



Minutes

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting

November 8, 2019
Sacramento, California

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)
Trish Rodriguez, Program Manager
Tara Welch, Attorney III, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Stacy Townsend, Enforcement Analyst
Kourtney Nation, Examination Coordinator
Deborah Dulay, Special Projects Analyst

Guests Present

Paul McDermott, Budget Analyst, DCA
Tavi G. Popp, Research Manager, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES), DCA
Heidi Lincer, Chief, OPES, DCA
John Nicolaus, California Council of the American Society of Landscape Architects (CCASLA)
Steve Harbour, Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD)

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

LATC Chair Marq Truscott called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and Vice Chair Andrew C. N. Bowden called roll. 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. He advised on the voting requirements and stated that all motions and seconds would be repeated for the record and votes will be taken by rollcall. Mr. Truscott stated the Committee would be recessing at approximately 11:45 a.m. for a lunch break.

Mr. Truscott announced that he attended stakeholder meetings for the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) hosted by the Department of Water Resources (DWR). On November 4, 2019, a webinar was held regarding an update on the research and implementation surveys with local land use agencies. Mr. Truscott continued that although these agencies are mandated to have a model water ordinance, the agencies lacked the funding or the staffing to implement the ordinance, and the purpose of the DWR surveys was to understand what agencies need in order to implement the MWELO. He stated that at the end of the meeting, discussion focused on establishing workgroups that would help devise ways to implement MWELO. Mr. Truscott said he will continue to attend the MWELO meetings on behalf of the LATC.

C. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Mr. Truscott invited members of the audience to address the Committee, stating that their comments would be recorded in the official minutes. There were no comments from the public.

D. Update on the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Trish Rodriguez directed the Committee to a letter from the DCA located in the meeting materials. Ms. Rodriguez stated that on October 8, 2019, Kimberly Kirchmeyer, previous Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, was appointed as the new director of the DCA. She continued that the Communications Division of the DCA created a new publication called “DCA – We’re Listening” to provide the public with information regarding how to interact with the DCA boards and bureaus during public meetings. She directed members to the poster in the hearing room and indicated that the pamphlets would be available on the table near the entrance.

E. Review and Possible Action on September 5, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes

Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to approve the September 5, 2019 LATC Meeting Minutes.

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.

F. Program Manager’s Report

1. Update on LATC’s Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs

Ms. Rodriguez gave an update on the election results from the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) Annual Meeting: (1) Cary Baird, President-Elect; (2) Chuck Smith, Vice President; (3) Allison Fleury, Treasurer; (4) Joel Kurokawa, Region 5 Director; (5) Chad Danos, Committee on Nominations Member; and (6) Deb Peters, Committee on Nominations Member. Ms. Rodriguez elaborated that although the LATC nominated Les Smith

for Vice President, Chuck Smith received the majority vote. Ms. Rodriguez continued that the three bylaws that the LATC supported were approved at the CLARB meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez updated the Committee on business modernization efforts and stated that the Stage 1 Business Analysis report was forwarded to the California Department of Technology for approval. She continued that Stage 2 has commenced and activities have included software demonstrations by 10 vendors, and that DCA cohort programs will meet to discuss vendors, including market research questionnaire results, consolidated business requirements, and cost. Ms. Rodriguez commented that during Stage 3 they will begin identifying which vendor will be selected.

Ms. Rodriguez updated the Committee on the online credit card payment system for license renewals, which was implemented in April 2019. She stated that approximately 60 online payments are processed per month, and since the online system has been implemented and through October 2019, an estimated 402 license renewals have been processed online. Mr. Bowden observed that there was an issue with the license renewal amount on the online payment system. Ms. Rodriguez reported that the fee change was not identified in the online system in a timely manner' however, the issue has since been resolved.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that per the LATC's Strategic Plan, staff have been working on an online candidate tutorial, and she will meet with DCA on November 18, 2019 to review the first draft of the presentation. Ms. Rodriguez continued that she will present an update for the online candidate tutorial at the next LATC meeting. She announced that on November 12, 2019 staff will attend two senior-level professional practice classes at the University of California (UC), Davis for outreach efforts and updates to the various education and training pathways.

