



DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS • BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES AND HOUSING AGENCY

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

# Landscape Architects Technical Committee

*Public Protection through Examination, Licensure, and Regulation*



## MEETING MINUTES

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD  
The Landscape Architects Technical Committee Meeting  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
October 21, 2025

### Landscape Architect Technical Committee (LATC/Committee)

#### Members Present

Pamela S. Brief, Chair  
Patricia M. Trauth, Vice Chair  
Martin "Marty" Armstrong  
Susan M. Landry  
Jon Wreschinsky

#### Staff Present

Laura Zuniga, Executive Officer  
Jesse Laxton, Assistant Executive Officer  
Kim McDaniel, LATC Program Manager  
Tim Rodda, Regulations Manager  
Gloria Padilla-Todd, LATC Enforcement Analyst  
Heather Davis, LATC Special Projects Analyst  
Bethany Butori, LATC Exam and Licensing Coordinator

### Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Staff Present

Helen Geoffroy, Legal Affairs Attorney III  
Alex Cristescu, TV Specialist

### Guests Present

Michelle Sullivan, UC Los Angeles Extension Program  
Kimberly Velazco, UC Los Angeles Extension Program  
Chris Grampp, Merritt College  
Molly Sealund, Merritt College  
Tian Feng, California Architects Board (CAB) Member and LATC Liaison

---

**A. Call to Order/Roll Call/ Establishment of a Quorum**

LATC Chair Pamela Brief called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and called roll. Five members of LATC were present, thus a quorum was established.

**B. Chair’s Procedural Remarks and Committee Member Introductory Comments**

Chair Brief explained that all motions and seconds will be repeated for the record and votes on all motions will be taken by roll call.

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

Chair Brief invited members of the public to address LATC.

The Committee may not discuss or act on any item raised during the public comment section, except to decide whether to refer the item to the Committee’s next Strategic Planning session and/or place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Government Code sections 11125 and 11125.7 (a)).

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Chris Grampp, Co-Chair of the Landscape Horticulture and Landscape Departments, welcomed the Committee to Merritt College and expressed gratitude for LATC’s support of community college landscape architecture programs. Mr. Grampp reported that Merritt College’s program places students directly into the workforce and, since launching in 2012, has helped more than 100 graduates secure employment and obtain licensure. Mr. Grampp shared that the program serves many career-changing students, particularly women, and has become a strong pathway for those seeking a fulfilling second career. Mr. Grampp explained that program outreach includes engagement with firms and public events, and highlighted Merritt College’s open-access “Landscape Design Forum”, which features topics relevant to landscape architecture, including fire-safe design and professional practice. Chair Brief thanked Mr. Grampp.

**D. Update from the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) and Discussion of the Same**

Kim McDaniel LATC Program Manager, reported the following on behalf of DCA Board and Bureau Relations: two new DCA executive appointments: Lucia Saldivar

as Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations (appointed October 20, 2025) and Shelly Jones as Assistant Deputy Director (appointed September 25, 2025).

Ms. McDaniel noted that the Department's Annual Report, one of its largest projects, was published late in summer 2025. The report compiles year-round data and accomplishments for the Legislature, and committee members are encouraged to review it.

Finally, Ms. McDaniel highlighted October as Cyber Security Month, reminding members of ongoing risks such as phishing and ransomware and urging them to "think before they click" and report any suspicious activity to the Executive Officer.

Jon Wreschinsky inquired about updates on the previously discussed DCA split into two entities. Ms. McDaniel reported that recent staffing changes have impacted progress, but an update is expected at the next meeting. Mr. Wreschinsky also raised concerns about potential financial impacts on the Board related to the split.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

#### **E. Budget Update from DCA Budget Office and Discussion of the Same**

On behalf of the Budget Office, Ms. McDaniel presented an overview of the Committee's Expenditure Projections and Fund Condition Statement documents

Chair Brief noted that the reserve balance has shifted from 10.8 to 10.6 months and requested more information on this fluctuation. The reason for some of the cost increases are unclear and the Committee would like further information.

A Committee member referenced the Expenditure Projection Report and noted discrepancies under Prior Year Fiscal Month 13 pointing out that facilities costs increased from \$25,000 to \$52,000, despite a budget of only \$15,000. Similarly, Departmental Services rose from \$30,000 to \$52,000, with a budget near \$40,000. The member asked the Budget Office for clarification on what caused these significant increases.

