

# Washington State Board for Architects meeting transcript – October 24, 2024

Sian Roberts (00:00:02):

Welcome all, but I will also let you know that the public comment period will be towards the end of the meeting. So you'll have to be patient as we go through our business, but there will be an opportunity for that. And when and if you choose to do that, as a courtesy we ask participants to mute their mics or phone when not speaking to reduce the background noise, and please remember to unmute your microphone when you're speaking. Also, for board members, to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thank you. So Sydney, at this time will you please call roll and board members please respond if in attendance?

Sydney Muhle (00:00:38):

Absolutely. Chair Roberts?

Sian Roberts (00:00:41):

I am here.

Sydney Muhle (00:00:42):

Vice Chair Loynd?

Erica Loynd (00:00:44):

Present.

Sydney Muhle (00:00:45):

Board member Harm?

Scott Harm (00:00:47):

Present.

Sydney Muhle (00:00:48):

And board member Wu.

Paul Wu (00:00:50):

Present.

Sydney Muhle (00:00:51):

We have a quorum.

Sian Roberts (00:00:52):

Thank you, Sydney. So we have all received in our packets the, oh, sorry, the agenda for the meeting today. So I do need a motion and a vote to approve the agenda.

Scott Harm (00:01:05):

Board Member Harm would like to make a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting.

Sian Roberts (00:01:11):

Thank you, Scott.

Paul Wu (00:01:11):

[inaudible 00:01:12]

Sian Roberts (00:01:11):

Do I have a second?

Paul Wu (00:01:12):

[inaudible 00:01:12] Wu. Second.

Sian Roberts (00:01:15):

Thank you, Paul. All those in favor, please say aye.

Scott Harm (00:01:17):

Aye.

Paul Wu (00:01:17):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:01:17):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:01:19):

Any opposed? The motion passes. So we will follow the agenda as published in your packets and next we'll need an approval of the minutes that were also included in your packet from the April 25th, 2024 board member and I will need a motion to approve those minutes.

Erica Loynd (00:01:40):

Board member Loynd, a motion to approve the minutes.

Sian Roberts (00:01:46):

Any second?

Scott Harm (00:01:47):

Board member Harm will second that.

Sian Roberts (00:01:50):

And I forgot to ask for discussion on the last motion. Any discussion here on the minutes?

Scott Harm (00:01:57):

Chair, if I could just bend our ear for a moment, I was reminded by it in reviewing the minutes. Sydney, there's a meeting called before, I've got the page up on January 23rd. I can already tell this group that I can't make that date 'cause I have a NCARB board of directors meeting out of state that day.

Sydney Muhle (00:02:16):

Okay, we can look at that when we get to that part.

Scott Harm (00:02:19):

Hopefully we have new members by then. We can still ...

Sian Roberts (00:02:24):

Yeah, we're compromised on our quorum these days-

Scott Harm (00:02:27):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:02:28):

... so.

Scott Harm (00:02:30):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:02:31):

Okay, so I'm going to call. Is there any more discussion on the minutes? Okay, all those in favor of approving the minutes from the April 25th 2024 meeting please say aye.

Scott Harm (00:02:47):

Aye.

Paul Wu (00:02:47):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:02:47):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:02:50):

Any opposed? Okay, the minutes have been approved. You know, typically we are sharing the agenda. I'm not seeing anything or we're sharing the documents. Sydney, I'm not seeing anything shared on the screen right now. There's usually a presentation.

Sydney Muhle (00:03:10):

Okay.

Sian Roberts (00:03:10):

Maybe I'm missing it.

Sydney Muhle (00:03:10):

I can see it shared, I can see [inaudible 00:03:11] there's number five right now.

Scott Harm (00:03:12):

Yeah, I can see it. Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:03:12):

That's my fault. I've got some settings in Teams that are making it ...

Scott Harm (00:03:15):

Close a couple windows.

Sian Roberts (00:03:17):

Yeah, I know, it's like a teeny, it's like a participant on my Team's-

Sydney Muhle (00:03:21):

Oh no.

Sian Roberts (00:03:22):

... thing. Hold on, I can change this.

Sydney Muhle (00:03:26):

Made me panic for a second.

Sian Roberts (00:03:28):

Focus on content. Okay, great. I can't see any of you but now I can see the content. Okay, so moving on to five, old business. So board members and staff will provide an update on outreach activity. So I'm going to open this up for discussion. I have a quick update but is there anybody else who has some update on this item first?

Sydney Muhle (00:03:53):

I'm sure mine will be in addition to what chair Roberts is going to say. So I will hold mine until the end.

Sian Roberts (00:04:02):

Okay, well there's a couple of items that I had to update on. One is that we did receive, and this might be what Sydney is going to talk about, we did receive some information from MCARB that they are going to be visiting the University of Washington actually on Monday at noon. And I have said that I can be there as well. Unfortunately we're not going to have anybody there from

the Department of Licensing from what I know, but at least I will be in attendance. Is that what you were going to mention, Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (00:04:33):

I was going to mention that as well as the town hall that we participated in last week.

Sian Roberts (00:04:42):

Oh, that's right, yes. Yeah, we also participated in a town hall with NCARB on alternative paths to licensure and with, sorry, with NCARB and with AIA Washington Council who actually organized the event and were able to speak to the, it was a webinar so we were able to get comments from the audience to discuss alternative paths. There were a lot of very unique and interesting situations that people find themselves in and I personally was really impressed with the licensing advisors that we have here in the state that are available to help people in interesting and unique situations understand what the best pathway through our process to get licensed is.

(00:05:28):

So I think all in all it was good to get out there and help people understand that there are pathways and what resources are available to them both through the state and through and NCARB and the licensing advisors to be able to understand how to get where they want to be in terms of licensure. Anything to add, Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (00:05:52):

Just to echo what chair Roberts just said, it a really well-attended event with a lot of really great questions. It did focus on alternative pathways to licensure and had myself and members of our team kind of digging in and seeing just how many applicants we have who are pursuing alternative pathways and that really is becoming a very popular means of licensure in the state of Washington. And I think that's a shift that we're kind of starting to see across a number of our licensing bases because of the proactivity of the board and of NCARB and AIA to kind of champion those alternative pathways. You think we're really seeing the benefit of that now that, especially coming out of COVID and the educational landscape changing even more so coming out of that, that a number of applicants are really starting to take advantage of that opportunity and it's creating a lot of really good discussion and helping us see how that's moving through and the benefits of it that those folks are making it all the way to licensure in Washington state.