Lastly, Ms. Rodriguez updated the Committee on the status of the regulation packages, stating that they are all with DCA except for California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 2655 (Substantial Relationship Criteria) and 2656 (Criteria for Rehabilitation), both of which are within the 45-day comment period ending on November 25, 2019. Ms. Landry inquired about CCR section 2671 and whether the proposed regulatory change would require landscape architects to include their license numbers on all correspondence. Stacy Townsend confirmed this and elaborated that the proposed language would require license numbers to be included on all forms of advertisements and presentments made to the public once approved. Tara Welch further explained that the proposed language of section 2671(b) reads as "including but not limited to, any advertisement, card, letterhead, or contract proposal," which means that license numbers would be required on all correspondence, including advertisements.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired about the passage rate for the Landscape Architect Registration Examination (LARE), and he observed two issues: (1) significant difference in the pass rate between California candidates compared to the nation, and (2) the failure rate for California candidates increased between years 2018 and 2019. He observed that candidates are failing in certain areas and the test should properly identify the education and experience that candidates are expected to have. Ms. Rodriguez responded that the likely cause for the difference between California and the national passage rate is that California has multiple pathways to licensure. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired about how 10 years of practice experience would be required for the evaluation process to becoming licensed. Kourtney Nation clarified that the 10 years of experience requirement was a previous proposal regarding reciprocity requirements, however, this

proposal was not adopted. Lastly, Mr. Wreschinsky announced that the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) is currently accepting comments until January 15, 2020 as part of their efforts to reanalyze their accreditation standards, and he inquired whether the LATC would propose changes. Ms. Welch cautioned that the Committee could not discuss this topic since it was not agendaized for the current meeting; however, she advised that individuals may submit their feedback for the LAAB accreditation provided they do not do so as an agent of the LATC.

2. Discuss and Possible Action on Annual Enforcement Report

Ms. Townsend reported that in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19, the LATC had eight pending enforcement cases, and the average time to complete an investigation was 122 days, which was significantly less than the standard of 270 days. She continued that there were three final citations, two of which were collected. For the remaining citation, Ms. Townsend explained that she contacted the collection agency that is currently under contract with the California Architects Board (Board) and LATC for the outstanding citation from FY 2018-19, as well as an outstanding citation from FY 2016-17. Lastly, Ms. Townsend reported that the final citation from FY 2018-19 was collected; however, the citation from FY 2016-17 was outstanding. Ms. Landry inquired whether people may submit complaints anonymously, and Ms. Townsend affirmed.

G. Review and Discuss 2019 Legislation

Laura Zuniga discussed Assembly Bill (AB) 476 (Rubio), which would have required DCA to create a task force to study the licensing of foreign-trained professionals and create a report to the Legislature; however, the Governor vetoed this bill.

Ms. Zuniga stated that AB 1076 (Ting) was signed by the Governor. She elaborated that the bill did not directly impact the LATC; however, it impacts individual applicants in the way they are afforded relief for convictions considered in licensure process. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether the newly signed law would apply to new applicants, and Ms. Zuniga confirmed.

Ms. Zuniga presented AB 626 (Quirk-Silva), which is a two-year bill that could be taken up in January 2020 when the Legislature reconvenes. She explained that the bill is sponsored by two professional associations for engineers and architects, and it deals with conflict of interest provisions and whether professionals can participate in the bid process. Ms. Zuniga stated that the bill would create exemptions for certain services; however, she explained that there is opposition to the bill. Ms. Zuniga continued that the sponsors are working with opponents, but construction groups are opposed to the legislation and newspaper editorials about the bill have been published opposing the exceptions to the conflict of interest provisions. Lastly, Ms. Zuniga elaborated that given the opposition to the bill, it is unclear whether it will go forward in the legislative process. Ms. Trauth inquired about the text of the bill, and Ms. Zuniga responded that italics in the text reflects the newly proposed language.

Ms. Zuniga provided an update on SB 601 (Morrell), which was signed by the Governor and authorizes boards to waive the license fee for individuals experiencing economic hardship or displaced as a result of a state of emergency. She elaborated that boards may adopt regulations in order to implement this law.

Ms. Zuniga discussed SB 608 (Glazer), which is the sunset extension bill for the Board and LATC and extends the sunset dates for four years. She explained that the bill includes changes to the written contract provisions and requires fingerprinting of new applicants as part of the licensure process. Mr. Bowden inquired about the individuals impacted by the bill, and Ms. Zuniga explained that the fingerprinting requirement would apply to new applicants, not existing licensees. However, Ms. Zuniga continued that in the future the Legislature could consider having the fingerprinting requirement apply to existing licensees.

