

# Washington State Board for Architects meeting transcript – April 25, 2024

**Susan Cooley** (00:00:02):

Meeting of the Architect Board to order. The board will have an opportunity for public comment during the meeting. As a courtesy, we do encourage participants to mute their mics or phones when not speaking. That will help reduce the background noise when others are speaking. But please remember to unmute your microphone when you are speaking. Also for board members, to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thank you for that.

(00:00:28):

Sydney, would you at this time please call roll call and board members respond in attendance?

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:33):

Absolutely. Chair Harm?

**Scott Harm** (00:00:37):

Present.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:38):

Vice Chair Cooley?

**Susan Cooley** (00:00:40):

Present.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:41):

Board member Roberts?

**Sian Roberts** (00:00:43):

Present.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:44):

Board member Loynd?

**Erica Loynd** (00:00:46):

Present.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:47):

Board member Manley?

**Roch Manley** (00:00:50):

Present.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:51):

And board member Wu?

**Paul Wu** (00:00:53):

Present.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:00:54):

All right. We have our quorum.

**Susan Cooley** (00:00:56):

Excellent. Thank you. For the agenda, the approval of the agenda, we need a motion and a vote for approval.

**Paul Wu** (00:01:03):

I move.

**Scott Harm** (00:01:06):

I would make a motion to... Go ahead, Paul.

**Paul Wu** (00:01:12):

I move to approve the agenda as presented.

**Scott Harm** (00:01:19):

Board member Harm, I'll second that.

**Susan Cooley** (00:01:22):

Great. All favor that, say aye.

Group (00:01:57):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (00:02:01):

Any opposed?

(00:02:03):

All right. Moving forward. Approval of the minutes from January. We need a motion and a vote for approval of the minutes.

**Sian Roberts** (00:02:03):

Board member Roberts, I...

**Erica Loynd** (00:02:04):

[inaudible 00:02:04] Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

**Sian Roberts** (00:02:04):

Board member Roberts. I move we approve the minutes.

**Erica Loynd** (00:02:04):

Board member Loynd. I second the motion.

**Susan Cooley** (00:02:04):

Excellent. And all those in favor say aye.

**Group** (00:02:04):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (00:02:04):

Any opposed? Oh, sorry. Any opposed?

(00:02:04):

All right. Those motion is approved. Moving on, smoothly. Awards and recognition. So I'm going to turn this over to Sydney to present this award recognition.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:02:16):

Thank you. And this is one that is very bittersweet, I think for all of us and that we are going to be losing board member Manley this summer. So Roch has been with the Washington Board for 12 years. He started in 2012. He's been a very active participant on the board, serving as chair two separate occasions, 2015 and 2016, and then again 2022 to 2023. He's served on a lot of different projects and different committees including a law review committee as well as drafting the guidelines for building officials document that was widely used for quite a long time. Roch did share a story with our team about attending an NCARB Regional Meeting in Long Beach, California somewhere around 2015, 2016. And at the conference, Roch's cousin came down from Pasadena, California to see him and Linda and brought guitars and an accordion. And the meeting was around St. Patrick's Day and they found a quiet spot in a courtyard at the hotel to visit and play music.

(00:03:33):

And the traditional Irish and Irish rebel tunes drew out other NCARB members who were returning from dinner and they ended up having an impromptu Patrick's Day concert. And in Roch's words, most of the audience members had a couple of drinks and dinner and were making the playing and singing more bearable. So I know personally for me, Roch was a very steady guide. He was the first chair that I worked with once I came on with the board and was very patient with me while I learned and got up to speed and was a great steady guy for me. And so I really appreciated my time working with him. We're going to be very sad to lose you, Roch. So I'll turn it over to other board members and staff for anybody else who'd like to share.

**Scott Harm** (00:04:27):

This is board member Harm. I'll jump in since this is the main reason why I wanted to make the call. So Roch has been my big brother through all of this. I came on the board, I don't want to

look at the finish line yet, but shortly after Roch did. So he was always like one year ahead of me. So I held onto his coattails or in F1 racing, I slid into a slipstream to make my growth on the board go even better than I had expected. I'm going to miss him sorely, he's always been there and [inaudible 00:05:03] But yeah, I'm bittersweet to see Roch go. [inaudible 00:05:13] active in the community, recruiting people. So just a great individual. I have fond memories of the concert he's talking about. I was there, it was my first regional meeting as well, which I never realized it was both of our first ones. But yeah, Roch, you're a great individual and we wish you and Linda nothing but the best. Thanks.

**Roch Manley (00:05:35):**

Thank you Scott and thank you Sydney and everyone else for the kind words and it's mutual. It's been a great experience and I was thinking earlier today about how we meet with each other across Teams or the conference table and we're all wonderful, interesting individuals and I'm sure in other circumstances, would be good friends as well. But thank you. And yeah, the concert was fun.

**Paul Wu (00:06:24):**

Board member Wu. Roch, you are my rock. But anyway, I feel like I have a lot to learn from you and since we lost Rick two years ago and now we're losing you. But I think your legacy and your shoes are hard to fill, so I appreciate that. Thank you.

**Sian Roberts (00:06:52):**

Yeah, and this is board member Roberts. Unfortunately I started the year after Long Beach, so did not get a chance to attend that epic event that I've heard about many times. But regardless, I think it's been a real pleasure serving with you, Roch. And we will definitely miss you. Your warm welcome to other board members and your guidance and assistance has really been valuable to me and I know to others as well. So I am realizing that I don't actually have any personal contact for you, information for you. So I'm hoping that you'll reach out to those of us who've worked with you in the past so that if we happen to be down in the Vancouver area, maybe we can look you and Linda up and continue in our relationship on a different kind of level. So thank you very much, Roch. We'll miss you terribly in this forum.

**Roch Manley (00:07:49):**

Thank you, Sian. And as far as stopping by any one of you, anytime, knock on the door, give me a text, it'd be great to hear from you.

**Erica Loynd (00:08:09):**

And this is board member Loynd. I just wanted to say thank you. I didn't get an overlap with you very long, but you definitely showed me how to be a part of the board and give me some great experiences that I'll definitely try to carry on your legacy here. Thank you for that.

**Roch Manley (00:08:27):**

Thank you. Thank you Erica. And by the way, I am via phone and video because I have no idea what the feedback was about and until I turned my sound down I was getting strange feedback on your voices as well. So technology is a little over my head on this one, so I know how the phone works.

Debra (00:08:59):

Roch, I just want to express my gratitude for your service on the board as well. Appreciate it. I've appreciated it. Coming into serving you in the Architects Board in the background, I know that our predecessor Rick Storvik has very fond memories of working with the Architects Board. We've all heard him say multiple times that it was his childhood dream to be an architect and this was living vicariously. And my first opportunity to meet you in person was at Rick's retirement party where you actually drove up, you and Linda, to wish Rick a farewell that he didn't attend in person because he had COVID. So interesting times that we've been living through. But I appreciate that you have been steady on this board and that your services appreciated to the industry and to the department. So thank you.

**Roch Manley** (00:09:58):

Thank you.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:10:04):

And Roch, we do have a plaque commemorating your time with the board that **Susan Nieves** is showing right now and we'll be getting that out in the mail to you as well.

**Roch Manley** (00:10:16):

All right. [inaudible 00:10:19] much. Very exciting. 12 years on the board. Seems like I started yesterday. I think along with others we've all seen a lot of changes and gone through the COVID experience as you mentioned, Debra. And it has been an interesting journey and it's been very interesting to see how the organization NCARB has evolved and grown and the effects that that has had on us and vice versa, with the changes in the path to licensure and other aspects. So I'll miss the interactions, I'll miss the stimulating issues and I'll be brutally honest, I have not even looked at the items that are coming up for a vote in the annual business meeting, being the lame duck that I am. But I'm sure I know that the composition of the board is really strong right now and you all make very, very good decisions concerning how Washington votes and how we move forward and how the duties of the board are processed. So thank you all for continuing.

**Paul Wu** (00:12:08):

Thank you.

**Susan Cooley** (00:12:20):

Thank you again everyone for saying those kind words. And again, thank you Roch for all of your service to the board. Moving on to old business, it looks like the board members and the staff that attended the summit, the regional summit I think is **Sian Roberts**. Would you like to provide a report out for the regional summit this year?

**Sian Roberts** (00:12:53):

Sure, happy to do that. And if Scott is still there and listening, he can pipe in whenever he wants.

**Scott Harm** (00:13:02):

I'll jump in.

**Sian Roberts** (00:13:02):

The big news of course is that I was elected as an at-large member of our regional board, so yay me.

**Roch Manley** (00:13:13):

Congratulations.

**Sian Roberts** (00:13:15):

Thank you. And Scott of course was [inaudible 00:13:21] I guess for his position as a regional chair for this year. So that was good. So we are well represented in regional leadership now that also, by the way, I believe means that we both get funded by NCARB for going to these events.

**Scott Harm** (00:13:42):

One small correction, sorry to interrupt, but I'm not the chair of the regional board.

**Sian Roberts** (00:13:47):

Oh, sorry.

**Scott Harm** (00:13:48):

[inaudible 00:13:48] the board of directors we have.

**Sian Roberts** (00:13:49):

Sorry. You're right. You are our regional director at... Yes, sorry. Yes, exactly. You are regional director on the national board of directors. There are so many leadership positions in this organization, it's really hard to keep track.

**Scott Harm** (00:14:06):

Tell me about it.

**Sian Roberts** (00:14:12):

So that was all positive. Let's see, there was a lot of discussion of the resolutions, which I don't necessarily want to get into because I know we have them coming up as a discussion point. So I'll share what we heard there as we go through those resolutions. But there was a lot of discussion, for instance, of the regional realignment and those kinds of things. There was discussion about... And in that there was discussion about the value of the regions and what the regions actually provide, which I thought was interesting. We did have a couple of breakout sessions where we talked about a couple of topics. We did talk about AI again as always, and I'm not sure a whole lot came out of that beyond what I've heard in other forums. But let's see. There was some questions about whether that was going to change the standard of care ultimately and how we address issues of licensure with the adoption of AI and how far that goes and how quickly that might go and how it might impact in NCARB's programs.