(00:07:23):

It was really, really incredible to see the community support that the architecture community provides to those applicants and the structure between NCARB and AIA and the partnership to really help anybody across any pathway pursuing licensure, how the support system and the structure is there to help them get to that ultimate goal and how effective that is. And that's something I'm really, really hoping to take to some of our other programs and use this as the model that hey this can be done and here's how, so it was [inaudible 00:08:07]

Sian Roberts (00:08:06):

That's great to hear. Scott you have your hand up. Sorry.

Scott Harm (00:08:12):

Yeah let me lower my hand so I don't forget to do it. Two questions. Is there a recording of that? I can't remember how you [inaudible 00:08:22] was there a [inaudible 00:08:23] 'cause I sure would like to listen in and my role is NCARB and then also I think the chair mentioned the really good licensing advisors that are available. Are the licensing advisors from the state or from the university or from the AIA? Who are those people?

Sian Roberts (00:08:41):

They're from the state.

Scott Harm (00:08:42):

Okay.

Sian Roberts (00:08:43):

And they are, I believe they are NCARB appointees. I could be wrong about that.

Sydney Muhle (00:08:49):

I believe they're AIA.

Sian Roberts (00:08:50):

Oh, AIA, okay.

Sydney Muhle (00:08:52):

I think Tammy's on the call so she could correct us if we're wrong, but I believe they are part of AIA.

Sian Roberts (00:08:59):

Oh.

Scott Harm (00:08:59):

Mm, great.

Sian Roberts (00:09:00):

I'm not sure. Can we allow Tammy to speak now? Is that like a okay thing [inaudible 00:09:07]?

Sydney Muhle (00:09:06):

As long as the board is okay with it, yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:09:08):

Okay. Tammy would you like to clarify please? You have your hand down by [inaudible 00:09:14].

Scott Harm (00:09:14):

[inaudible 00:09:14]

Tammy (00:09:14):

Sure. Yes, yes. Thank you. The NCARB advisors are selected by Washington Council. Erica was one for many, many years and we appreciated her work on that, and then we submit those names to be officially approved. Nihal Goel is one of them, the other is Tyler Gates and if you're interested in learning a little bit more about that or reading their bios, you'll find them on our website. What was the other one? The recording. Yes, we do have a recording and it is up live on YouTube. Anybody that would like to watch that can go on to the AIA Washington Council YouTube channel and find it.

Scott Harm (00:09:58):

Thank you Tammy, yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:09:59):

Thank you Tammy-

Tammy (00:09:59):

Mm-hmm, yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:09:59):

... thank you again for organizing that.

Tammy (00:10:02):

Oh my gosh, thank you. Thank you for your participation. It was great.

Sydney Muhle (00:10:07):

And then yes, as chair Roberts indicated, NCARB will be visiting University of Washington next week in Seattle. Unfortunately I'm kind of the only staff member currently in a position to be able to go up and assess and I just do not have the availability next week. I tried moving things around in my schedule to make that happen and I just couldn't carve out that half day to be up in Seattle, unfortunately, but chair Roberts is going to be in attendance and if another board member also had availability and wanted to attend, I'm sure that would be greatly appreciated as well. And then NCARB is sending someone out to facilitate that discussion as well.

Sian Roberts (00:10:51):

So before I take volunteers for that, I want to mention one other, or I ask if there's interest in that, I want to mention one other outreach activity that I ... I did reach out to the Lake Washington Institute of Technology because they are one of the community colleges or I don't know if they're technically an institute of technology in the state of Washington that offer architectural technology degree. They also have a two plus two agreement with WSU so their graduates can kind of go to WSU, finish up their bachelor degree and then probably I'm guessing move into the NAB-accredited master's degree should they choose to.

(00:11:34):

So we visited them, Scott, you may remember a long time ago and I reached out to a guy named Bob Mandy who's the same person who coordinated our visit last time. He seems very

interested. Obviously this would be different than our last visit because we went as a board as part of one of our regular meetings. This time I think we would have to do it as two individual board members so that we don't get into having a public meeting making that into a formal public meeting. So I'd like to respond to Bob and offer up two of our board members to be able to go and meet with the students there. And then also if anybody is interested in coming to the University of Washington with me on Monday, be happy to have another participant there as well. So I'm not going to hog all the outreach opportunities. Other board members are interested, I'd like to hear about it and put you on the list.

Scott Harm (00:12:34):

I-

Erica Loynd (00:12:36):

This is board member Erica. What time is it again?

Sian Roberts (00:12:39):

The University of Washington one? It's at noon.

Erica Loynd (00:12:41):

At noon. I would like to join you but unfortunately I have a presentation I need to give at noon in our office.

Sian Roberts (00:12:52):

Okay, would you be interested in the Lake Washington Institute of Technology meeting with those?

Erica Loynd (00:12:56):

Yeah, what's [inaudible 00:12:57]

Sian Roberts (00:12:57):

There is no time yet. I've just reached out so I was going to respond to him with copying a couple of you or actually can I not do that? I probably can't do that anyway. We'll figure out a way to get you connected with Bob for [inaudible 00:13:11]

Erica Loynd (00:13:10):

[inaudible 00:13:12]

Scott Harm (00:13:11):

I'd like to, if there's room, chair, for me to join the Lake Washington one, I would also be interested or at least be made aware of when that meeting is. I would love to join you on Monday but just like my fellow board member, I'm already triple booked for that time for Monday.

Paul Wu (00:13:31):



Likewise here, board member Wu. I would like to join the Lake Washington event since it's close to where I live and I would like to participate. I'm traveling next week so I couldn't attend the other one. Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:13:46):

Okay. Maybe what I could do to avoid the email quorum issue is pass this on to Erica to coordinate a time and then maybe offer up to Scott and Paul if they're available, find out who else could make that?

Sydney Muhle (00:14:05):

And Steph is happy to coordinate as well, if you would like.