Mr. Wreschinsky referencing the Fund Condition Statement noted that revenue from surplus money investments appears steady in the low to mid-forties for the prior and current years but shows a significant decline starting next year. He asked whether the state is anticipating changes that are not reflected in the report. Mr. Wreschinsky also observed a pattern for the category, Statewide General Administrative Expenditures, observing a pattern alternating between 65 and 89 each year, and questioned whether this reflects a biennial state action or allocation. Mr. Wreschinsky noted that the Expenditure Projection Report lists two-line items,

Department Pro Rata and Departmental Services, under the same fiscal code, and requested clarification on the difference between them. He also pointed out that Departmental Services appears underfunded. Additionally, under line item 5346 (Information Technology), there is a budget deficit. Mr. Wreschinsky asked for details on this expenditure, noting that LATC provides certain services to CAB and inquired whether those costs are reflected in this report.

Laura Zuniga responded that she does not believe this is listed on the expenditure report, noting the amount LATC contributes towards CAB currently \$25,000.

Mr. Wreschinsky asked about the 28.78% figure shown in the lower corner of the page, questioning whether it represents the surplus.

Ms. McDaniel confirmed she has noted all questions and will follow up with fiscal.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

**F. Review, Discussion, and Possible Action to Approve July 24, 2025, LATC Meeting Minutes**

Chair Brief and Patricia Trauth discussed Ms. Trauth's absence from votes during the July 24, 2025, meeting, which was due to technical issues. It was confirmed that no revisions to the meeting minutes are necessary.

**Susan M. Landry moved to approve the July 24, 2025, Meeting Minutes (no amendment needed).**

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

**Members Landry, Wreschinsky, and Chair Brief voted in favor of the motion. Member Armstrong abstained due to being at the UCLA Certificate Program Review during the prior meeting. Member Wreschinsky abstained from the vote due to not being able to locate his copy of the meeting minutes with his notes for comments. The motion passed 3-0.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

## **G. Merritt College Landscape Horticulture Tour with Molly Sealund, Coordinator, Landscape Horticulture Department and Discussion of the Same**

Molly Sealund and Chris Grampp of Merritt College provided the Committee and staff a tour of Merritt College's Landscape Horticulture Department. The tour offered Committee members an opportunity to observe the college's facilities.

Ms. Sealund highlighted the college's commitment to hands-on learning, sustainability, and community-based design. The tour included visits to instructional gardens, greenhouses, and outdoor learning spaces, showcasing how students apply classroom knowledge to real-world projects.

Committee members expressed appreciation for the opportunity to engage directly with educators and noted the value in such tours in understanding the educational pipeline for future landscape architects. The Committee thanked Ms. Sealund for coordinating the visit and acknowledged Merritt College's contributions to the profession.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

## **H. Program Manager Report**

### **1. Update on Committee's Administrative/Management, Examination, Licensing, and Enforcement Programs and Discussion of the Same**

Ms. McDaniel reported that staff work continues to align with the Strategic Plan and noted that the Program Manager Report now includes a goal-completion metric requested by a committee member. She highlighted Enforcement Officer Gloria Padilla-Todd's collaboration on social media outreach aimed at increasing consumer awareness and reducing complaints. She thanked outreach staff Heather Davis and Bethany Butori for presenting to 120 UC Pomona students and noted upcoming presentations at UCLA and UC Davis.

Ms. McDaniel stated that there were no regulatory proposals planned for 2025, with only cleanup amendments anticipated for 2026. She reviewed California Supplemental Exam (CSE) and Landscape Architecture Registration Exam (LARE) data included in the meeting materials and noted the Chair's concerns with the Division of The State Architect (DSA) regarding Green School Yards.

The Committee discussed conflicts between DSA's requirement for an architect's stamp and the Practice Act, which allows landscape architects to stamp drawings in

certain cases. Chair Brief noted that Path of Travel elements often trigger DSA's insistence on architect involvement. Mr. Wreschinsky explained that the requirement comes from the Education Code and would need legislative change.

Ms. McDaniel invited feedback on the CLARB draft report template included in the Program Manager Report and discussion ensued amongst members.

Ms. Landry noted her appreciation for the chart on page 41 of the packet and inquired about changes in pass/fail rates since the profession was opened to other professions (e.g., contractors, landscape architects). Members engaged in a discussion regarding the CSE.

Mr. Wreschinsky commended Ms. McDaniel and staff for the comprehensive Program Manager Report. Mr. Wreschinsky inquired about social media metrics, specifically whether there is a way to distinguish between followers who are members of the public, licensees, or other groups, noting that understanding this distinction would help assess the effectiveness of outreach efforts to the public versus those already engaged, such as licensees. Heather Davis reported that Instagram primarily attracts students, including American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) chapters and universities, while LinkedIn has a broader audience of licensees, students, instructors, and firms.