(00:15:28):

And then the other big topic, the session that I attended that I thought was probably the most valuable, was the incidental practice. So there is a work group that is currently looking at incidental practice and I know that has been something that we have been interested in and addressing for a while. There've been a lot of questions about this. Specifically for us, it's been more about engineering and architecture. So Bob Calvani has been on this task force that has been working with engineer board organization and interior design board organization and landscape architects as well to talk about how do we understand where we can overlap but where we shouldn't overlap, where we have jurisdiction, where we don't have jurisdiction. So it sounds like we're making a lot of progress. I think that they're really interested to see what they come up with. They are right at the end right now. They should be producing something pretty quickly for us to see this year. And he said that there would be something at the annual business meeting, a workshop to talk about this.

(00:16:32):

It felt like it was going in a really good direction in terms of just getting more specific. But I think their biggest challenge has been in the interior design realm that there's been some... That's been the most friction and the hardest for them to be able to understand and resolve and come to agreement on. Of course that's irrelevant to us because we don't actually even license interior designers here in Washington state. So I'm just hopeful that they can get over whatever that is and show us what they've come up with and what they've agreed to with the engineers and the landscape architects because that could really help support us in communicating with building officials about and potentially impacting our lawn being a little bit more clear about where engineering and architecture can overlap and where they can't.

**Scott Harm** (00:17:23):

So I don't remember... If I can just jump in and add a footnote.

**Sian Roberts** (00:17:28):

Yep.

**Scott Harm** (00:17:29):

I can't remember, Sian, if you went, so excuse me. But board member Wu and I attended the last Washington Association of Building Officials meeting over in Spokane and Paul, you can remember that all these building officials are looking for guidance from people like us, especially the smaller jurisdictions where they're not only the building department plans again or they're the site inspectors and fire marshal sometimes. So I spoke up and said it's really important that we finish this work because there are individuals out in the field who really do need some guidance because they feel overwhelmed and fear that they're going to make a life altering decision in the wrong way.

**Sian Roberts** (00:18:11):

Yep. Yes, agreed. There was talk about the green book kind of thing, the red book, green book, whatever we want to call it, thing that we talked about, and the concerns about what that would look like and or what might come out of something like that and the need to really have something more definitive that we can actually implement beyond a guidance document, but something that is clearer for our laws. So I think that's... I'm very excited about that. I think that

could be... Who knows what will come out of it? But from what I was hearing from Bob, it sounded like they were getting somewhere they were getting to a good point. There was one thing that we did go and talk... I will say that it is often difficult to understand what kind of disciplinary action is appropriate and as we are looking at cases, and I did talk to somebody from Arizona...

(00:19:15):

Scott, you were in that conversation as well, that they have some guidance, some sort of informal guidance that I thought might be helpful for us to be able to think about just in terms of making sure that we're clear about what's appropriate. We haven't really done... It's been a while since we've had a disciplinary action that has required some sort of fine or fee and I believe that there is some sort of understanding of what that looks like from the attorney's side. But anyway, I just thought it was helpful that they seem to have some sort of a... I'm not going to say a table because obviously everything is... Each situation is individual, but some sort of understanding of what was an appropriate level of disciplinary action for particular issues. So anyway, I just thought that might be something. That was something that kind of made me think, "Oh, do we have something like that in place? Should we have something like that in place or should we discuss that?" So that was just one question mark that came out for me in the meeting.

(00:20:17):

And then beyond that, I think everything I had was related to the actual resolutions. Scott, did you have anything that you wanted to add?

**Scott Harm** (00:20:25):

The only thing I was real excited to see is we had our first round of contested elections where more volunteers came up than were positions. And then the real big thing for me is at the national level, the at large member is... Oh gosh, nine, I think nine applicants for just a couple positions. And so we did hear some nominating speeches from each of the candidates. I think they're available for video download if you're so inclined. But I think it's an exciting time at the national level that we're really restructuring the leadership and opening it up to more opportunities, some more equity and diversity, all things good. So I'm pretty excited to see that transpire during our tenure being board members.

**Sian Roberts** (00:21:23):

Yeah, totally agree. It was great to hear all of the candidates for the at-large positions and there's some very strong people in there and I guess that we're going to have to make a decision on who we are voting for in that election. So we'll want to talk about what this board's thoughts are about. I don't know if anybody's had a chance to look through or give any thought to that. Usually these elections are performative so that we already have who is... We just go there and vote and there isn't really a question or maybe there's two and they're very similar and it's not that big a deal. Here, we really have a very diverse group of people coming with different experiences and skills to the table for these at-large positions and whoever's there is going to have to obviously make the call as the voting delegate.

**Susan Cooley** (00:22:17):

[inaudible 00:22:20]

**Scott Harm** (00:22:19):

Yeah, and I'm going to unfortunately have to drop off in about five minutes.

**Susan Cooley** (00:22:30):

We can move on pretty quickly to the next thing of new business if we're done with that.

**Sian Roberts** (00:22:35):

Mm-hmm.

**Susan Cooley** (00:22:36):

Which is the election of officers for the upcoming year. So at the second meeting of the year, the board holds elections for chair, vice chair and secretary for the following 12 months. I'm just going to let everybody know that I am resigning my position as a public member, so I'm not going to be up for election. So this has... In the past, it's gone through a succession plan, but I think at this point I think we can open this up for nominations for each position or if somebody's interested to nominate themselves, I believe. But what we'll start with is we would need to do a motion and a vote for each position. And so maybe we'll start with the secretary or do we want to start with the chair? Do we have a preference? You want to just start with chair?

**Scott Harm** (00:23:27):

So I would love it if someone volunteered. [inaudible 00:23:38] I apologize in advance, but I'd like to nominate Sian Roberts as the chair.

**Susan Cooley** (00:23:45):

Sian, do you accept that nomination for chair?

**Sian Roberts** (00:23:48):

Yes, I do accept the nomination. Thank you, Scott. I appreciate that.

**Susan Cooley** (00:23:52):

Do we have a second?

**Paul Wu** (00:23:53):

I second that nomination.

**Susan Cooley** (00:23:56):

Board member Wu?

**Paul Wu** (00:23:57):

Board member Wu second that nomination.

**Susan Cooley** (00:23:59):

Thank you. And then let's vote on that then. All in favor say aye.

Group (00:24:04):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (00:24:06):

Any opposed?

(00:24:10):

Thank you. Board member **Sian Roberts**...

**Sian Roberts** (00:24:14):

Roberts.

**Susan Cooley** (00:24:15):

... Will be the chair. Sorry, I know your first name. I don't always connect it with the last name. Sorry about that. So board member Roberts will be the chair for the upcoming year and now we'll open up to vice chair position. Do I have any nominations?

**Roch Manley** (00:24:36):

This is Roch. [inaudible 00:24:41] but I'd nominate Paul. Paul Wu for vice chair.

**Sian Roberts** (00:24:47):

I second that nomination.

**Susan Cooley** (00:24:50):

Board member Wu, is that okay? Do you accept that nomination?

**Paul Wu** (00:24:55):

I will tend to decline that nomination for this year. I'm still quite busy and heavily involved in what I'm doing right now with a group of students, so I would like to defer that. Sorry about that. Appreciate your nomination.

**Susan Cooley** (00:25:18):

Do we have another motion on the floor for vice chair?

**Sian Roberts** (00:25:21):

I nominate board member Loynd as vice chair.

**Erica Loynd** (00:25:27):

I accept that nomination.

**Susan Cooley** (00:25:31):

We have a second for that?

**Roch Manley** (00:25:34):

I would second that nomination. This is Roch.

**Susan Cooley** (00:25:36):

Thank you. All right, let's vote for board member Loynd to be vice chair. All in favor say aye.

Group (00:25:43):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (00:25:43):

Thank you. Any opposed?

(00:25:50):

That motion is carried for board member to be vice chair. And now let's open it up for secretary position.

**Sian Roberts** (00:26:01):

I think we are either... Paul, are you also too busy to take on the secretary? It sounds like you are. Yes.

**Paul Wu** (00:26:15):

I will take on the secretary position.

**Sian Roberts** (00:26:20):

You will?

**Paul Wu** (00:26:20):

I agree to do that, yes.

**Sian Roberts** (00:26:20):

Okay, great. Then I nominate...

**Paul Wu** (00:26:20):

It's a lot for me to learn.

**Sian Roberts** (00:26:20):

I nominate Paul Wu as a secretary for the upcoming year.

**Scott Harm** (00:26:26):

This is board member Harm. I'll second that.

**Susan Cooley** (00:26:29):

Excellent, thank you. All those in favor of board member Wu being secretary, please say aye.

Group (00:26:33):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (00:26:37):

Any opposed?

(00:26:39):

All right, motion has passed for board member who to be secretary. Thank you guys for both your nominations and your acceptance for taking on those roles for next year.

**Scott Harm** (00:26:49):

Double that. Thank you very much.

**Susan Cooley** (00:26:55):

Moving on to the next annual business meeting, Susan Nieves, will you please lead the discussion on this for the new business, for the annual business meeting?

**Susan Nieves** (00:27:09):

Yeah, sure. So the annual business meeting will be in Chicago from June 13th through the 15th. The travel dates will be June 12th through 16th. It's the same funding structure from the spring meeting and Susan Cooley is resigning so she will not be attending as the public member. We have... Someone from our licensing unit will be representing as the executive board member. And we currently don't qualify for the new board member. So through the NCARB funding, two licensed board members can attend. So the board will have to make a determination on who they would like to send through the funding with NCARB and also determine a delegate and an alternate, which will require a motion and a vote. So I'll turn it over to the board to discuss who would like to attend.