Scott Harm (00:14:08):

And I'll throw out there too, if we run into a quorum issue, just go ahead and remove me from the invite list if it helps. I just didn't have Paul there. There's going to be, we're again run into a quorum so if there's space available, sign me up. If there isn't, I won't whine, kind of a thing.

Sian Roberts (00:14:27):

Okay. Okay, sounds good. All right, I'll take it from here. One way or the other I'll probably excuse myself from the conversation and get that all set up so that we can get in touch with them as well. I think that would be great to reach out to this program. I think they've got a great program. I remember it from last time and they're really able to outreach to a really broad audience here in western Washington so it's a good program and I'm happy that we can support it. Any other items on outreach that anybody wants to bring up? Hearing none. Let's move on to item 5.2, which is discussion of demographic trends. And I'm going to pass this on to Sydney to lead the discussion on this.

Sydney Muhle (00:15:17):

[inaudible 00:15:17] going to be much easier to find for multiple states across the country and it turns out it was not. So this is an item that was requested during the July board meeting. Looking at the age demographic trends, as the board is aware, about half of our licensee base is over the age of 55 and so we kind of consider that to be at or approaching retirement age and that's when we really start to anticipate that those numbers will start to drop. And so the board have requested that we look at some age demographics across the country to see if this is a uniquely Washington situation or if this is something that's starting to happen across the industry and across the country. I thought that this information was going to be really, really easy to find and to access and it turns out it was not. So I am going to request that we can move this to the January agenda.

(00:16:21):

I have reached out to NCARB and they're seeing what data they are able to find for their purposes. Any age demographic information that they have is completely voluntary so it won't be a full complete picture, but they're looking to see what they're able to put together and I spent several hours trying to see who of our neighboring jurisdictions are also tracking this information and I couldn't find anybody so I looked through about a third of the NCARB jurisdictions and could not find a single jurisdiction that was tracking this. So it could be I did not look through the

majority. It could be that it's being tracked by jurisdictions that I didn't look at, but it was definitely not tracked by any of the western jurisdictions. So definitely gives me something to dig a little bit deeper on and I will bring back more information in January.

Sian Roberts (00:17:25):

Great, thank you Sydney. And as a reminder to everybody, I think this was a discussion topic we had about, yeah, declining numbers of licensees in our state and what that might mean and for us going forward and are we looking, if we're looking at total number of licensees, are we missing some trends by not looking more carefully at the age-related data.

(00:17:51):

Okay, anybody else have any discussion points on this particular item? All right, let's move on to new business and I think this is maybe what Scott was getting at earlier, adoption of the 2025 meeting dates.

Scott Harm (00:18:12):

Yes.

Sydney Muhle (00:18:13):

Yes it is. So we'll be looking at our 2025 meeting calendar and it already sounds like maybe we need to look at adjusting the January date and if that's the case, that's fine, we can look at what that will look like. But this is what Steph has proposed mirroring what we've had for the last two years. So Thursday, January 23rd, Thursday, April 24th, Thursday, July 31st, which is slightly later but that's accommodating some holidays falling on different days of the week this year and then October 23rd. So if we do need to look at moving the 23rd, we can certainly do that. This will tie in a little bit to an update that I'm going to give an announcements with our board appointments, but anticipating we might still have the issue of being very close to our minimum for a quorum in January.

(00:19:15):

So I think if Scott is unable to attend January 23rd, it would probably be good to go ahead and look at adjusting that date so we can either adjust to earlier within the same week. We do have a holiday on the 20th of January, so that does make it a little bit tighter or we can look at moving it back a week to sometime the week of the 27th. So what are the board's thoughts?

Erica Loynd (00:19:45):

This is board member Loynd. I just opened up my calendar and realized I do have jury duty on the 23rd as well, 22nd and 23rd. So doing my civic duty, I will likely not be able to attend. So the quorum would be broken and should I get on a case it would last through the 30th potentially.

Sydney Muhle (00:20:01):

Okay.

Erica Loynd (00:20:01):

And I am not available on the 16th. If that was the other option.

Sydney Muhle (00:20:10):

Okay.

Erica Loynd (00:20:11):

But I think the 30th would be the, I don't think a case would go until through the 30th, I would hope.

Sydney Muhle (00:20:19):

So we can look at the 30th. The other option, it is very close to New Year's, but we could look at moving up to January 9th if that was available for all of you.

Scott Harm (00:20:34):

Yeah, very good point on near New Year's 'cause there's so many, I don't know that said, if any of the board members take off that whole week between Christmas and New Year's. Yeah, it's usually a low count of attendance so again, if we have new board members, that may or may not be an issue, but I could make the 30th work, right now. It's wide open, just as a matter of ...

Sian Roberts (00:20:58):

I can make the 30th work as well if that seems to be a preferred date. Paul is-

Paul Wu (00:21:03):

[inaudible 00:21:04].

Sian Roberts (00:21:03):

... the 30th work for you?

Paul Wu (00:21:06):

I'm available.

Sydney Muhle (00:21:08):

Okay, so why don't we go ahead and schedule that for January 30th and then Erica if something happens that you do end up on a case, if you want to just let me know as soon as you know, then we can make adjustments from there and we'll just see what we can do from that point. All right, so then with that, instead of January 23rd, we would be looking for adoption of January 30th, April 24th, July 31st, and October 23rd.

Sian Roberts (00:21:42):

Okay, hold on sec. I believe the regional and NCARB, well we don't have to worry about those yet. So I guess we are looking for a motion to approve the 2025 calendar date meetings for the architect board with the modification of the January 23rd meeting to January 30th. So looking for a motion.

Paul Wu (00:22:20):

I move.

Erica Loynd (00:22:20):

[inaudible 00:22:25] Loynd, I move to approve.

Paul Wu (00:22:28):

I second that motion, Paul Wu. Board member Wu, yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:22:31):

Any further discussion on these dates? All those in favor of adopting the dates, say aye?

Scott Harm (00:22:38):

Aye.

Paul Wu (00:22:38):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:22:38):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:22:41):

Posed. Okay, we have a schedule for 2025. Thank you all.

Sydney Muhle (00:22:48):

Thank you.