H. Discuss and Possible Action on LATC Budget Items

1. Presentation by DCA, Budget Office Regarding LATC Annual Update

Ms. Rodriguez introduced Paul McDermott, Budget Analyst with DCA. Mr. McDermott presented the LATC budget and explained his method of analyzing revenue streams against expenditures given the currently available data for FYs 2017-18 and 2018-19. He also explained that he used projected numbers to formulate his analysis because FYs 2017-18 and 2018-19 have not yet been closed out, however, he stated that the fund allocation numbers are accurate. Mr. McDermott summarized that the estimated revenues were \$588,000 with expenditures of \$1,059,000 versus the projected revenues of \$558,704 with projected expenditures of \$1,031,096. He elaborated that projections were made assuming that the program will spend to the total allocation, and he continued that that the revenue is primarily impacted by the \$220 renewal fee, which has recently increased to \$400. Mr. McDermott continued that even though the budget appears to be structurally imbalanced, the figures are acceptable given the recent fee increase and over time the budget will correct itself. He commented that once he has more definitive figures, he will present another budget update at the next meeting. Lastly, Mr. McDermott concluded that the budget is acceptable provided that the program is underspending its allocation, revenues will increase due to the recent fee change, and expenditures will balance out over time. He observed that the increase in expenditures is likely caused by the overall cost of doing business in California going up, including increases in salaries and wages, and facilities correction on rent charges.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether funds in the reserve made up the difference between revenues and expenditures, and Mr. McDermott explained that budgets are created by looking at the previous year's surplus and the surplus carries over from year to year. Mr. McDermott stated that when the renewal fee was reduced the program had a major surplus that needed to be reduced, and since then, the surplus has reduced and balanced out. He continued that even though revenues have come in each year the carryover surplus from previous years has equalized, requiring additional monitoring of the surplus going forward.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the fund condition document is a handout that was separate from the packet. Mr. McDermott commented that the handout reflected the quarterly updated figures for revenues. Ms. Landry inquired when the handout was prepared, and Mr. McDermott confirmed that it was prepared as of November 7, 2019.

2. Review and Possible Action on Potential Initial Landscape License Fee Decrease

Ms. Rodriguez stated that discussion of a potential decrease in the initial license fee was prompted by a comment from a member of the public at the February 8, 2019 LATC meeting. Ms. Rodriguez continued that at the May 29, 2019 LATC meeting staff presented an analysis of

California's initial license fee compared with other comparable jurisdictions, and the Committee required additional information from the Budget Office to determine whether a fee reduction was feasible.

Mr. Bowden commented that reducing the initial license fee was not feasible given the current state of the LATC budget, and he continued that the current initial license fee amount would not be a deterrent to becoming licensed given the overall costs of the required examinations.

Mr. Truscott inquired about how many individuals are newly licensed per year, and Ms. Nation replied that about 100 people are licensed per year. Mr. McDermott commented that he ran several scenarios projecting a potential decrease in the initial license fee, and based on his analysis, it would be a sound decision for the amount to remain at \$400. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired what percentage of the total revenue per year is from new licensees, and Mr. Bowden stated that the current discussion dealt with initial license fees. Ms. Trauth inquired how long the renewal fee had been reduced, and Ms. Rodriguez confirmed that the reduction was in effect for two renewal cycles. Ms. Rodriguez commented that the reason for the negative Budget Change Proposal (BCP) and reduction in the renewal fee was because the fund balance was approaching the statutory limit, and she continued that a decrease in the initial license fee would not benefit the overall fund balance based on the current fee amounts and recommendations from the DCA.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired what the statutory limit was, and Mr. McDermott replied that it was 24 months, which was why the program needed to lower its reserves. Mr. Bowden inquired about the \$400 license fee relative to the expenses incurred by the LATC, and Ms. Rodriguez replied that the fee has been in place since 2001 and an analysis was likely completed at that time.

Mr. McDermott confirmed that a fee audit was discussed in 2001, and he continued that a fee audit would confirm the types of occupational tasks required to process the initial license. He commented that a fee audit would take approximately three months to complete. Ms. Trauth inquired whether a fee audit is performed prior to increasing the license fee, and Mr. McDermott confirmed that the fee audit is required to confirm the statutorily permissible amount and then a regulation would need to be implemented reflecting the fee change. Ms. Trauth asked whether the fee audit determines the appropriate fee amount. Mr. McDermott replied that the renewal fee reverting to \$400 was already reflected in the language of the relevant regulation, and he continued that the initial license fee has remained at \$400. He continued that a fee audit would be required to determine the appropriate amount for the initial license fee, and he elaborated that the fee audit is an intensive study. Mr. Truscott inquired whether the DCA had a recommended timeframe for performing a fee audit, and Mr. McDermott replied that it is up to the respective boards to determine.