**Scott Harm** (00:28:09):

And this is board member harm. I've got to sign off real quick, but this is a reminder. I'm funded from NCARB National so I don't come out of the coffers for the state, but don't de facto think that I would be one of our funded delegates because that's already taken care of.

**Sian Roberts** (00:28:27):

Are you up though... Since you're going to be gone, are you able to be a voting delegate or an alternate?

**Scott Harm** (00:28:34):

Yeah, I believe so. Yeah. I've checked the rules in fear that we weren't going to have a robust team this year. So yeah. Yes.

**Sian Roberts** (00:28:43):

Okay.

**Scott Harm** (00:28:44):

Yep.

**Sian Roberts** (00:28:46):

Thank you.

**Erica Loynd** (00:28:46):

This is board member Loynd. I was hoping that I would be able to go this year because I've not been able to go to one yet. So I was hopeful to go and be able to see what or meet the people and get involved in the activities.

**Sian Roberts** (00:29:06):

And this is a board member Roberts. I'd like to put my name in as well. We are going to be doing an activity related to the competency task force that I've been on, so I'd appreciate being able to participate in that activity. I don't know if I'll be there for the voting though, so that's my limitation on my participation if I go.

**Paul Wu** (00:29:36):

If we have funding for one more member, I would like to participate in as well, but only if we have the funding for it.

**Susan Cooley** (00:29:48):

Sian, did you mention that your travel is funded or no?

**Sian Roberts** (00:29:53):

It is not. I have not been told that my travel is funded yet, so I don't believe that I will be funded for that activity.

**Scott Harm** (00:29:59):

You're the chair of that group, right? [inaudible 00:30:06] chair?

**Sian Roberts** (00:30:08):

Yes, But I don't know if the chairs get funded. I haven't been told that. Although I was last year. That's right. I was last year.

**Scott Harm** (00:30:18):

Trust me. Yeah, I would commit to trying to myself finding that out but I'm going to be in the air. Paul, if you're willing to hang on the balcony per se, I don't know what the correct reference is, but if we can verify because Sian might be covered as the chair.

**Paul Wu** (00:30:37):

I'll be willing to be the backup. If we do have funding, I will attend.

**Sian Roberts** (00:30:42):

Okay, that sounds good. I'll see... I guess I'll reach out to NCARB, Scott. I'll just go ahead and reach out. Although it sounds like they might be busy with the board meeting, but I'll reach out and see if that's going to happen.

**Scott Harm** (00:30:55):

Yep. And if push comes to shove, again, I'll be there in the morning, I can broadcast in the mail out to a few people. I can confirm it.

(00:31:04):

... Broadcasted it in the mail to a few people. I can confirm it if you haven't done so. Okay, I'm going to sign off then. Thank you.

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:31:04]

**Sian Roberts** (00:31:08):

Great, thank you.

**Susan Cooley** (00:31:09):

Thanks for that.

**Sian Roberts** (00:31:10):

So as far as this goes, then I'll go ahead and confirm, see if I can get funded and if I can, then board member Wu, I'll let you know and Sydney and we'll go from there. Sound good?

**Paul Wu** (00:31:26):

I agree. Yes.

**Susan Cooley** (00:31:30):

Sounds good. Are you good with that, Susan and Sydney?

**Susan Nieves** (00:31:34):

Well, we'll need a motion and a vote and the delegate is pretty important for casting its vote as the annual business meeting. I believe Scott Harm could be the delegate and he's funded, or if it's Erica or Sian or possibly Roch, or excuse me, Paul.

**Sian Roberts** (00:31:56):

I move that... Should I just make one big motion for this? Does that work?

**Susan Nieves** (00:32:03):

Sure. Okay.

**Sian Roberts** (00:32:05):

So I move that the funded delegates for NCARB's annual Business meeting be Board Member Loynd and either Board Member Roberts or Board Member Wu, depending on alternative funding for Board Member Roberts and I move that Board Member Harm, be our voting delegate with board member Loynd as our alternate.

**Erica Loynd** (00:32:35):

I second that motion in its entirety.

**Susan Cooley** (00:32:39):

Thank you. All right, so all those in favor of that motion, please say aye.

**Sian Roberts** (00:32:44):

Aye.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:32:44):

Aye.

**Paul Wu** (00:32:44):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (00:32:47):

Is there any opposed? All right. Motion carried. Thank you for that. Thank you for all that discussion as well. All right, moving on to outreach of schools. We need to discuss the outreach plan for Washington Schools, and I'm going to turn this over to **Susan Nieves** to lead that discussion.

**Susan Nieves** (00:33:06):

I think we have a couple more, excuse me, items with the annual business meeting.

**Susan Cooley** (00:33:13):

Oh, determine the list of nominees and how to direct their votes. My apologies on that. I missed a bullet here. Do we want to discuss the resolutions for the direction of the vote at this point?

**Susan Nieves** (00:33:33):

Yeah, so the NCARB annual business meeting, they have eight proposed resolutions and our delegates about harm will be voting for this board in regards to those eight resolutions. So the eight resolutions, the first four are listed on the screen there, and in the packet was detailed information regarding the eight resolutions. So the board would discuss the resolutions and how they would like to direct their votes at the annual business meeting. So if the board would like to have a discussion regarding the resolutions, it sounded like board member Roberts had some pretty big insights to the different resolutions.

**Sian Roberts** (00:34:20):

Yes, I could maybe talk us through them maybe one by one and just have a discussion about each. And if we have any preference, we can pass that on to... Well, Erica can maybe be the one that keeper of the keeper of our recommendations for voting purposes. So since Scott, I believe, has probably left us by now, so the first resolutions are 24A and 24B. and if you are interested in doing a deep dive on these, I would not prevent you from it. However, these are resolutions that the policy advisory committee looks at on an annual basis. What they're trying to do is clean up all of the old resolutions that no longer apply to NCARB's current practices and eliminate them.

(00:35:21):

So both of both A and B are clean-up efforts. And I would recommend that one of the policy advisory committee members was in our regional meeting and was very confident that these were going to help NCARB move forward without a lot of loose ends that don't conform with what they currently do. So it's about sun setting basically and would recommend that we go ahead and vote in the affirmative for 2024 A and B. Any discussion on this? Those are the easiest ones.

(00:36:05):

C and D are MRAs related to our mutual recognition agreements with other countries. And so C is for the agreement we currently have with Australia and New Zealand. And I believe that this is an update, I think it might've expired and it's just a renewal of that agreement, but as what I think is really positive about this is that as we are renewing these agreements and NCARB is working to try to make sure that we are able to insert alternative pathways as much as possible with each agreement with each other jurisdiction.

(00:36:46):

So I personally don't see... I would tend to vote in favor of C, but these did definitely spark more conversation among the group. So I don't know if people have had a chance to look at it in detail, but obviously we have the ability to make any decision we want as a board. So this is just whether NCARB is accepting this for the certificate purposes. And yeah. Sydney, I see you nodding if you want to add anything here in terms of what the impact of adopting or not adopting these resolutions, I think we went through this in the last meeting about how does this actually work and what does it mean if we adopt it? Do we have to adopt it? What does our procedure for candidates who might come from New Zealand with, for instance, a NCARB certificate?

**Sydney Muhle** (00:37:43):

I would be happy to address that. And so yes, board member Roberts is correct. At this point, this is just creating the pathway for each individual jurisdiction to then sign on to these mutual recognition agreements. The jurisdictions are not required to sign on to these just because we vote in favor of them. This is just creating that pathway at the NCARB level and then once those agreements have been approved, we'll bring them back to the board to sign on.

(00:38:09):

I do think that this is a really positive step and I'm not 100% certain what it would look like for an architect from Australia or New Zealand or I believe Canada and Mexico are also up for this discussion as well. So we're still going to have to look at what that's going to look like internally process-wise, but I believe it would look very similar to what it is right now for any applicant using alternative pathways from within the United States to be able to apply within Washington State.

(00:38:48):

So we'll look at that and we can bring back additional information once those MRAs have been approved at the NCARB level and we'll certainly bring back that information when we put it forward to the board for your consideration. But I do think that this is a very, very positive step forward that we're seeing that as these mutual recognitions are coming up for re-approval or if they're sunset, being expanded to include those alternative pathways, I think that's

something that NCARB has been telling us we're going to pursue it and it's just kind of been waiting, hoping that they will. And I think this is kind of seeing that come to fruition. They are, as those are coming up, and they're able to show the different jurisdictions what that looks like, that they're pushing hard for alternative pathways to be included. So they're hearing that discussion among member boards and are utilizing that in these moving forward. So hopefully we'll see it in more.

**Paul Wu (00:39:57):**

Board member Wu here. I have a couple of comments on this. Specifically, this is only addressing the NCARB agreements. It doesn't address the state licensure requirements, is that correct?

**Sian Roberts (00:40:15):**

It allows them to have an NCARB certificate.

**Paul Wu (00:40:19):**

But beyond that, to be licensed in each state, each state has the additional layer of requirements that we can add to that. Is that correct?

**Sian Roberts (00:40:32):**

Well, let Sydney answer that.

**Sydney Muhle (00:40:37):**

Yes. Within reason, it looks a little bit different for each jurisdiction, but the long and short answer is yes, we do. So just like we had discussed with the UK agreement, I know there were concerns about someone being able to obtain an NCARB certificate when maybe the education requirements were less than what they are here in the United States. And so yes, that is an option that the board would have with these agreements down the line. So at this point in the... Go ahead.

**Paul Wu (00:41:09):**

Board member Wu here, two specific requirements as that's sort of important for our state is one is the alternative pathways, the other one is the working experience post-academic experience. So those two items, I want to make sure that we have those in place based on my experience with what you get out of a formal education for our profession. So I do want to make sure that we include those requirements in the future discussions.

**Sydney Muhle (00:41:48):**

We can absolutely bring those back once these MRAs are approved at the NCARB level and we bring them back for board consideration, we'll be sure to bring back what that looks like for each jurisdiction as we present that information to you.