Sian Roberts (00:22:50):

Okay, let's move on to item 6.2, which is discussion of 2025 board goals and priorities. And I think Sydney's going to lead the discussion on this?

Sydney Muhle (00:23:04):

I am. Give me just one second to pull up the right presentation, 'cause if I had them up all at once, my computer would freak out, so bear with me. All right, so this is just revisiting the board's established goals and priorities that were set in 2024 and reaffirming or making any adjustments for 2025. I don't anticipate this being very lengthy discussion as the board has had very lengthy discussions on these topics previously. So it's just reaffirming and seeing if there are any adjustments that are needed heading into 2025.

(00:23:51):

So the previously established priorities for the board are to establish a calendar for regular items to be reviewed. This has been done in the background on staff. We're just working on getting it into a usable format to share with board members, reviewing our authorizations regularly. And now that it's been about two years since the authorizations were put in place, that's something we'll look at putting together for 2025. Looking at when annual planning should occur, currently it's the last meeting of the year. If this does not work, then we can adjust to whenever the board would like, but this tends to be kind of the lighter agenda for this board. Each of our boards kind

of has one that just depending on how things fall for their program, that ends up being the lighter one and the last one of the year, generally yours.

(00:24:56):

Looking at the impact of diversity for licensure and how the board criteria matches education, prioritizing outreach, discussing the benefits of licensure to an open candidate pool, increasing diversity of candidates for licensure and on the board, working with partner organizations, AIA, education, NCARB, differing sub fields within architecture and then student outreach and then finally demystifying licensure. So the goals that the board set in 2024 toward those priorities were to develop an annual organizational plan and calendar for board operations. Again, this has been done in the background, we're just getting it into a usable format for all of you so that we can share it out. And we will include any contact information for our industry partners attending a [inaudible 00:25:59] event in October. Unfortunately, we were not able to participate in that this year.

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:26:04]

Sydney Muhle (00:26:03):

...unfortunately, we were not able to participate in that this year, and would probably want to look at changing that, to seeing how we can better support the relationship with WABO. We had a very strong relationship with them. And, I'm not certain if something's going on on the WABO side, or if maybe several members of the board have changed. But, a lot of that contact suddenly fell off, during this past calendar year.

(00:26:32):

So, we're looking to re-establish that and kind of see what's been going on there. Board diversity and recruitment. Focusing on Eastern Washington, and recruiting through partner organizations. I can tell you that was absolutely a part of the process for this most recent recruitment, that we are still waiting on appointments for. But, we did have applicants from Eastern Washington. And so, we were very, very excited for that. So, hopefully we do get some representation from that side of the state.

(00:27:02):

And then, participating in student outreach events, which we've already been covering. That is ongoing.

(00:27:08):

So, with that, I would love to hear from the board on what you guys are looking for, and I see Scott already has his hand up.

Scott Harm (00:27:16):

Yeah, sorry about that. So, don't forget to lower it. I'm not waving at everybody. There we go. So Sydney, if you need a champion for the WABO thing, please count me in on that. I think everybody on the board currently knows, especially Paul because he was subjected to me participating in this, but I'm a real advocate for that relationship.

(00:27:37):

So, anything that I can be asked to do, including if it's legitimate: representing the board, going by myself if I have to, on my own time. Whatever it takes. I really want to try to get back in the good graces.

(00:27:54):

I appreciate what you said, but yes, kind of disappointing. I find that to be a very engaging, and insightful event. So yes. Thanks. And, do we need to explain for the audience what WABO is, do we think?

Sydney Muhle (00:28:14):

We can. Yes. That is the Washington Association of Building Officials, for anybody who is not aware. Thank you for catching that.

Scott Harm (00:28:22):

Yes. We have very large representatives, like let's say City of Seattle, is just a huge department. But then, you get into Eastern Washington. One person could be the plant examiner, and on-site inspector, and some other position. They're filling all the things.

(00:28:38):

So, it's a really diverse group. And, one set of concerns, may not apply at all to another group's concerns. So, it really becomes pretty dynamic. Anyways, thanks.

Sydney Muhle (00:28:48):

Yes. Since it has been awhile since we saw this, probably a year is my guess, I would like some clarity on what we meant by differing sub-fields within architecture, in terms of outreach.

(00:29:07):

Does anyone recall what we meant by that? I am wondering if looking at commercial, residential, government, private. I think looking at those different areas in terms of outreach. And, I'm going to try and ask the board for their memories as well. But, that would be my thought.

Scott Harm (00:29:39):

I thought it was also like an exterior envelope, consultant/specialist kind of a thing. We have accessibility consultants, that we use. That's what my remembrance was. It was not exactly a tiered licensing, but just recognizing specialization is what I thought that was about. But, I might be wrong.

Sydney Muhle (00:29:57):

I'm just trying to understand what the outreach would be, and trying to look at these priorities and see what we've been... It feels like these are players, not only we've discussed... But, we've been planning on doing, or we have been doing these things. I'm just not sure what this means, or what it looks like.

Speaker 1 (00:30:18):

I want to say that might've been one that Rock offered up last year.

Speaker 2 (00:30:24):

I don't remember the exact conversation, but I do feel like that was... And, we could clarify it, so that it is ongoing. I like your comments, Scott. There are so many people who are practicing as licensed architects, but not doing the more traditional role description of putting together a single project, or a typology. Those very specific specialties are growing, and becoming more and more essential. And, having them feel included in the process and the environment of their licensure, I think would be really great.

(00:31:01):

Okay. Yes. I appreciate that. That sounds good. Thank you for the reminder and the clarification.

Sydney Muhle (00:31:19):

All right, so then this can always be an ongoing discussion. I did include this piece in your board packet. So, if anything occurs to you, we can always bring that back to the board at a future meeting. But, this is just our annual check-in to see where we're at, and how we're doing on it, and if we need to add, subtract, adjust, any of that. So, if you guys see anything else that you'd like to see adjusted right now, we can go ahead and add that. Otherwise, we'll just be looking for a motion from board, to reaffirm that this is the direction you guys want to head for 2025.

Speaker 2 (00:32:04):

I have one more question, which would be about the authorizations review, and what we meant by that regularly, and whether we'd want to do that at some point in 2025.