Mr. Armstrong commented that the data table is informative and may not require further analysis of the CSE. Mr. Armstrong noted that most candidates he knows who have failed the CSE are from out of state and emphasized that national candidates should focus on California-specific content, which is strongly emphasized in California educational institutions. Chair Brief emphasized the importance of reminding CLARB that California is a major licensing body and noted that LATC had at times been excluded from discussions. Chair Brief expressed support for the report format and commended Ms. McDaniel and staff for their thorough work.

Ms. Trauth inquired about the recent increase in LinkedIn connections. Ms. Davis explained that the growth is due to targeted engagement with professionals, students, professors met through outreach, and firms. Ms. Davis noted that LinkedIn is more effective for connecting with professionals, while Instagram is better for reaching students, particularly through ASLA chapters.

Ms. Landry asked which types of enforcement cases are most common and Ms. McDaniel responded that unlicensed activity is the most frequent.

Ms. McDaniel presented certificates of recognition to Mr. Armstrong for his participation in the UCLA accreditation review and to Chair Brief for her service as the Chair during 2025.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

**The Committee took a break for lunch at 12:28 p.m. Roll was taken, and a quorum was established at 1:00 p.m.**

## **2. Review, Discuss, and Possibly Take Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board Regarding Strategic Plan Item 1.5: Research the Possibility of Establishing Continuing Education (CE) Requirements for Renewal**

Chair Brief initiated a discussion on establishing continuing education requirements. Ms. Landry expressed support, highlighting the need for ongoing education in areas such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design, compliance, irrigation, and fire management. Ms. Trauth noted that LATC has previously discussed continuing education and identified cost as a concern.

Ms. Zuniga explained that LATC would need to justify the need for continuing education, with the Committee recommending it to the Board, which would then seek legislative authority. Ms. Zuniga added that the legislature would require a clear explanation of the problem continuing education aims to address and reiterated that cost to licensees is a significant consideration. Mr. Wreschinsky emphasized that any continuing education requirements would need to be directly tied to health, safety, and welfare.

Mr. Armstrong inquired about CAB's process for continuing education. Ms. Zuniga shared that the American Institute of Architects advocated for Zero Net Carbon continuing education requirements. Tian Feng noted his observation that continuing education is commonly required by licensure boards nationwide, with only a few jurisdictions not requiring it for architects. Mr. Feng noted uncertainty about whether the same applies to landscape architects. Ms. Zuniga shared that LATC has conducted research on continuing education in the past and can provide that information to the Committee. Mr. Wreschinsky noted that licensees in multiple jurisdictions may be subject to different continuing education requirements. Mr. Armstrong suggested raising the issue with CLARB at the national level.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

### **3. Review, Discuss, and Possibly Take Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board Regarding Strategic Plan Item 3.1: Increase Outreach to Schools and Professional Associations to Improve Communication**

Ms. McDaniel reported an increase in social media outreach and shared that LATC is developing a formal outreach plan. Ms. McDaniel noted that a letter was sent to Deans of Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board accredited landscape architecture programs, with plans to send a letter each semester. Ms. McDaniel also mentioned ongoing engagement with community colleges.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

#### **I. Review, Discuss, and Possibly Take Action to Make a Recommendation to Approve UC Los Angeles Extension Certificate Program Site Review Team Recommendation**

Chair Brief recused herself from the conversations regarding the accreditation recommendation due to participation in the program. Mr. Armstrong presented the findings from the UCLA Extension Certificate Program accreditation review, as outlined in the meeting packet. Mr. Armstrong introduced Kimberly Velasco, Portfolio Director of Design Arts, and Michelle Sullivan, Chair of the Guidance Committee for the Landscape Architecture Program. Mr. Armstrong reviewed the seven standards evaluated during the site visit and summarized the Visiting Team's recommendations and suggestions for improvement:

1. UCLA Extension Certificate Program should develop and implement both a formal written Evaluation Plan for the Landscape Architecture Certification Program and a Succession Plan for key leadership roles.
2. UCLA Extension Certificate Program should develop a long-term Strategic Plan.
3. UCLA Extension Certificate Program should take immediate steps to ensure compliance with the time-based requirements outlined in the proposed regulatory standards, specifically that the Program Administrator serves a minimum half-time base and that the administrative support is maintained at a 1.0 full time equivalent.

4. UCLA Extension Certificate Program should ensure that all program policies, procedures, and evaluation processes are formally documented in written form.

The Committee reviewed and discussed the UCLA Extension Certificate Program Visiting Team Report, with Mr. Armstrong answering questions. Members discussed the report's format and agreed that amendments may be made in the future.