Ms. Landry asked about the fund balance, and Mr. McDermott commented that the program is currently decreasing surplus reserves and the overall trend is negative. Ms. Landry inquired about the impact of a reduction in the fee relative to the overall percentage, and Mr. McDermott explained that reduction in revenues combined with rising expenditures was the reason why he recommended not reducing the fee because expenses have drastically increased statewide.

Mr. Truscott summarized that the initial license fee is currently \$400, and Mr. Wreschinsky commented that the amount is reasonable and part of a professional's operating expenses.

Mr. Wreschinsky continued that the fee should stay at its current level unless the reserves trend downward. Ms. Landry commented about the populations who take the exams but do not pay the initial license fee, and Mr. Bowden elaborated that for individuals who acquire the requisite education and pass the necessary exams the fee amount would not be a barrier to gaining the initial

license. Mr. Truscott observed that the reason for assessing a possible reduction in the initial license fee was to make it easier for individuals to become licensed, and he continued that any changes to the fee would require a fee audit to determine the appropriate amount. Mr. Truscott observed that the fee audit might reveal that the true cost of the initial license is more than what it is currently, which would be counterproductive to the original goal of trying to make it easier for individuals to become licensed. Mr. Truscott continued that given the budget figures, and the trend in the reserve, he felt comfortable keeping the initial license fee amount at \$400. Lastly, Mr. Truscott stated that in the future the LATC should consider a fee audit to determine the true cost of the initial license fee. Mr. Wreschinsky commented that if the State would require additional money from the boards and bureaus, then the LATC should anticipate and consider any changes to fees accordingly.

I. Occupational Analysis of Landscape Architect Profession

1. Presentation by DCA, Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) Regarding Occupational Analysis and Linkage Study to Update California Supplemental Examination (CSE)

Ms. Rodriguez introduced Tavi G. Popp, Research Manager with OPES, and Heidi Lincer, OPES Chief. Ms. Popp explained that OPES provides examination services for boards and bureaus within the DCA, and she continued that they also provide analysis of technical standards for examinations. She stated that OPES focuses on entry-level tests that are designed to protect the public and are based on the feedback provided by subject-matter experts (SME). Ms. Popp also discussed the contract that would authorize OPES to commence the Occupational Analysis (OA), and she continued that after a candidate passes the LARE, a secondary evaluation is necessary to determine whether the individual is ready to practice in California given that the state has unique requirements compared to other jurisdictions. Ms. Popp described the process of examination development to determine what the CSE should assess. She continued that the OA is meant to ensure that the exam content is job-related and fair, and the process is legally defensible. As part of the exam development process, Ms. Popp stated they interview licensed landscape architects to gather a list of job tasks and knowledge statements and conduct a survey among licensed practitioners. Given the feedback from the survey, Ms. Popp continued that the information is presented to the SMEs in order to determine what should be covered on the CSE. She explained that any overlap between the LARE and the CSE should complement each other in order to test for the full practice for California. Ms. Popp explained how OPES evaluates the LARE in order to assess the skills required to practice in California, and she stated that OPES can create its own exam if they determine that the national exam is insufficient to properly evaluate the candidates. She gave an example of water conservation, an important issue for California and explained that OPES analyzes the results of the job task survey and that the SMEs decide which tasks related to water conservation would be critical for entry-level landscape architects to know in order to perform their jobs competently and safely. Ms. Popp said that it is important to assess whether the California exam reflects the current practice, and that the OA and survey would be completed by the end of 2020.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked about the timing of when California evaluates the CSE compared to when the national exam is evaluated. Ms. Popp explained that many factors affect when California evaluates the CSE, and she said sometimes OPES must wait until the results of the national exam are released before they can perform their analysis. Ms. Landry asked whether candidates are

evaluated on their ability to draw the requisite designs, and Ms. Popp hypothesized that such a skill would be evaluated on the LARE. Mr. Bowden commented that the CSE would need to evaluate issues and topics unique to California, and he gave the examples of MWELo, fuel management, and fire safety as subjects that should be tested on the CSE.