Sydney Muhle (00:32:17):

So, that as the board will remember, was the document that was previously known as the Delegations From the Board, authorizing the Department of Licensing to process applications, intake complaints, all of those administrative pieces that the department does behind the scenes on behalf of the board.

(00:32:39):

So, that's what those authorizations are for. And, there were some changes when that was approved back in 2022. And, the board had indicated wanting to do a fairly regular review of that, just to make sure that we were staying up with everything the board was wanting from the department, and that the department was meeting our end of the bargain, and that we were staying up to date with all of the requirements within that.

(00:33:15):

And so, that was where that had originally come from, making sure that we're taking a regular review on that. I think there have been some occasions where those have been represented to the board for different reasons on a fairly regular basis, every three to four years. And then, there have been other stretches where one set would be in place for eight to ten years. And so, it could be something that the board saw regularly, or there were board members who had never seen them before. And, it was just making sure that we're keeping that communication

piece open in regard to those authorizations, and making sure that that is fresh, and that the board is well aware of what is contained within those, and what it is that the department does on behalf of the board.

Speaker 1 (00:34:08):

Yes. I agree. I think when we saw them first we were like, "Oh yes. Okay, great. This is how this works. And, now I see that it's written down somewhere, and that it's an authorization that the board has given." So, reviewing it regularly may not be reviewing it to as much to alter it, as to educate the board on what delegations have been made, and what are the responsibilities of the board versus the Department of Licensing.

(00:34:33):

So, I might recommend seeing this now as one of our priorities. When we are fortunate enough to have the appointments made for the new board members at some point during 2025 (And, I know that I'm not sure board member Lloyd has seen these either), it might be worthwhile to bring it to the board's attention as a review, so we understand a little bit better. Again, what our responsibilities are, and what we've delegated to the Department of Licensing.

Sydney Muhle (00:35:05):

We can absolutely do that. And, I believe Vice Chair Lang was brand new when these were brought to the board, and was probably still in the drinking from the fire hose phase of her time on the board.

Erica Loynd (00:35:19):

Board member Loynd agrees.

Speaker 1 (00:35:24):

Okay, great. Yes. I think it'll be helpful to new board members as well.

Sydney Muhle (00:35:31):

Okay. Any other comments from the board on these? I am assuming that what we're going to vote on now, is changing that number to 2025. And, this would continue to be our priority, and our goal to meet those priorities. Do I have any more discussion points from the board, on these priorities and goals?

Speaker 2 (00:35:55):

Mr. Board member Lloyd, one thing based on our conversation about the connections we have with the NCARB licensure advisors, when I was the licensure advisor before. And then, I learned about the board more, as I was getting closer to becoming part of the board. Having a relationship with them, would be good. And being mentors to them of what the board can offer them as resources, a bit more one-on-one. So, having them be able to have a session with us. Maybe one of the board members could be a resource to them.

(00:36:31):



They are great people. They take on a lot, and they answer a lot of questions. Knowing how much we impact that process too, would be really great. So, maybe including a 'participate with outreach' to the state AI Washington Council licensure Advisors.

Sydney Muhle (00:36:51):

That's a great idea. And, they do a lot of work. I can tell they do.

Speaker 2 (00:36:53):

They take a lot of questions.

Sydney Muhle (00:36:56):

Yes. Yes.

Speaker 2 (00:36:57):

Hundreds of questions.

Sydney Muhle (00:36:58):

Yes. Any other ideas? Okay, well we're going to need a vote on adopting these goals and priorities. So, I'll ask for a motion.

Scott Harm (00:37:26):

This is board member harm. I'd like to make a motion to approve the FY 2025 goals and priorities, as presented by the licensing staff.

Erica Loynd (00:37:37):

Board member Loynd, and I second the motion.

Sydney Muhle (00:37:38):

Any further discussion?

Scott Harm (00:37:44):

Yes. Just real quick, Sydney. I think we all know that I'm really interested in getting representation from Eastern Washington. So once again, if there's something that I can be called upon to do, count on me. In years past, I've gone over there on my own time, and visited a number of offices.

(00:38:02):

But, yes. I think it would benefit the board if we did have some representation from Eastern Washington. So again, I'm ready and willing to burn calories on that side, if it helps in any way, shape, or form. I don't want to get in the way, or anything like that. But other than that, cool.

Sydney Muhle (00:38:19):

Yes. We'll keep you posted on those recruitment areas, that recruitment continues to make its way through.

Scott Harm (00:38:25):

And again, for the observers of this meeting who will be speaking later, the background on this is all of the board members previously... We're down to the smallest board since I've been on. And, I've been on the longest. But, we're all on this side of the Cascades. And so, we feel it a priority to get some people or persons from that side of the Cascades, to participate in this sport.

(00:38:51):

And, it's not that much of a burden, since we do so much of this virtually. There's not a lot of needing to travel back to Olympia for meetings, as there once was. So, if someone on this meeting (and there's my plug) is interested, and you're on the eastern side of the state, raise your hand. Anyways, that's my soapbox.

Speaker 2 (00:39:14):

Sydney, does it make sense or is it later, that you're going to give an update on where this is in the process?

Speaker 1 (00:39:20):

I'll provide the update later.

Speaker 2 (00:39:22):

Okay. Okay, let's go ahead and do a vote for this then. All those in favor of accepting the 2025 goals and priorities, please say, "I". Those post. Okay. Goals and priorities are adopted for 2025. Thank you, Sydney.

Sydney Muhle (00:39:41):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 (00:39:44):

Okay, item 6.3, legislative update. And Sydney, it sounds like you're going to lead the discussion on this item.

Sydney Muhle (00:39:53):

I'm going to start us off. And then, we're actually going to have a couple of guest speakers joining us as well. So, I just wanted to provide a quick update, now that we are in the final quarter of 2024 and gearing up for legislative session 2025. And, the legislature is already really ramping up. I think we've already had a number of bills pre-filed not tied to this board, but a number that are already pre-filed. This will be a longer session this year, so it is going to be a very active one. And, as the board is aware, we do have one proposal from the department that will have an impact on the architect program. And, that is the budgetary accounting designation within DOL, to move the program under the O6L [inaudible 00:40:45] accounting designation as a really quick reminder or update, to the members of the public who are joining us.