**Sian Roberts (00:42:02):**

I guess what would be helpful, because I think the way it works now is that if you have an NCARB certificate, you come in, that's kind of you ticket in, you then do your state law exam and you pay your fee and you're in. And so what we would have to do if we wanted to not

accept these people for one reason or another would be to put some sort of flag on any NCARB certificate that comes from any of these jurisdictions, is that correct? And then do an additional review. Is that possible or not?

**Sydney Muhle** (00:42:36):

I would have to chat with Elizabeth about what that would look like. We also have to make sure that we are applying this equitably. So by assuming that all of these MRAs are approved at the NCARB level and that the board has the opportunity to sign onto them, then we have to make sure that we are equitably applying that. So at the end carb level, they've looked at these and they have established what the equivalency is to get that end carb certificate very similarly to what they have here in the United States.

(00:43:10):

So different jurisdictions here in the US have different experience requirements and maybe different education requirements, but that NCARB certificate allows somebody just to, as board member Roberts indicated, that's kind of the golden ticket that they get to come in and say, I have the end carb certificate and that gets transferred anywhere. So we'll have to look at that with the AG's office and what that looks like. So we just have to make sure that we're applying it equitably and we can't exclude somebody simply because of where they're based in the world.

**Sian Roberts** (00:43:46):

My understanding from our last meeting, and maybe I got this wrong, was that we didn't even really have to sign on to an agreement because basically if somebody has an NCARB certificate, they have an NCARB certificate. So I guess maybe some sort of clarification on this. I think what I'm picturing in my mind is NCARB, like you said, has gone through and vetted the experience and the education for each jurisdiction and basically they're saying it's equivalent.

(00:44:18):

So Paul, there's a very rigorous process that NCARB goes through. That doesn't mean that we are comfortable with it, but it does mean that N CARB is comfortable with it. So I feel like if we have any concerns, it would have to come from us that we feel like this particular jurisdiction does not meet our criteria for some reason. And then we would have to, as you said, equitably say that they would have to, for instance, not enough education.

(00:44:53):

There's not enough experience in the New Zealand process for us to feel comfortable with. So anyone from New Zealand has to demonstrate they have three years of experience. We'd have to have something like that, I would think. But at this point, I don't want to go down that path until we've reviewed these and there's a board member has a concern about any particular one of them. It feels like that's the place to start because the default is they get their certificate and they're able to come in and likewise, we get our certificate and we're able to go there. So I guess what I'm suggesting is that as we move, and I will tell you that there are going to be more of these because End Carb is actively talking to other jurisdictions across the globe, so we should develop what we are comfortable with as a board for a procedure here. I think it would start by board members reviewing these documents and identifying any concerns they might have.

**Erica Loynd** (00:46:05):

This is board member Loynd. Was it bringing to my mind that if you have an NCARB certificate but didn't have a NAAB accredited degree, there are some states that don't accept that we do, but I know Oregon does not. But you still would have an NCARB certificate and be submitted to the state and then they would go through it and say, "Yes, you have an NCARB certificate, but it does not include a NCARB accredited degree, so therefore does not cross over." So I believe there are jurisdictions that already have it that are within America and a similar process to that, that would happen with an MRA.

**Sian Roberts** (00:46:41):

That's exactly what I was thinking, Erica, that we would have some sort of control at the staff level that would flag a candidate and say, "Oh, this candidate doesn't have whatever." And so even though they have an NCARB right now, anybody who has an NCARB certificate is good here, but there are states where yes, you're right, they do. It's not just good enough to have an NCARB certificate. You also have to meet other state requirements.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:47:12):

And when these MRAs are approved, I want to try and keep us on track that we don't want to go too far down the path because we're not quite there yet.

**Sian Roberts** (00:47:22):

Correct.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:47:22):

But we can certainly bring back all of that information as well as some additional information from our licensing team on what that looks like and how they flag those and if there's additional reviews, anything like that. And we'll bring all of that back for you for consideration with each of these.

**Roch Manley** (00:47:39):

This is Roch. Just some comments on the discussion. As Sian said, it's probably a good idea to review the mutual recognition agreements and ferret out any concerns that you might have. And if possible, having a direct conversation with NCARB if there are questions and doubts, having a direct conversation with an NCARB representative and asking those questions directly to help the board understand if those are issues for members of the board or not, might be a thought.

(00:48:29):

The other thoughts, let's see. It actually slips my mind at the moment, but yeah, following up on these items with NCARB, if there are questions. The other thought, if the board did decide to put more requirements or restrictions on certificate-holding foreign architects who are applying under these agreements or believe they're applying under these agreements to the state of Washington, we should be aware of whether that would require a rule or law change to be able to enforce or apply those restrictions that the board might have in mind.

**Sian Roberts** (00:49:31):

Good point, Roch.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:49:33):

And I do believe it would require a rule change to add any additional restrictions. I believe that came out of the discussion with Elizabeth at our last meeting. But I will double-check with her once these come back.

**Sian Roberts** (00:49:47):

I guess the upshot that I'm hearing is I feel like this board. After the annual business meeting, when we find out if these have been ratified by NCARB, it would be up to us to as a board to review each of these in detail and determine whether we believe there's a reason for adding another step and then that would open up a whole other can of worms. But let's start by do we need to open that can of worms? Does that sound like a good path forward on this?

**Paul Wu** (00:50:23):

Yes, I agree.

**Sian Roberts** (00:50:27):

Yeah. Back to the individual resolutions. The first one is a re-upping of the MRA with New Zealand and Australia. I personally believe that we should vote yes on this. And the second one is a little more complicated because it's a new one and it's with Taiwan. And there were quite a few discussions about the political uncertainty in Taiwan and who we were making the agreement with and whether that could change if the political situation in Taiwan changes. I think the upshot from NCARB was, well, if that changes, then it changes our agreement kind of thing, but there was still a little bit of maybe discomfort among some board members about who we were entering this agreement with and whether political changes in Taiwan would make us not as comfortable with this agreement. There were others who said we should support the Taiwan's National Association of Architects currently as they are and recognize architects from that area. So I bring that up. I personally, again, am in favor of voting for this, but I'm definitely open to hearing what the rest of the board feels and thinks about both of these.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:52:03):

And if I can jump in really quick, just from my perspective as an MBE, I think it's important, and I understand all of the political issues surrounding this particular one, and I think NCARB has been very painfully aware of that all along. But I think from, or I want to caution the board to, if we can, try and remove some of that political discussion from it and treat it a little bit more dispassionately and in that as it stands currently today, this is another nation that we would be looking at having a mutual recognition agreement period and then we can look at the standards and all of that.

(00:52:57):

But just trying to approach this from a little bit more of a business perspective in the business of the board is this increases your licensee base by one other country should the board sign on to this down the line. So just wanted to throw that little piece of caution out there that I think it's wise to remove some of that political discussion from it at this particular point, understanding that down the line if and when those factors come into play, NCARB is aware of those and then

there will be ways for NCARB to address it and ways for individual restrictions to address it with NCARB specifically, one direction or another.

**Sian Roberts** (00:53:41):

Thank you for the caution. I'm relaying the discussion board.

**Paul Wu** (00:53:48):

Yeah, board member Wu here. I would like to chime in. I think both of the resolution C and D should be treated the same way and leave layer of control at the state level will be fine. I think this goes in both directions, both us in the states to be mutually agreed in other countries as well as the reciprocity process. So I think we should, again, emphasize the need for additional layer of investigation and approvals before we go ahead, just blind accept everybody.

**Sian Roberts** (00:54:37):

Am I hearing you that approving these or voting yes for these in the annual business meeting and then reviewing and determining what is appropriate for our state afterwards is the way to go. Is that what I'm hearing you recommend?

**Paul Wu** (00:54:56):

Yes, I do.

**Sian Roberts** (00:54:57):

Because treating the same would be voting yes on both and then addressing specifics at the state level later on?

**Paul Wu** (00:55:04):

That's correct, yes.

**Sian Roberts** (00:55:19):

Any other thoughts on yay or nay on these resolutions for our state?

**Erica Loynd** (00:55:26):

This is board member Loynd, your point, I remember who is very noted and I feel like the one for Australia New Zealand has more conversation and things. The one for Taiwan and I may have missed conversations happened earlier, but this one is new and there's a lot more kind of those considerations, and I do agree they should be treated the same, but there's the other side of... And I do trust NCARB to do the vetting and doing the comparatives to make sure the level of scope is similar or certifiable, but there's a certain amount of review of understanding so that it isn't a constant flow of yes and carb is ratifying them and making them clear.

(00:56:16):

And then it's the state's obligation to that. Then I think there is a certain amount of real understanding of what is the difference between... and this example, the Taiwanese and the Australia New Zealand agreement and participating in just understanding what that may mean. I

think having a little bit of due diligence of how many MRAs are in the works are getting created is important.

**Sydney Muhle** (00:56:44):

And I meant to point this out earlier in board member Roberts discussion on these, but we also always have the option to... Or maybe it was Roch that brought it up, we always have the option to invite and carbon to our meetings and they've offered several times, particularly when we were talking about the UK agreement, they offered to come to our meetings several times and so we'd be happy to have them come, if and when, assuming these are approved, we're happy to invite them to that meeting and that way you guys can ask them questions about the vetting process and what that looked like, any others that are coming up and just kind of get a better feel for what's happening at their level and how they go through these processes.

**Erica Loynd** (00:57:34):

And one question, follow up question from board member Loynd, at the agenda for the meeting in Chicago, they are going to be presenting these and that information before the voting happens? Correct? So we go prepared with our questions and then have the discussion there before the voting.

**Sian Roberts** (00:57:52):

There is an opportunity for discussion on these, honestly, the amount of work that NCARB does behind the scenes to vet these things, there's just not enough insight into all of that. But there is discussion I would highly recommend if you have any questions or concerns that you do a detailed review of all the information you get from it, because there's a lot for each one of these that you do a detailed review of that and you have some very specific questions to ask. I think it's on our... I guess what I'm trying to say is on us to kind of understand what is in there and then to ask the questions that we need to feel comfortable.