Ms. McDaniel explained the site visit process, noting that the Program submitted materials in advance for the Visiting Team's review. Based on the Team's findings and the Program's response, the recommendation is to grant approval with the condition of hiring a program administrator.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Michelle Sullivan introduced herself as Chair of the Guidance Committee and noted that the UCLA Extension Landscape Architecture Program is entering its 48<sup>th</sup> year, having started in 1977. Ms. Sullivan shared that she has served on the Guidance Committee for ten years, including the last five as Chair. Ms. Sullivan noted the Program's continued growth in alignment with evolving industry trends and emphasized its role in providing educational opportunities in landscape architecture to individuals who might not have otherwise had access. Ms. Sullivan also highlighted that instructors are active practitioners who bring current professional trends into the classroom. Ms. Sullivan noted that most students complete the program and are employed by graduation. She also shared that since COVID-19, the program has remained primarily online, allowing it to reach students across the U.S. Ms. Sullivan noted that the program is currently in a period of transition following the recent retirement of Stephanie Landregan, the former Director of the Landscape Architecture Program.

Kimberly Velasco expressed gratitude to the Committee and shared her appreciation for being part of the accreditation. Ms. Velasco introduced herself as the new Portfolio Director overseeing the landscape architecture program. Ms. Velasco thanked the Visiting Team for their thoughtful review and recommendations and highlighted her pride in the program's strong reputation for academic rigor, design innovation, and community impact. Ms. Velasco also noted the continued high level of student engagement across studio work, community projects, and professional networking. She provided an update on the hiring process for the program Director and offered to answer any questions from the Committee. Ms. Velasco informed the Committee that a candidate for the Director position has been identified and interviewed. Ms. Velasco shared that while the recommendation calls for 0.5 FTE, the university can only approve 0.45 FTE. Ms. Velasco noted strong support from Dean Eric Bullard, who recognizes the value of the program, which recently graduated its 47<sup>th</sup> cohort. Ms. Velasco shared that Chancellor Julio Frank introduced a new campus-wide vision called "UCLA One",

aimed at unifying the main and extension campuses. Ms. Velasco noted efforts to build partnerships with the main campus, including shared instructors and faculty. Ms. Velasco added that she and the administrative staff are working on long-term documented plans and intend to present a living document at the next accreditation period.

Ms. Trauth requested that irrigation be documented under the curriculum section.

Mr. Armstrong thanked Ms. Velasco and Ms. Sullivan for their thorough responses.

**Ms. Landry made a motion to approve the Visiting Team Recommendation to extend accreditation through December 30, 2030, which was seconded by Ms. Trauth.**

**Mr. Wreschinsky agreed to accept the motion with the condition that the program provides periodic updates on the recommendation and suggestions.**

**Ms. Landry modified her motion to include that the UCLA Extension Program will provide an annual update until the requirement is met of hiring a new Director for the Landscape Architecture Program. Ms. Trauth amended her second.**

**The Committee took a break at 1:55 p.m. Roll was taken, and a quorum was established at 2:01 p.m.**

**The motion was approved unanimously by Members Trauth, Armstrong, Wreschinsky, and Landry. The motion passed 4-0.**

## **J. Update and Discuss Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) Current Events and Committees**

### **1. Annual Meeting Update**

Ms. Zuniga reported that one person was approved to attend the CLARB Annual Meeting in Lexington, Kentucky, and that elections were held prior to the event. Ms. Zuniga shared that legislative trends were discussed and informed the Committee that she is now serving as Chair of the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards Member Board Executive Committee.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

## **K. Discussion and Possible Action on Election of Officers**

**Susan M. Landry moved to elect Pamela S. Brief as 2026 LATC Chair and Martin Armstrong as Vice Chair.**

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

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

## **L. Legislation Update and Discussion**

### **1. AB 1341 (Hoover) Contractors; Discipline: Building Law Violations**

Chair Brief reported that AB 1341 (Hoover) was previously discussed at the last meeting and that there have been no new developments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

## **M. Review and Discuss Zone Zero Defensible Space Regulation, LATC Chair, Pamela Brief**

Chair Brief reported that the Board of Forestry released an updated draft regulation and encouraged members to review it. Chair Brief clarified Zone Zero requirements, outlined the proposed three-year phased standards, and noted local discretion and possible exemptions. Chair Brief summarized four vegetation options under consideration, ranging from limited potted plants to broader vegetation with restrictions.

Members raised concerns about fencing requirements, irrigation, and impacts on homeowners. Chair Brief addressed questions about tree removal and highlighted broader health, safety, and environmental considerations. The Committee agreed to submit written comments, and Chair Brief will prepare a letter and speaking points for the upcoming Board of Forestry meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

**N. Review, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding Future Committee Meeting Dates**

Chair Brief led discussion about 2026 meeting dates. Meeting dates were established for LATC, with the following dates confirmed: January 30, 2026, May 8, 2026, and August 7, 2026.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no comments from the public.

**O. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.