(00:40:55):

The [inaudible 00:40:56] O6L designation within the Department of Licensing, is an internal accounting designation. It allows us to put the program's account (which is still a standalone account), under an umbrella account designation, that provides some overdraft protection and

assistance. If something were to happen that the program's fund balance suddenly gets very low, we have a really large expense that hits the program. That helps provide overdraft protection, and still allows some breathing rooms so we don't have to do emergency fee increases, or anything like that.

(00:41:42):

And so, we are looking at that change with a number of our programs. And, the architect program is one of them. The board did agree to proceed with being a part of that proposal over the summer. And, just providing an update that that is still moving forward. The bill has not dropped yet. It's still very much in the process with DOL. But, that proposal is still moving forward. So, are there any questions on that before I continue?

(00:42:17):

Okay, so another one that was brought to our attention, is that there is a group that is looking at pursuing licensure for interior designers within Washington state. And, while not directly impacting architecture or the board, they have requested to come and do a brief presentation to the board, just to give an update and provide some awareness on this proposal, because there is so much interconnectedness among the design professions. They're trying to share awareness, and some additional understanding of what they're looking to propose this legislative session.

(00:42:58):

And so, I'm going to introduce... Make sure I get everybody's names right. I am happy to introduce Michael Transon, who is the government affairs and contract lobbyist for the International Interior Design Association, Northern Pacific chapter. Megan Only, who is the VP of Washington advocacy for the IIDA. And, Matthew. I apologize now if I butchered your name, but Varsuch.

Matthew Varsuch (00:43:29):

Varsuch.

Sydney Muhle (00:43:34):

Thank you. And, they're going to tell the board a little bit more about what the proposal is regarding interior designers. Welcome.

Matthew Varsuch (00:43:47):

Thank you all very much. I think Megan had a personal emergency, so I don't know if she's able to join us today. But, I'm going to fill in for her.

Megan (00:43:56):

I'm here.

Matthew Varsuch (00:43:56):

Oh, there you're, go ahead.

Megan (00:43:56):

I'm here.

Matthew Varsuch (00:43:57):

All right.

Megan (00:43:58):

Sorry. Yes, and nice to meet you all. Thank you for having us. We would like to introduce ourselves. We are an organization of a United Alliance, of a bunch of different interior design organizations. CIDQ is our testing body. ASID is the American Society of Interior Designers, Washington State chapter. And then, the IIDA Northern Pacific chapter is all encompassed under the Consortium for Interior Design Washington State.

(00:44:27):

So, we have a national organization, that is now brought to our state. We're seeking commercial interior design regulation. So, you can hit the next slide there, Sydney please?

(00:44:41):

So then, looking at these at larger scale here as an introduction to us. And, you can hit the next slide. This is a very brief presentation as well. So also to further introduce myself, I'm an NCIDQ interior designer. At Integris Architecture in Spokane, Washington. And, Sydney represented myself. But Matt, do you want to elaborate a little bit on your role as well?

Matthew Varsuch (00:45:03):

Yes, of course. Thank you. So, I work with the council for Interior Design Qualification, essentially the interior design counterpart to NCARB. Our members are regulatory boards from across the United States and Canada. We write and administer the NCIDQ exam, which is the prerequisite for registration or licensure in the vast majority of regulated jurisdictions in the United States and Canada, of which in the United States there are 30.

(00:45:32):

I would be happy to talk a little bit more about the exam, but we have very brief time. And so, hopefully, that is another presentation. But we, like NCARB, require experience and education, in order for folks to sit for our three-part exam, which tests an interior designer's knowledge and competency, to protect the public in their practice. And again, when we were talking about interior design, we're not talking about interior decoration. We're talking about the design and planning of interior non-structural, non-seismic construction and alteration plans within building code, life safety codes, energy codes, and proper guidelines for obtaining a building permit.

(00:46:14):

And so, we are bringing this presentation to you today, because yes, the professional societies in the state of Washington are interested in pursuing reasonable regulation of the interior design profession. And, for your identification, the majority of our members are joint multidisciplinary boards. We have about 28, 29, I believe, member boards. The majority of them oversee both architecture, and interior design. And so, why are we bringing this presentation to you? Because, throughout the course of legislative discussions, there have been some situations where interior design gets incorporated under a singular board, or under the architect's board.

(00:47:00):

And so, we are bringing this to you, so that you can be informed and involved as a stakeholder in the process. We will be communicating with other stakeholders as well, including the AIA chapter in Washington, if that has not happened already. But SCIQ works very closely with ICOR, the Inter-Organizational Council on Regulation, which includes NCARB, National Council of Engineering and Surveyors, as well as the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards.

(00:47:33):

You may have heard a little bit about ICOR at the recent NCARB annual meeting, and our efforts to define practice overlap through the Practice Overlap Task Force. Our effort is ongoing. And we hope to have that as a resource to you shortly. But, I don't know if there's anything on the next slide.

Speaker 2 (00:47:53):

Yes, there is. Sorry. I didn't want to interrupt you. But, this was our agenda. Matt went through that. I think to circle back on the occupational regulation, this would be for registered commercial interior designers. This would be the code regulated public spaces, that we all work in. Interior designers have a health safety and welfare impact on the built environment, in these locations. So, really, we're just seeking to codify through law our qualification, through our exam, our education, and our experiential hours to be in our legislation here in 2025, when we have our bill introduced.

(00:48:31):

So, I think another piece to what Matt was alluding to was ICOR. But, a really pivotal moment in our legislation journey throughout our country, is in 2021. NCIDQ and NCARB have compared our exams. And, we've found significant overlap of 80% of definite similarity. So, just knowing that NCARB has participated in this, and released a national stance that they support interior design legislation at a national scale. So, we are in conversations with [inaudible 00:49:03] Washington council. We're meeting with them in the next month, just to give you guys an update on our outreach thus far. I think the next slide too, just to not take too much of your guys' time today because it's a lot of information. But, Matt has included these contacts at other states that have had recent licensure passing, with interior designers joining architectural boards. And so they're very receptive, and have a wealth of knowledge on what this looks like within their state structure.

