during the meeting, and the Committee should anticipate and discuss the various outcomes. Ms. Landry summarized that even though the LATC rejected the Indiana amendment, the amendment could be approved and incorporated into Resolution #2 at the Annual Meeting, and therefore, the Committee should decide whether they should still support Resolution #2 even if the language is modified. Ms. Anderson confirmed, and she elaborated that other amendments could be introduced during the parliamentary process, and therefore, Mr. Bowden should be given flexibility to address any possible changes to the resolution language. Ms. Welch agreed, and asked the Committee to consider whether they would be comfortable with the language of Resolution #2 changing, specifically whether they would still support Resolution #2 if the Indiana amendment or any other modification to the original resolution language was incorporated during the parliamentary process. Ms. Welch continued that if the language of Resolution #2 were modified, then the possible actions would be as follows: (1) adopt the resolution without the Committee having the opportunity to review the modifications, (2) abstain, or (3) vote against the resolution so it could be brought forth next year. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired what would happen if the Indiana amendment were approved but Resolution #2 were ultimately rejected. Ms. Anderson replied that she could not speculate on a possible outcome to Mr. Wreschinsky's hypothetical scenario given that it was unclear how CLARB would react if the same set of resolutions were brought forth for a third time. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether the bylaws would remain the same if the resolutions were tabled and no vote taken, and Ms. Anderson confirmed his inquiry. Mr. Wreschinsky commented that he supported Mr. Bowden's judgement to vote on the issues at the CLARB Annual Meeting.

**Patricia M. Trauth moved to grant Andrew C. N. Bowden the authority to represent the LATC at the 2019 CLARB Annual Meeting.**

**Susan M. Landry seconded the motion.**

Ms. Welch encouraged the Committee to consider modifying the motion to grant Mr. Bowden the authority to represent the LATC's interests and provide Mr. Bowden the greatest degree of flexibility regarding any actions related to the eligibility requirements under Resolution #2.

**Patricia M. Trauth amended the motion to grant Andrew C. N. Bowden the authority to represent the interests of the LATC at the 2019 CLARB Annual Meeting with regards to the eligibility requirements.**

**Susan M. Landry seconded the amended motion.**

Ms. Welch asked the Committee whether they agreed that the eligibility requirements should be flexible. Mr. Bowden commented that the LATC should not support the Indiana amendment, however, if most votes tend to favor the amendment during the deliberation process at the Annual Meeting, then support of the amendment may be acceptable, unless the LATC's vote were a swing vote. Mr. Truscott acknowledged Mr. Bowden's comments and redirected the Committee to discuss the language of the motion authorizing Mr. Bowden to vote on the eligibility requirements. Ms. Trauth stated that she had originally phrased her motion to give Mr. Bowden general authority to vote because of the various outcomes that could occur during the parliamentary process at the Annual Meeting. Ms. Welch summarized the comments of Ms. Trauth that the Committee should grant Mr. Bowden the authority to represent the interests of the LATC regarding all resolutions under consideration at the CLARB Annual Meeting.

**Patricia M. Trauth amended the motion to grant Andrew C. N. Bowden the authority to represent the interests of the LATC regarding all resolutions at the 2019 CLARB Annual Meeting.**

**Susan M. Landry seconded the amended motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

Mr. Truscott prompted the Committee to discuss Resolution #3, and he asked whether Indiana had input regarding this resolution. Ms. Anderson explained that amendments to resolutions require majority vote of the quorum whereas resolutions require two thirds vote of the quorum. Ms. Anderson continued that any amendment that is not already resolved must be in a resolution, and therefore, Resolution #3 as presented by Indiana does not affect the other resolutions. Ms. Anderson reiterated that Resolution #3 is a separate resolution and would not modify anything that was presented previously. Mr. Bowden asked whether CLARB was in support of Resolution #3, and Ms. Anderson confirmed his inquiry. Mr. Truscott commented that CLARB did not have a separate Resolution #3, and Ms. Anderson stated that Indiana has the purview to propose a resolution of its own at the Annual Meeting.

**Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to support Resolution #3 CLARB Bylaws 2015, Article V – Membership; Section 3, Organizational Structure.**

**Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.**

There were no comments from the public.

**Members Bowden, Landry, Trauth, Wreschinsky, and Chair Truscott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

**F. Review of Future LATC Meeting Dates**

Mr. Truscott announced that the next LATC meeting is November 8, 2019 in Sacramento, and Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that the meeting would be at the DCA headquarters. Mr. Truscott continued that the California Architects Board (Board) has a meeting on September 11, 2019 in Pleasant Hill, and he would attend the meeting on behalf of the LATC. Lastly, Mr. Truscott announced that there was another Board meeting on December 11, 2019 in Los Angeles, and Ms. Rodriguez mentioned that there would likely be an LATC item on the agenda. Ms. Zuniga added that the Board meeting will be held at the East Los Angeles College. Ms. Landry inquired about the length of the November LATC meeting, and Ms. Rodriguez replied that she would provide an estimate given the anticipated items on the agenda. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether he could suggest agenda items for the November LATC meeting, and Ms. Rodriguez confirmed.

**G. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.