**Erica Loynd** (00:58:29):

I do-

**Sydney Muhle** (00:58:34):

Oh, I was just going to add to that. I believe each of the MRAs also spells out the equivalency pieces pretty clearly. It does look different across each jurisdiction, but I think NCARB's eventual goal way down the line is to create some more universal standards and try to elevate the profession as a whole up to a certain level to where architects are operating generally in the same sphere across the world.

(00:59:06):

So I think that is their pipe dream high in the sky down the line, but this is small baby steps to that. But yeah, those are spelled out very clearly in those MRAs. And then anytime you have questions, you can always contact council relations at NCARB and they usually have resource documents available that they can share back with you on what it took for them to get to this point.

**Erica Loynd** (00:59:37):

Yeah, it's board member Loynd I totally appreciate the amount of work they put into this. They want to elevate this as much as anybody else does. It's very important to them and it's a huge undertaking. Very good. Thank you.

**Sian Roberts** (00:59:50):

I do appreciate that. Maybe we should circle back maybe sometime, maybe the fall meeting or something, having somebody from NCARB to walk through some of this with us, if we spend the time getting prepared for that, I think would be really valuable for us to understand where this is headed and try to figure out, not try to react every time one of these comes through, but have a level of confidence and an understanding of what our process should be.

**Paul Wu** (01:00:16):

Board member Wu, I totally agree with your assessment and the plan of action here. I think this is one of the more principle duties that we have as a board to make sure that all the licensures are done properly. So I do agree that we should proceed.

**Sian Roberts** (01:00:48):

Okay. Any real concerns about these two aside from the ones we've discussed? Okay, should we move on? All right, the next one is Canada and Mexico, which is pretty much the same discussion we just had, I think. All right. So this one received a lot of discussion as well, not because of the way it's been described here, but because of the way it actually reads. I believe this is the one that says that you only have to have graduated from high school or have a GED in order to have access to the exam. So that is what the actual change to the language is. This is really opening up the IPAL approach to anyone, right? So it's an alternative pathway fix. So it allows people-

(01:02:03):

Alternative pathway fix. So it allows people to not have to have that degree beyond, not to have that secondary degree at any level in order to have access to take the exam. There were many people who were concerned... I wouldn't say many. They were people who were concerned that people were going to graduate from high school and take the ARE, which I think many of us felt was that's probably very, very unlikely. And if an individual can pass the ARE as a nineteen-year-old, more power to them.

(01:02:36):

But there are other steps you have to go through to get licensed. So in my mind, although it does read like, "Wow, all you have to do is graduate from high school to have access to the ARE," I believe that it is keeping with our efforts to open alternative pathways to licensure and that is where it's come from. Any concerns about this one?

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [01:02:04]

**Roch Manley** (01:03:26):

This is Roch. Not a concern, but just I know some of us have been serving on other NCARP committees such as yourself, Sian, and some of the discussions that are coming out of the committee work enlightening this resolution F, are kind of interesting. One of the points it's

brought up is no, a high school graduate is not going to be able to apply to take the exam and then successfully complete and pass the exam. That's just not going to happen. They probably would not want to put down the coin to try to make that happen and it would be a bit of a wasted effort.

(01:04:20):

But some of, just loosely, some of the interesting discussion that I've heard looks at working with the path to licensure to open it up to equivalent evaluations, but different approaches to that evaluation, at least on the experience side. So it's really interesting what's coming and you all should be seeing some really good, interesting changes and improvements and modifications as you go forward on the board and in your association with NCARB, so I'm excited for you all.

**Sian Roberts** (01:05:27):

Thanks, Roch. So I don't hear any concerns about this one. This was F, so if it's okay, I'll move on to G. So G also provoked quite a bit of debate and I would imagine that there may be some amendments to this as we go forward. Well, those who are attending the annual business meeting, we'll have to look out for last minute amendments to this.

(01:05:57):

Basically it has to do with... It really has to do with the national board. Again, NCARB is a little highly focused on leadership and this is sort of the result of mixing up the board, basically, and looking to be able to open up board leadership to more than just member board members who have gone up through the regional leadership process.

(01:06:25):

So this is a little bit of a check on this and this is saying should, it's a question of whether the executive committee of the national board, so secretary, secretary, treasurer, incoming president, president, whether any of those positions should require an NCARB certificate. And so there's a couple of complexities to this that I didn't really understand at the time, but basically, if it is required that the NCARB certificate, if the NCARB certificate is required for somebody to elevate onto the executive committee, then that means that for instance, the public member cannot be a member of the executive committee.

(01:07:11):

And I think it's basically saying if you are a part of the executive committee, you should be invested enough in NCARB to hold a certificate. Number one, you should be an architect, you should be invested enough to hold an NCARB certificate and it wouldn't be appropriate for somebody who wasn't an architect and wasn't an NCARB certificate holder to be in that level of leadership.

(01:07:37):

The other caveat to that is that there are some people who cannot get NCARB certificates for various strange reasons and there is a member on the national board right now for whom that applies. So they got their degree in California at some point when they didn't have the ARE, there's a random time period in there and they were unable to get NCARB certificate anyway,

they've worked through it, they've got an NCARB certificate, everything's going to be fine, but those little issues started to pop up.

(01:08:19):

So the way this is reading now is, and so there's a lot of debate and there's a crazy amount of debate about this just so you know. So this is why I'm saying I would not be surprised to see some type of edit to this before we get there, but right now it's saying if you're an architect, you need to hold the certificate. So that opens the door for a public member, for instance, to come in. It doesn't open the door for the person who is an architect and for whatever reason could not manage to get the NCARB certificate.

(01:08:54):

So that's how it's currently reading. As I said, I think there's going to... I already know that there have been some amendments proposed to this to try to require that, at least at the president level or whatever, that they be a certificate holder. So any thoughts about whether there should be a limitation at that level and if so, what it should look like?

**Erica Loynd** (01:09:22):

This is board member Loynd. Being that it is an NCARB affiliated board, to me, it doesn't seem like a cumbersome thing to say that you should have and hold the documentation that shows that you abide by the NCARB's basis for architecture. If they were to say that you couldn't act on any board that was related to the practice of architecture, say the Washington State Board or the Academy of Institute or American Institute for Architecture or something, I think that would be over-stretching and kind of imposing their reach on other organizations, but this is NCARB, so NCARB has this as their baseline of criteria for credentials. It makes sense to ask the members to hold it.

**Sian Roberts** (01:10:14):

What do you think about a public member? We've had some very strong-

**Erica Loynd** (01:10:18):

Yeah, a public member being, the point of them is they're not an architect, so they wouldn't have the criteria that makes sense to have them exempted from it. Yes.

**Sian Roberts** (01:10:27):

And that you would feel comfortable having a public member be president of NCARB, like a non-architect, be president of NCARB?

**Erica Loynd** (01:10:34):

That's a different discussion.

**Sian Roberts** (01:10:34):

Yeah, that's a discussion. that's coming up, this is what's coming up and basically this resolution would allow for that.

**Erica Loynd** (01:10:42):

Got it. That makes sense where the debate is. I hear that message. Okay.

**Sian Roberts (01:10:52):**

This is a hill I'm not going to die on, quite frankly. But I, as much as I am in favor of inclusion and trying to get as much diversity and inclusion on the board as possible, I kind of do have a gut feeling that the president of NCARB should be an architect and should be committed enough to the organization to hold a certificate. So yeah.

**Roch Manley (01:11:24):**

This is Roch. Just a thought on that. I agree, Sian, if you look at it in the perspective of providing leadership to NCARB... Well, we have staff, we have Mike, President Mike, I mean, CEO Mike, we have professional staff, not all of whom are architects. The board and the guidance from the board and their knowledge of the industry in the trenches aspects of the profession is too valuable to say, "Yeah, let's have our NCARB president be a non-architect." That's my gut feeling as well on that.

**Sian Roberts (01:12:35):**

Okay. Well that's good to hear. I think Erica, you and Scott, you and or Scott are probably going to have to do a little dancing there when we get to it because I would imagine there's going to be a lot of amendments from the floor on this one.

**Erica Loynd (01:12:51):**

I will read up, be prepared.

**Sian Roberts (01:12:54):**

Great. Okay. H, this is the regional realignment. I don't know if any of you have been able to participate in any of the listening sessions on this, but I think they've been really valuable and this has evolved quite a bit over time, what I was trying to get out of Scott before the meeting was whether we're looking at the most current here and I believe we are, but I would also on this one, not at all be surprised to see this evolve and change or go away or actually just not come to the floor.

(01:13:33):

So this one really has very little impact on our region, region six, I think we lose Idaho, that's about it. So it's not that big a deal for us. It's much a bigger deal for the very small Northeastern and southeastern, I believe, regions that are going to be sort of, there's a lot of logistics to this that people have been complaining about in terms of money dues and how that all gets separated and split and there's a lot of that that goes along with it.

(01:14:05):

For us, it's not going to be that big a deal, although our revenue base will go down. I guess I should also, well... I should also mention that our region is currently running a deficit. I probably should have mentioned that up front when I talked about the actual meeting and apologies for that, but we would lose the revenue of the Idaho board.

(01:14:29):

So there's that in general. However, if you look at the numbers and the way that the realignment has been considered, it results in a much more equitable regions in terms of numbers of jurisdictions, number of licensees, and so therefore, just from a representative basis, to me it feels like it makes the regions more equitable and I personally am in favor of it. I mean, there are different ways of thinking about it, but one of the ways of thinking about it is in the way most regions believe their reason for being is that they get to put somebody on the board, that is Scott for us this year. We get to put somebody on the national board. So if you look at a region that is tiny, they've got much fewer people from which to select somebody to go to the regional board so they get a much greater representation. That said, I think to me it just makes sense. I don't know, this regional structure has been in place forever. Apparently they've been talking about this forever. It's never been able to actually happen. It may not happen this time. To me, it feels like a well-considered change and I would be in support of it. But again, I think we're not the ones that are being impacted as heavily as some of the other regions that that have more concerns with this.