(00:49:33):

So, we just wanted to make sure you had these contacts, if you wanted to reach out to them as well. And, the next slide is our last slide, 'questions and discussion'. I'm not sure if we have time for that today. But, I'm sure everyone has them. So, I suggest taking those QR codes, and visiting them. We have our Northern Pacific chapter, that has lots of resources, and my email there as well. And, our CIDQ, we have lots of video resources on exactly what we're trying to achieve here. So, thank you all.

Michael Transon (00:50:05):

Yes. This is Michael Transon. And, I'll try to button all this up. We know it's a lot of information. You've got our PowerPoint slides, that we just presented to you. And then, you also have a document that's been put together by the consortium of folks down below, entitled 'The Importance of Reasonable Regulation of Interior Design'. And, hopefully that gives you a nice high level of where this is going, from a policy standpoint. We have a lot more information. But in my conversations with Sydney, we did want to get into this meeting in October, because you don't have a meeting that's before the legislative session starts. So, we definitely wanted to get this before you, get you thinking about this. I know there's going to be much more to come, and happy to work with you and Sydney on the details of how this legislation is going to work in Washington state.

(00:51:05):

And lastly, I'll mention we are waiting for the national folks to work on and get us their last little draft of some model legislation, that's going to be used around. So, that's what we're going to base the Washington State legislation on. And, that'll come here after that decision is made in early November.

(00:51:25):

So, just wanted to button all that up. And, we're happy to work with you, happy to come to more meetings to peel back the onion a little bit if that's needed, and answer any more questions. So, I'll stop there. And, thank you very much for having us on such short notice. And Sydney, thank you for all of your help in putting this together. I appreciate it very much.

Sydney Muhle (00:51:45):

Yes. Of course. And, we do have time for questions from the board. We did anticipate there would be a number of questions from the board. The documents that Mr. Transon mentioned, were received this morning. So, those will be shared out to the board as soon as this meeting is done, for you guys to take a look at as well. I do...

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [00:52:04]

Sydney Muhle (00:52:03):

It's done for you guys to take a look at as well. I do fully anticipate this will be an ongoing discussion and that you guys will have more questions before the end of the calendar year. So I guess we could start with questions from the board on what you've already heard today, and then we can discuss how you guys want to track this moving forward. So I'll stop there.

Erica Loynd (00:52:34):

This is board member Erica. I appreciate your presentation in getting this conversation started. I have lots of colleagues that are passionate about this as well. This may be a question for Sydney. Would this be anticipated to be joining our board or would there be another Washington State regulating board that manages interior design on its own?

Sydney Muhle (00:52:56):

So I think that is actually a question that I am going to defer to the three folks who are doing the presentation, just because this was not a question that we were able to answer previously. So that would be one of mine as well.

Michael Transon (00:53:14):

So this is Michael. And I think as a start, I think we lean into joining your board, which is a model that exists in other states. In Washington, as you all know, all of the boards that DOL has under its purview must be self-sustaining and basically pay for themselves, if you will. So I think our initial thought is that to keep those fiscal costs down, the idea would be, I think at least at this juncture, to join the architecture board.

Paul Wu (00:53:53):

This is board member Wu. In my previous life I taught for 10 years at Bellevue College. At the interior design department, there was a movement at that time to get licensure for interior design. And I do agree there's a lot of overlap between what the interior design designer do and architects do. So the difficult part is where do you draw the line between the two practices? So I think that will remain a big question for all of us to address further. I believe, so.

Matthew Varsuch (00:54:37):

I can actually speak to that Mr. Wu, if you don't mind. So language. So as Michael mentioned, we at our annual meeting coming up in the first week of November are going to be finalizing with our Assembly of Delegates an updated draft of model legislation. And within that model legislation includes a very defined definition of the practice of registered interior design, including what registered interior designers can do independently and what they cannot do independently. And what's notable about that language is that that was developed or helped shaped at the state level with several bills that have passed over the last few years in collaboration and coordination between interior design and architecture communities at those states. So we had over the last three years, North Carolina, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin help develop this scope of practice language and help get to a place where both parties were okay with that language and it became law and we borrowed heavily from that for our model law. And so that combined with the upcoming practice overlap task force guidance from I Corps should help very much define the lines upon the boundaries, as you say.

Sian Roberts (00:55:58):

There's lots of hands up. So I'm going to go to Richard who has a number one next to his hand.

Sydney Muhle (00:56:05):

So before Richard [inaudible 00:56:08], I believe he is a member of the public, so I just want to caution one, if we're going to have any public questions on this, one, we would need approval of the full board to do that. And two, then our public comment rules would apply. So it will need to be kept at three minutes. It can't really be a question and answer. And I know that is a struggle in our public meetings, I get that, but it's the structure that we have in place for open meeting laws. So if the board is going to allow that-

Sian Roberts (00:56:42):

I would suggest that we hold off for public comment until the end. Thank you. And there's no decision action here for our board at this point, so I think just hearing comments at the end will be fine. Okay. I'm going to move on to Elizabeth then.

Elizabeth (00:57:06):

Okay, thank you. First, I just want to make sure that we have this discussion defined in our agenda that we're having right now. Are we good on that? Because all I can see is question and discussion, and I just want to make sure that this discussion is in the agenda.

Sydney Muhle (00:57:25):

Yes, it is.

Sian Roberts (00:57:26):

It is in the agenda. [inaudible 00:57:28]

Elizabeth (00:57:28):

Thank you. I don't have the agenda up in front of me. And let's see. So I just wanted to ask you a couple of questions. One is there's a movement, sort of an anti-regulatory movement across the United States and in Washington State as well. I wonder if you've had any problems with that movement? I know the national engineers and accountancy boards have met up. They have formed a group to address that issue.

Michael Transon (00:58:09):

So this is Michael. I'll take that just a little bit. We have not run into that sediment yet. We are relatively early on in our advocacy process, so I appreciate you bringing that to our attention and we'll make certain that we lean into that sediment, if you will, as we move along.