Ms. Popp commented that OPES could give another presentation about passing score and pass rates. Ms. Trauth inquired about minimal competency, and Ms. Popp explained the process to determine how a minimally competent person would respond to test questions. Ms. Popp continued that OPES relies on the feedback from SMEs to verify whether the CSE questions properly evaluate the knowledge and competency of an entry-level professional.

2. Review and Possible Action to Approve Fiscal Year 2019-20 Intra-Departmental Contract with OPES for Occupational Analysis

Ms. Rodriguez directed the LATC to the meeting packet for a copy of the Intra-Departmental Contract with OPES. Ms. Landry inquired whether the examination process includes a section on drawing and drafting. Ms. Rodriguez replied that after the LARE was restructured certain sections of the test were combined, and she continued that CLARB had the discretion to modify the LARE. Mr. Truscott commented that the OA is meant to determine which topics and skills should be tested on the CSE. Ms. Popp replied that SMEs evaluate whether the skills necessary for practice in California are covered on the national exam, and she continued that OPES could provide a presentation regarding the results of the OA and the feedback from the SMEs about which topics are relevant to practice in California. Mr. Bowden inquired about the difference between the previous OA contract with OPES versus the current contract. Ms. Lincer stated that the last OA occurred in 2014, and she gave a summary of the cost breakdown of the services and stated that costs increased since the last contract. Mr. Bowden inquired whether the scope of services is the same as provided in previous contract, and Ms. Lincer confirmed that the scope of services remained the same.

Andrew C. N. Bowden moved to approve the Intra-Departmental Contract with OPES for OA.

Patricia M. Trauth seconded the motion.

Mr. Wreschinsky inquired about the timeframe for the contract with OPES, and Ms. Lincer confirmed that completion of the OA will be finished on-time if SMEs are available for the workshops. She continued that the linkage study may be delayed depending on the release of the results from the national exam. Mr. Truscott inquired about recruiting SMEs, and Ms. Nation commented that there were no problems with recruitment in the past. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether the national OA would be part of the current contract, and Ms. Lincer replied that this assessment was different and would require a separate contract. Ms. Rodriguez stated that another OPES presentation may be given on the linkage study in the May 2020 LATC meeting.

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.

J. Discuss and Possible Action on LATC Member Administrative Manual

Ms. Rodriguez summarized that updates to the LATC Member Administrative Manual were based on the Board's recent amendments, which were approved in June 2019. Ms. Welch identified two additional amendments. Ms. Welch stated that language should be added on page two regarding term limits for LATC members. Ms. Welch continued that term limits are for four-year terms expiring on June 1st on the fourth year, and no person shall serve as a member for two consecutive terms. Ms. Landry inquired about whether there is a specific time period required between the two consecutive terms, and Ms. Welch replied that a break in service is required between term limits and no specific time period was identified. Ms. Welch continued that appointments by the Governor, Assembly, and Senate take time so the turnaround between terms is not quick. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether the four-year term included the one-year grace period, and Ms. Welch replied that the grace period occurs after the term's expiration. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether the second term would take effect automatically or whether the appointing body would have to reappoint the individual. Ms. Zuniga confirmed that the member would have to be reappointed, and she continued that the individual could serve their grace period of one year and would need to be reappointed to another consecutive term by the appointing body. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether the individual would have to reapply, and Ms. Zuniga confirmed, stating that the appointing body would require the member to go through the application process again. Ms. Rodriguez inquired whether each of the two consecutive terms would consist of the full-length of four years, and Ms. Welch stated that serving a partial term does not count as one of the consecutive terms per an opinion issued by the Attorney General.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked what would happen if a licensee were to approach an LATC member with a question or concern, and Ms. Rodriguez replied that those inquiries would be handled as a public comment and placed on the agenda so the LATC could discuss the issue publicly. Ms. Rodriguez continued that some issues can be handled without needing to go before the LATC, depending on the nature of the inquiry or request.

Lastly, Ms. Welch proposed changes on page 10 of the Manual where the subdivision of the legal citation should appear as singular and not plural because there was only one subdivision being referenced. Ms. Landry inquired about whether half of the board members must consist of women, and Ms. Zuniga advised that she would verify whether that proposal became law.

Susan M. Landry moved to approve the proposed changes to the LATC Member Administrative Manual including amendments regarding term limits on page 2 and revisions to the subdivision citation on page 10.

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.