**Sydney Muhle (01:16:04):**

And I can jump in here really quick. Region six would lose Idaho and Colorado's. We would be losing two-

**Sian Roberts (01:16:11):**

Thank you.

**Sydney Muhle (01:16:13):**

... Jurisdictions. But Susan has also put together a really great graphic on just to kind of put it all on one screen for you so I can let Susan share that if you have it up.

**Sian Roberts (01:16:31):**

Oh yeah, perfect.

**Sydney Muhle (01:16:34):**

That way you can show or see what the current structure is up above and the proposed structure below, as well as how those numbers kind of flush out and not just with the number of jurisdictions, but it even gets us a little bit, quite a bit more equitable in terms of represented licensees by state.

**Sian Roberts (01:17:23):**

Any concerns with the regional realignment? Okay, well I think this will be a really interesting one, again, I think we'll hear a lot and it may change between now, I'm guessing it will change between now and the annual business meeting. Probably change after the board meeting this weekend is my guess.

**Erica Loynd (01:17:58):**

This is board member Loynd. Is it possible to have this sent out in the meeting notes or something or sent out to the group? Because this is very clear. This is helpful.

**Sydney Muhle (01:18:08):**

Absolutely. And the other thing I would ask, if you don't have any concerns with this, are there any concerns or guardrails that you guys would like to send with the delegates on if we depart from this structure too much? What are kind of the left right lateral limits on what you guys would like to see before it just becomes a no vote?

**Erica Loynd** (01:18:36):

This is board member Loynd and I know I'll be one of the people that will be there voting, but one of the things that I think is interesting of this chart the most is what you discussed about how some of the regions are significantly smaller and us being region six and now region A are one of the largest, if not the largest in many of the categories, but to be compared in the current version to be for the number of licensure, Canada, even just taking that one or the licensed architects in the state, we're 10 times the size of region five.

(01:19:09):

That's a significant impact. I agree that this, when you see the numbers and do the comparatives, it's pretty big and I appreciate the new path being within about... Me doing architect math, meaning not really scientific, looks like about maybe a 20% gap at the most. And I think if it starts getting to the point where it's even 50%, if they realign and a state throws one, like we get back Colorado and that pushes us to be significantly higher than all of them. That would be something I'd want to see if they started changing the numbers that way. This seems though we are the largest, it would be more understandable. It's closer.

**Sian Roberts** (01:19:59):

Yeah, I guess I would just say if it ends up not accomplishing what we want to accomplish, if it ends up not accomplishing the more equal numbers across the board and it gets so mixed up by small boards who want to maintain their size or whatever and it just becomes not worth it. It is a lot of effort. So I don't want to lose Colorado and Idaho if it's not going to really make a difference overall in the structure. That would be my only guardrail on this, which isn't a real guardrail, but it's some maybe guidance.

**Sydney Muhle** (01:20:46):

Yeah, I think that gives some clear guidance for the delegates to take. I think we had that come up last year with the executive committee shakeup and that was kind of what we ended up going to, knowing that there's probably going to be resolutions presented, or amendments, sorry, presented on the floor that could completely change this. And I think that was kind of the point that we came to. So I wanted to make sure we incorporated that this year with this discussion early.

**Susan Cooley** (01:21:18):

Is that all that the resolutions that we need to discuss? Moving on to the 2025 election, is that where we're at with the agenda? Somebody want to share that again?

**Sydney Muhle** (01:21:51):

Sorry, I'm not used to being one sharing. I forgot that I wasn't.

**Susan Cooley** (01:21:56):

That's okay. I'll let Susan again lead that discussion on that. Most of these, as Scott was mentioning, some of them are running unopposed, but there are some that are not running unopposed.

**Susan Nieves** (01:22:09):

So at the annual business meeting, there will be elections and on the screen there you'll see all of the unopposed candidates. So those, the board will not need to make a determination on, but there is two at large director positions. So there are 10 candidates. And out of those 10 candidates, the board will need to make a determination on which two they would like **Scott Harm** to cast his vote for the board at the meeting. So this will require a motion and a vote and a discussion from the board with who they would like to see as their vote.

**Sian Roberts** (01:23:01):

I think this is going to be very hard for people too. Actually, I guess my question is, does this board need to vote on who, Scott, who our delegate is going to vote for? Or is this similar to others that... Because they will be giving speeches at this event and is this something where we're going to have a discussion but it is going to be ultimately the delegates decision who to vote for?

**Susan Nieves** (01:23:34):

My understanding is the delegate will cast the two votes for this board.

**Sydney Muhle** (01:23:42):

The delegate will cast your votes, but particularly if you have strong opinions in favor or absolutely against any particular candidates, this is the time to make that known because the delegate is casting the vote on behalf of the entire board. So typically, it would be directing them who you would like for them to vote for.

(01:24:07):

However, understanding that this is a little bit different of a structure, and this is our first year really with this structure and this many candidates throwing their hat in the ring, that this is just kind of a little bit of a new animal, or if there are particular skill sets or perspectives that you all believe would be vital at the NCARB executive committee that maybe aren't there currently that you'd like to see if any of these candidates possess, you guys can kind of provide that direction as well, but Scott will be voting on your behalf, so we just need to give him some direction on how you guys want that to go.

**Paul Wu** (01:24:54):

Wu board member here, may I ask where can we find information on these candidates?

**Sian Roberts** (01:25:03):

There are candidates in your packet. Oh, sorry.

**Paul Wu** (01:25:09):

They are in the packet. I'm sorry?

**Erica Loynd** (01:25:11):

This is board member Loynd. Can you say what page, because the bookmarks don't work to get to that page? So I was trying to click back to it. Do you know what page they start on?

**Sian Roberts** (01:25:19):

180. 170. I'm scrolling back up to the top here.

**Erica Loynd** (01:25:24):

Yep, that's there. Yep.

**Sian Roberts** (01:25:25):

You see it? It's the at large director's resumes.

**Susan Cooley** (01:25:32):

One starts at 153.

**Erica Loynd** (01:25:34):

The scrolling on my mouse went to...

**Sian Roberts** (01:25:40):

I can tell you what I know about some of them. I don't know them all. Let's see.

**Susan Cooley** (01:25:55):

It's on 153 is Bobby Joe's. Where her starts.

**Sian Roberts** (01:26:04):

Okay. I don't know Bobby Joe. In her speech, I believe... Yes. She says this in her cover letter too, that she talked rather passionately about her mental health and neurodiversity issues and how that had been a barrier to her in terms of her path towards licensure and how she would bring that perspective to the board. And I think she says that pretty clearly in paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4 here. And so it looks like she's been on the DEI collaborative.

**Susan Cooley** (01:26:51):

Is there a way... I'm just looking at respect for time, is there a way to just be able to go through these and generate opinions and read what they have and then provide that input to the delegate?

**Sian Roberts** (01:27:08):

Good question.

**Sydney Muhle** (01:27:08):

Yeah, I was just going to say, I suppose if you guys wanted to throw Scott under the bus since he is not here, then you guys can put that responsibility 100% on him if you choose to and just hand that decision making off to him. But yeah, I would say if you want to read through your candidate packets and if you come across somebody that you're like, "Yeah, hey, I really feel

like this person's perspective would be great," or as you're reading through, "Hey, I've had experience with this person and maybe would not be the best perspective to have on the board for A, B, or C reason," I would say you can share that directly to Scott and Erica. Just please don't include the entire board because we don't want to run into OPMA issues. And if you're ever concerned about that, you can always utilize myself and Susan to compile all of that and send it to them as well.

**Sian Roberts** (01:28:03):

I think that sounds great to me, like a great approach. I'd be happy to share my knowledge of a few of these people, but I'd also be happy not to. They're all great. I mean, there are some really, really strong candidates here who've been involved and passionate about NCARB and bring unique perspectives and more youthful energy and all of that stuff that we were hoping that we would get by restructuring the board and creating these positions. So I don't think in any way we'll be disappointed.

**Paul Wu** (01:28:38):

Board member Wu here, may I suggest that we each read through the resume and make our decisions or determinations and send our recommendations to Susan or whoever handle that and then they can disperse those information to our voting members. Would that work?

**Sian Roberts** (01:29:04):

Yep.

**Susan Nieves** (01:29:06):

I can totally do that. And maybe I'll just send out a little reminder and then that way Scott will have all the information that he needs the day of the meeting.

**Paul Wu** (01:29:18):

All right.

**Sian Roberts** (01:29:19):

Sounds good. So then I guess if we need a motion, I guess I move that we delegate the decision of the vote for the at-large director positions to our voting delegate **Scott Harm**. This is board member Roberts making that motion.

**Erica Loynd** (01:29:37):

Board member Loynd, I second that motion,

**Susan Cooley** (01:29:43):

The motion on the floor is to have board member Harm as the delegate vote. And then all those in favor say aye.

**Board members** (01:29:52):

Aye.

**Susan Cooley** (01:29:55):

Any opposed? Motion carries. So you ready to move on to outreach to schools?

**Sian Roberts** (01:30:09):

Yes.

**Susan Cooley** (01:30:09):

As the new one. So the board will discuss outreach plans for Washington schools and Susan's going to lead that discussion.

**Susan Nieves** (01:30:18):

So I have had correspondence with NCARB's outreach manager, Emily Anderson. She said that NCARB will be conducting their Washington School outreach this fall or potentially spring of 2025. She'll let me know when she scheduled that and I'll make sure that the board is aware and find out if anybody wants to participate in the NCARB outreach.

(01:30:44):

She's also aware of your October meeting and she said that she would schedule the outreach around that if they choose to do it this fall. And I noted from the last board meeting that board member Robert offered to compile a list of schools to do outreach to and board member Manley has already been working in our Vancouver area with the outreach. So board member Roberts, do you have an update, possibly?

**Sian Roberts** (01:31:16):

Yeah. I wish I had more of an update. I wish I had given you a list before this meeting, but I did not. And so I will commit to doing that before next meeting. I've done a little bit of research. Basically, the strongest program is one we've already visited, but I would like to think that we could do again, and that is the Lake Washington Institute of Technologies Architectural Technology Program. And that is a feeder to WSU as well.

(01:31:41):

So I think it could be something where that is a two-year program that then with additional experience could lead to licensure or I think many of those students then move on in their third and fourth years to WSU. Other schools have programs that are CAD design or drafting design, mechanical or architectural drafting. They're more kind of on the engineering side, but they have the architecture. They might have a class in architecture and I think those are the ones we visited before, both up in Bellingham and down in Vancouver.

(01:32:17):

And then of course obviously WSU and UW, which I'm sure that NCARB will be targeting. I would guess they would also reach out to Lake Washington, but I'm not sure if that's going to happen or not. I will create a more definitive list for us next time we can talk about whether we want to reach out. I think what often happens and Roch, maybe you can jump in and help me with this because as I was looking at the programs, I didn't actually see programs that looked architectural, but I know we have gone and visited with professors who are doing kind of an architectural project, so it feels to me that this might be an engineering tech degree that these students are getting like a two-year engineering tech, but they haven't have a professor-

(01:33:03):

... two-year engineering tech, but they haven't have a professor who wants to teach a class that's more architectural design related. Is that how you've seen those programs Roch?

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:33:04]

**Roch Manley** (01:33:13):

Well, yes and no. I'll just relate a little experience from my last experience committee junket to the San Francisco area. I joined Martin Smith on a school visit, and it was to a community college outside of San Francisco, in the suburbs of San Francisco, and they had a very aggressive program for architectural design. So it really was. There was engineering, and then separately, but this was specifically for architectural design. I think the program, the visit we made to Lake, what was it, Lakewood?

**Sian Roberts** (01:34:07):

Yeah. Lake Washington Institute of Technology, that one has a similar program, I think. Yeah.

**Roch Manley** (01:34:12):

Yeah. This program in California is very similar, and clearly they're catering to returning students, students who have had various life experience, and students that are straight out of high school, and looking for a path that is not as costly to them personally. They might be from more diverse backgrounds, or backgrounds are more challenged economically, and this is a great path for them to take their three-year degree, and go to a four-year school that offers an accredited degree. And a lot of these students that we met with in the San Francisco area were planning on doing just that. They seemed very well-informed, and very aware.

(01:35:15):

My thought is that if we can reach out to programs like that, and help the staff make it more real for the students, and inform the students better about what the requirements are, and what they need to look toward doing to become a licensed architect, that would be a pretty good service. Our program here in the Vancouver area, the Clark College program is no longer. Like so many of these community colleges, it's very, very dependent on staff, on their instructors that they have at the college who have the background, have the knowledge, and are able to put together a program in design. And that's a rare thing. So in my mind, that's another reason to support and promote the programs that are out there like that, and the instructors that have those capabilities.

(01:36:28):

I think I sent Sydney, Susan and I copied Scott on it. We have a registered architect at Heritage High School here. And I think we did a few years back, we did a board visit there to her. Well, I think it was her class, or it might've been another instructor, but Susan Mangin is the instructor there at Heritage High School, and I sent her information. And an invitation that she'd sent to me to an architecture competition that they were having that's happening in the Portland area, I wasn't able to attend that. I was out of town, but I'd promote paying attention to the community college level, as well as the accredited degree programs, as well as high school programs that

are aggressively looking at architecture design, and informing students of what the world of architecture is about. Those are my thoughts on that.

**Sian Roberts** (01:37:50):

Yeah. I think from my cursory look, Lake Washington is the only one that has a real architectural design program, and I probably need to dig a little bit deeper, but that's really all I could find in terms of the community college, or the community, or technical college world, which is unfortunate, because it's really it's here in the Seattle area. Right? So we don't have that geographic diversity of the technical colleges, which is probably the big. That's where a student who is in a different part of the state is going to have as much trouble going to Lake Washington Technical College as they are going to University of Washington in terms of cost, and not quite as much, but still the access isn't quite there.

(01:38:41):

So anyway, I appreciate what you're saying, Roch. I think we to, we should definitely focus on being able to engage with Lake Washington. The high school programs, the ACE program here is also a strong program for high school students, that could maybe benefit from a board member dropping in once or twice, and talking about pathways, that high school students who understand there's different ways that they can get to be an architect. And then, I don't know. It's a big lift to think to have other community and technical colleges understand that this is something they could do, that if they could put up a program, that they could offer to their students a pathway to licensure as an architect. And maybe that's more of a talking to administration than outreach to students as a first step.

**Susan Nieves** (01:40:03):

Well, we could definitely bring this topic back to the board, and continue the discussion with the different schools, and possibly reaching out to the administration of the schools that don't offer the programs for the architects.

**Sian Roberts** (01:40:22):

Yeah. Maybe we just bring this back, and maybe create especially. It's great that NCARB is going to include us hopefully in their school visits in the fall. That's a big step, and then maybe next time, we can talk about what we think an action plan might be, understanding the landscape currently.

**Susan Cooley** (01:40:45):

Great. Are we ready to move on to annual calendar? Are we done with that? Wrapped up that discussion?

**Sian Roberts** (01:41:00):

Yep.

**Susan Cooley** (01:41:01):

All right. Cool. All right. So the board wanted to establish a calendar of regular items to be reviewed annually. Can we flip the slide to the next one, and let Susan talk about that a little bit?

**Susan Nieves (01:41:17):**

So I prepared an annual calendar calendar that's displayed. I went back several years to see what items were consistent with our agendas, and most of the stuff is similar to what we provided in the last year, with the exception of the year in review, and the review of the board authorizations, and the budget. The review of board authorizations was something that when the board approved the authorizations, you guys mentioned that you would like to review them possibly annually. So that's why I added that one. But the budget and the year-end review was something that has happened in the past years. So if there's any items that you would like to add, or take off, if you just want to let me know, and I can begin incorporating those to the agenda.

**Sian Roberts (01:42:20):**

Just a correction, the NCARB Spring Summit is actually their regional summit.

**Susan Nieves (01:42:25):**

Oh. Thank you.

**Erica Loynd (01:42:30):**

This is board member Loynd. I think in line of the conversation we just had about outreach to students, I think having something on the calendar that it should be an ongoing conversation of right now we're strategizing what it could be, but it could be interesting to have it on, to make sure we're following up, and maybe it becomes a debrief of what outreach has happened. But having that timely with events that we're going to host, or programs that are going to be starting, just having it on there may make it where it becomes a priority.

**Susan Nieves (01:43:05):**

Yeah. Some of our other boards, they have an outreach discussion every board meeting that they have. So definitely that can be an item that we keep on the agenda.

**Susan Cooley (01:43:25):**

Any other comments or input? Thank you, Susan, for putting that together. That's helpful. All right. Moving on to committee task force reports, or actually reports in general, but we're going to start with committee task force reports, and that first one will be the Model Law Committee. Susan, do you want to? Oh. Sian, go ahead.

**Sian Roberts (01:43:56):**

I was just going to jump in as member of the committee.

**Susan Cooley (01:44:00):**

Yeah. Absolutely.

**Sian Roberts (01:44:02):**

We did. We've hurrah, hurrah. The rolling clock has been retired, or sunsetted, or whatever they call it, which is great news. And I think our plan was always to let the dust settle from that, and then maybe this summer start to engage [inaudible 01:44:25] Council again, because they did a

nice heavy lift for us on getting that rolling clock resolved, and maybe engage them here, and report back out again in the fall. I don't think we have. We won't have a report probably until the fall. Erica, do you agree with that?

**Erica Loynd** (01:44:41):

Yep. That's [inaudible 01:44:42]. I agree.

**Sian Roberts** (01:44:46):

So if staff has anything else to contribute ...

**Susan Nieves** (01:44:51):

No. Just if you want to let me know when you'd like that added, most likely it would be the fall. So I will probably reach out to you with the reminders of adding agenda items, but definitely, we'll get it back on in the fall for you.

**Sian Roberts** (01:45:05):

Sounds great. Thank you.

**Susan Nieves** (01:45:07):

Mm-hmm.

**Susan Cooley** (01:45:13):

It's like we're moving on to staff reports. Susan, do you want to take this on, or do you want me to introduce each one?

**Susan Nieves** (01:45:21):

Oh. Sure. I can do that.

**Susan Cooley** (01:45:22):

Mm-hmm.

**Susan Nieves** (01:45:23):

So we are getting support from our Centralized Investigations Unit. We have Evelyn Manley-Rodriguez, who is a program manager. She's going to review the data for the complaint statuses.

**Evelyn Manley-Rodriguez** (01:45:39):

Thank you Susan. So good morning. I'll be presenting the complaint status as of March 11th, 2024. As of this date, we have 4 cases that were closed, 2 cases were closed by case manager, Erica Loynd, and 2 cases were closed under status N.A., which means either these cases didn't meet jurisdiction, technical assistance was provided, or the case was unsubstantiated. As of this date, there were five cases that were open with investigations, and under management review, we have two cases. And both cases were assigned to case managers, for a grand total of 11 cases through this time period. That's all I'll have. Back to you Susan.

**Susan Nieves** (01:46:30):

Yes. Thank you, Evelyn.

**Evelyn Manley-Rodriguez** (01:46:32):

Thank you.

**Susan Nieves** (01:46:33):

Does anybody have any questions regarding the report?

**Erica Loynd** (01:46:38):

This is board member Loynd. I have a question. I believe it was our last meeting. There was one that was going to be presented with a finding to be closed, but it got postponed or more. Is it still under? Is that one of the ones that's still in our management review, or did that get closed?