K. Review and Discuss Requirements of Landscape Architects for Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Developer (QSD) Certification

Ms. Rodriguez stated that a licensee inquired whether the LATC offers a training program to become QSD certified, and she described the background and requirements of the QSD certification. She explained that after staff conducted research and discussed it with the LATC Chair it was determined that information regarding QSD certification should be shared with the members at the Committee meeting and that no action was necessary. Mr. Bowden confirmed that no action is required of the LATC given that there are ways to obtain the training necessary to become certified, and he continued that the topics related to the certification may be included on the CSE, if appropriate. Ms. Landry agreed, and she observed that these topics may be relevant to the California practice and might be appropriate for the CSE. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether landscape architects can perform the work without the certification, and Mr. Truscott commented that it would depend on the agency or jurisdiction. Mr. Wreschinsky asked whether these tasks are part of the normal scope of practice for landscape architects otherwise the QSD-related tasks would need to be performed by another professional. Mr. Wreschinsky also expressed concern that the regulations may not be applied equally among all jurisdictions if each jurisdiction or local agency had the discretion to identify who may sign the designs. Ms. Landry commented that being a landscape architect may not be sufficient and additional training is required before an individual may become certified and draw stormwater pollution prevention plans. Ms. Trauth and Landry, and Mr. Wreschinsky expressed interest in having a presentation at the next LATC meeting regarding the extent of the training program, QSD training requirements, and how landscape architects currently interact with the program and become QSD certified.

L. Discuss and Possible Action on New LATC Logo

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the Board adopted a new logo, and she continued that the DCA's Office of Publications, Design and Editing (OPDE) assisted in generating several design and color options. She offered the LATC various options for the development of a new LATC logo design: (1) OPDE, (2) Committee members, and (3) students. Ms. Landry expressed interest in having students submit designs, and she commented on the significance of the current LATC design, suggesting that the new logo be more reflective of the profession. Ms. Trauth agreed and stated that the new design should reflect the profession of landscape architects, and she continued that she supported the idea of having students submit designs. Ms. Rodriguez stated that she could reach out to landscape architect programs and ask for student submissions. Ms. Rodriguez continued that they could combine the process and ask for designs not just from students but also OPDE. Ms. Zuniga described the process of the Board's adoption of the new logo, and she stated that OPDE provided several designs and the Executive Committee requested additional revisions. Ms. Zuniga continued that the Board ultimately approved a new logo after a lengthy discussion of the design choices. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired whether there was record of the previous LATC logo, and Ms. Rodriguez said that she would research the matter further. Mr. Truscott expressed interest in adopting a new logo, and Mr. Bowden further commented that the new logo should be representative of the profession of landscape architects. Mr. Bowden also expressed interest in having both students and OPDE submit design options for the LATC's consideration. Ms. Zuniga summarized that the members could provide additional feedback to OPDE to help with the design process. Mr. Truscott stated that LATC staff could streamline the design process, and Ms. Rodriguez commented that staff could present the options to the LATC at its next meeting. Mr. Truscott asked whether the members could provide written parameters and input for the design process, and Ms. Welch advised that any comments or input provided by LATC members regarding the new logo should be summarized by LATC staff. Lastly, Mr. Truscott gave a

timeframe of about two weeks for member comments regarding parameters for the new logo at the next meeting.

M. Election of 2020 LATC Officers

Mr. Truscott stated that Mr. Bowden is in his grace period, and Mr. Bowden expressed his gratitude for serving on the LATC. Ms. Landry expressed her appreciation for Mr. Bowden's presence on the Committee. Mr. Truscott stated that his term ends in June 2020, and he continued that he felt comfortable serving during the grace period which is at the Governor's discretion.

Susan M. Landry moved to nominate Marq Truscott as Chair for 2020.

Andrew C. N. Bowden 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.

Susan M. Landry moved to nominate Jon S. Wreschinsky as Vice Chair for 2020.

Marq Truscott 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.

N. Review of Future LATC Meeting Dates

Ms. Rodriguez identified possible meeting dates for the next year: February 5, 2020 at UC Davis, and May 27, 2020 at Southwestern College. Mr. Wreschinsky stated that he could reach out to Southwestern College to verify when the term ends, and Mr. Truscott stated that UC Davis is still in session in May and suggested that the two dates and locations should be switched: February 5, 2020 at Southwestern College, and May 27, 2020 at UC Davis. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the Board meeting is December 11, 2019 at East Los Angeles College, and Ms. Trauth stated that she could tentatively attend.

O. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:23 p.m.