**Evelyn Manley-Rodriguez** (01:46:57):

[inaudible 01:46:57] Sorry. Is that for me, or is that for Susan?

**Erica Loynd** (01:46:59):

No. No. Go ahead.

**Evelyn Manley-Rodriguez** (01:47:00):

Oh. The case is still with the case manager. The new information came in. So we're reviewing additional information at the moment, and our goal is to hopefully put it back for July's meeting.

**Erica Loynd** (01:47:15):

Okay. That was my question of what, because I thought it was postponed because the case manager was not there to present, but if more information's come in, then okay. Great. Thank you.

**Susan Nieves** (01:47:31):

Thank you Evelyn. So with our licensee count report, we have Tanya Hessler with the Licensing Customer Support Services Unit. She will be reviewing the data with the board.

Tanya Hessler (01:47:47):

Good morning. I'm the program manager for the architect unit. Here is our licensee counts that we have. I believe it should say March 11th of '24 up there. So we've broken them down into age classifications. We have from 65 and above 1,723 active licensees. 55 to 64, we have 1,846. 45 to 54 is 1,703. 35 to 44 is 1,337, and 25 to 34 is 370, the grand total of 6,979. And then on the graph, you can see as the active licensees have climbed from 2020. We had 6,433. It's steadily increasing into 2024 to 6,970. In January, we processed 25 new applications, 282 renewals, and in February, we processed 33 new applications, excuse me, and 240 renewals.

**Susan Nieves** (01:49:04):

Thanks providing that information Tanya. Does the board have any questions regarding the licensee count? So it looks like we're moving on to the summer quarter hybrid meeting. So the Department of Licensing has authorized board staff to schedule one hybrid meeting with an in-

person option if we can receive a quorum of the board. So the July 25th, 2024 board meeting, if it moves forward with the hybrid option will be in a large conference room at the Black Lake building. So I've sent out a few emails asking for confirmation if you plan to attend virtually, or in person. And we're just waiting on a few more responses regarding in-person, or attending via online. Does anybody have any questions regarding the hybrid meeting option?

**Sydney Muhle (01:50:42):**

So I just want to throw one piece out there, and that is that one of the stipulations that the department has put on us in order to have these in-person meetings is that we do need to have a quorum attending in person in order to have them. And that's simply to justify the cost and the expense to host these in-person meetings, because we are going to be doing them at one of our facilities, and there's just a whole lot of other moving pieces that go into that. So they want to make sure that if we're hosting these in person, that we're not just doing it for one or two people, that we're going to have a robust board attending in person. So if you could please just get those responses back to Susan as soon as possible on whether or not you'll be able to attend in person, we would really appreciate that. Thank you.

**Susan Cooley (01:51:37):**

Thank you. Right. Sydney, we're talking the rolling clock legislation. Pass that to you.

**Sydney Muhle (01:51:50):**

Yes, and Sian stole my thunder a little bit by saying yes. The rolling clock legislation did pass with flying colors. It was signed back in March I believe. So we've already begun working on the rulemaking and implementation process for it. The one change that happened through the course of the legislative session is that we as the department requested that this be in effect. Oh. I see Paul has a question.

**Paul Wu (01:52:23):**

We lost your voice a little bit.

**Sydney Muhle (01:52:29):**

Okay. I'll try and speak up. Maybe I'm having some internet issues, and I've got storm swimming through. So we did request that the implementation date for this be effective July 1 of 2024. And that is just to allow us enough time to make the computer updates that are needed. So this will go into effect July 1 of 2024. NCARB did immediately put out a whole bunch of communication to examinees in Washington State. And then the department is following that up with very, very similar communication. We want to make sure that that message is crystal clear, and reaching as many licensees as possible. So we will keep you all updated, but by our next meeting, it should be in effect, and we should be good to go. So are there any questions? Thank you also for your support as we worked through that. And Sian, I know you were a huge help to us in working with AIA. So thank you so much for being that bridge for us as we got this off the ground, and got it rolling. We appreciate it.

**Susan Nieves (01:53:45):**

So I have the master [inaudible 01:53:46]. Oh. Go ahead Susan.

**Susan Cooley** (01:53:48):

No. Go ahead. I was just going to let you go with the master action list.

**Susan Nieves** (01:53:50):

Yeah. The master action item list, "The model law committee will most likely be coming back in the fall. The statistics for law exam next winter management analyst help," that is still in progress. "Staff to reach out to NCARB and AIA regarding the five-year rolling clock," that has been completed. "Staff to reach out to universities, and NCARB, and coordinate visits," looks like we will be moving a standing outreach item to our agenda to discuss outreach, and, "Staff to reach out to AIA regarding legislation impacts, legislation impacting the industry." So Sydney took a little back burner with up and coming legislation with AIA, and focused on the rolling clock with AIA. So now that that's been resolved, Sydney said that she's going to pick that back up with AIA, and any types of updates or information that we receive, we'll be sure to get those out to the board. Are there any questions? Great.

**Susan Cooley** (01:55:08):

We're going to open this up for public comment. We just have a few minutes left. So we'll try to hurry. And the public may address the board on matters within the board's jurisdiction. You could either verbally during the meeting, or submitting written comments in advance. Verbal comments are limited to 1 3-minute comment. Written comments are limited to no more than 500 words, and must be emailed to [dolboards@dol.wa.gov](mailto:dolboards@dol.wa.gov) no less than 2 business days prior to the meeting with the subject line, "Public Comment: Architect Board." In response to all public comments, the board is limited to requesting that the matter be added to a future agenda for discussion, or directing staff to study the matter further. Inflammatory comments and language will not be permitted. Susan, do we have any comments that were submitted in writing?

**Susan Nieves** (01:56:00):

There were no public comments submitted in writing.

**Susan Cooley** (01:56:03):

All right. Thank you. Do we have any verbal comments from anyone in the public? There's an amount of delay. I'm waiting. I'm not hearing anything. So I'm going to close the floor for that now, and we'll move on to the conclusion announcements. Do any of the board members or staff have any announcements, or additional reports they'd like to make at this time?

**Sydney Muhle** (01:56:38):

I just have one brief one, and that is that we have finally received a number of applications for our vacant position. That was for Rick Banner's position, but we'll now include board member Manley's position as well. So we will be conducting those initial discussions during the month of May, and then submitting our notes to the governor's office. And hopefully we will have at least one new board member by our next meeting, potentially two. But we'll keep the board posted as that moves forward.

**Susan Cooley** (01:57:11):

Excellent news. Great. Thank you. Anyone else?

**Paul Wu** (01:57:17):

Well Board Member Wu here. I just want to say goodbye to Roch, and really appreciate your work here on the board. So hope our paths will cross again.

**Roch Manley** (01:57:35):

Likewise, Paul, and I was hoping there's one last opportunity to say thank you all for serving with me on the board, and during my tenure, and lets you know how much I enjoyed it, how much I feel I grew from it, and grew from my interactions with all of you, and how much I learned. And I think I will as much as the fully retired freedom, and then not having the constraint of a board meeting every quarter will be appreciated. I will miss interacting with you all, and I'll miss the stimulating discussions, and feeling like I'm keeping up with what's going on in the world of licensure. So thank you all, and goodbye, and hope to see you as Paul said in the future.

**Sian Roberts** (01:58:40):

Bye Roch. Thanks for everything.

**Susan Cooley** (01:58:41):

Are there any additional announcements?

**Debra** (01:58:51):

[inaudible 01:58:52] announcement, but I wanted to thank **Susan Cooley** for her time on the board. Sad that you won't be continuing with us, but understand that life takes priorities over the things that we want to do. But I really appreciated your service on the board, and your participation as vice chair who's stepped into lead more meetings this last year than I think you expected taking on that role. Thank you. Really appreciate it.

**Susan Cooley** (01:59:26):

Thank you, Debra.

**Sian Roberts** (01:59:28):

Yeah. Sorry we got so wrapped around Roch leaving, and it was part of the agenda, and everything, and you announced your resignation in the middle of this. So yes. Thank you for everything, and we'll miss you as well, Susan.

**Susan Cooley** (01:59:42):

Thank you.

**Roch Manley** (01:59:44):

Likewise, Susan. This is Roch. I wish we had had more of an opportunity to work together, and my leaving the board, and now you're leaving the board. And I'm grateful that we crossed paths during that small handful of meetings.

**Susan Cooley** (02:00:09):

I joined right before COVID. So I had one in-person meeting, but yeah. Thank you Roch. All right. All right. Let's go to future agenda items. Is there anyone that has any future agenda items they'd like to add to the list? Nope. Okay. Let's do a review of the action items, and the items for the next meeting. I'm going to call on Sandra Schaffer if you would like to review those.

**Sydney Muhle** (02:00:45):

Oh. Sorry. That's actually going to be me. I thought we changed it yesterday.

**Susan Cooley** (02:00:50):

Sorry.

**Sydney Muhle** (02:00:50):

I had computer issues. So it must not have saved. I'm sorry. So I captured that we will be bringing back additional information, and procedural impacts, and any rule changes necessary for additional requirements if and when the MRAs are brought back to the board for consideration. And then we'll be bringing back more information regarding outreach, including the list from Sian, and the potential of reaching out to Lake Washington, and different high school and technical programs, and maybe what it would take to have those discussions with administrators prior to moving to student outreach, and then making outreach a standing agenda item for future board meetings. So I think I captured everything.

**Susan Cooley** (02:01:40):

Sounded good to me. All right. Well I think we're at our final adjournment, and the time is now 12:03. And if we don't have anything additional, we'll adjourn the board meeting. Next board meeting is July 25th at 10 A.M. Pacific.

**Paul Wu** (02:02:03):

Bye.

**Sian Roberts** (02:02:03):

Thanks everyone.

**Susan Cooley** (02:02:04):

[inaudible 02:02:04]. Thank you. Thanks staff. You did a great job.

**Paul Wu** (02:02:05):

Thank you.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [02:02:06]