Elizabeth (00:58:31):

Okay, great. And the second question is taking your model legislation, one of the issues with the architects board that we run into, between the architects board and the engineering board, is the architects board practice definition is very broad and loose. And so keeping that in mind, I think it's very important for this board and with the systems from you, if you're going to go forward with the legislation, to make sure that there is no conflict. This is the chance, this is your chance to do that.

Michael Transon (00:59:09):

Perfect.

Elizabeth (00:59:10):

Yeah.

Michael Transon (00:59:11):

Yeah. And I haven't talked to Sydney a little bit about this. I have talked to my colleague at DOL, Bo Persbrocker, and I'm going to, as we get our model legislation wrapped up, I am going to lean into the DOL staff to, as we go about drafting this legislation and crafting it, that it is



complimentary to your current statute and making sure that those overlaps are noted and duly distinguished, for lack of [inaudible 00:59:44].

Elizabeth (00:59:43):

And let me be clear here, it isn't DOL staff that has that expertise. It is the board. I mean the board, that staff has its own expertise, but these are the definitions that the board should be looking at and determining. I think that's part of where we ran into trouble in the past and we still have trouble with the definition of architecture. It could definitely be improved, but it's the board that has that expertise. So I just want to make sure, not that you shouldn't be going to the staff, but that this board needs to be part of that process.

Michael Transon (01:00:22):

Perfect. And we'll work with Sydney to make certain that happens, for sure.

Sydney Muhle (01:00:26):

Yes, we do bring the board members into those conversations, but to provide a single point of contact. They work with the staff to make sure that we can get it out to the board and that we can also ensure that we're not running into any OPMA issues and that we're collecting those and providing the input in one space so that it's not coming in multiple directions. But yes, we do bring the board and their expertise in on those discussions throughout the legislative session.

Sian Roberts (01:00:58):

I'm going to jump the queue in the questions for just a second to follow up on this one because I think that, I know that, I think it was Matthew mentioned the I Corps group looking at these very issues. And my understanding from being in NCARB meetings lately is that this has been a struggle and that it would really be great to see a positive outcome out of that. We've been waiting as a board because of the issues that Elizabeth has brought up, we've been waiting patiently for something to come out of that effort that would help us as a board, and it's been super disappointing not to see real progress come out of that group. So any insight you have on that would certainly be welcome.

Paul Wu (01:01:44):

I think one of the, I'm interested in looking at some model laws and regulations on the other states and see what that details are. Can I find that on your website?

Matthew Varsuch (01:01:57):

If I can respond, if that's okay, Sharon?

Sian Roberts (01:02:00):

Yeah.

Matthew Varsuch (01:02:01):

The model law is not on our website quite yet. We're in the process of finalizing an updated draft from 2010. And so once we get the final stamp of approval from our assembly of delegates at our annual meeting on November 8th and 9th, then it will be uploaded to the website and of course promptly provided to this board for review.

(01:02:24):

And then to speak to I Corps. Yes, it has been a very deliberate process, a very intimate and intricate process. We have another meeting actually of the steering committee immediately following our annual meeting in Chicago from the 10th and 11th. So we hope to have more progress and more information to share hopefully after that meeting. But it's been, because there are so much overlap between all four of the design, five of the design professions and so much work to be done and so much to look at there, it's been a very long, long slog, as I'm sure you can imagine, and heard from the annual meeting presentation at NCARB.

(01:03:06):

So rest assured we want to get that information out to you as soon as we can and we absolutely will. We hope that and expect that that could be a very useful resource for all of our member boards.

Sian Roberts (01:03:19):

Thank you. Okay, Erica, I think you're next.

Erica Loynd (01:03:23):

Board member, Erica. You mentioned Matthew, specifically in your presentation, that part of this, as you described, the scope that it is for non-seismic environments and things, knowing that we are a seismic environment everywhere in our state and many of the interior things that are happening would require that kind of stuff. Are there other states that are in a seismic category similar to Washington that would be comparable to how they are addressing this?

Matthew Varsuch (01:03:56):

Perhaps California, if I may respond, I'm so sorry. But perhaps California. But California is actually the only jurisdiction in the country in North America that doesn't use our exam, so I can't really speak to that. But yeah, to your question, Erica, there are very specific carve outs for things like structural designs and anything that can be considered seismic or structural obviously is outside the scope of practice. And for those projects underneath our model legislation, an architect would still be needed to review those plans and stamp and sign construction plans. But I will definitely look into that in terms of Washington has unique considerations with regards to seismic, I'm sure other states as well. That's something I'm happy to look into and get back to you on.

Sian Roberts (01:04:44):

'Cause even ceiling requires seismic.

Matthew Varsuch (01:04:46):

Sure.

Erica Loynd (01:04:46):

Yeah. It goes even like a partial height wall or a ceiling grid structure or trellises that people are really, it's really common to have installed. The line is very gray and it's very easy to fall into a

spot that needs a seismic reinforcing and things. So that's something I would think needs to be very clear of how that distinction is drawn of what is allowable.

Matthew Varsuch (01:05:09):

Of course.

Sydney Muhle (01:05:09):

[inaudible 01:05:13] circa, Scott?

Scott Harm (01:05:14):

Yeah, it's not really a question for Matthew or anyone else, but more of a statement of interest. I know it seems like you're sharing notes with NCARB and I Corps, but a big topic within our world of NCARB is alternative pathways to licensure. So while you're doing your model, I see you nodding Matthew, so maybe you're already on top of this. But yeah, be aware that they're considering pretty substantial potential changes that may or may not be adopted by jurisdictions, but that's one of the biggest, I just came back from an NCARB meeting in Fargo, North Dakota, and that was the entire conversation for two and a half days.

Matthew Varsuch (01:05:53):

If I may respond to that, Chair Roberts, if that's okay?

Sian Roberts (01:05:57):

Yeah, go ahead.

Matthew Varsuch (01:05:59):

So actually, I'm well familiar with the discussion being had at the NCARB level right now. The benefits of the interior design profession being a newer one is that we have had alternative past licensure for quite some time. So for example, CIDQ has an alternative review process wherein interior designers who have been practicing for a certain amount of years underneath the offices of another design professional without meeting the education requirements can submit their work and their chronicle experience to a panel of reviewers and then be tentatively approved to sit for the examination that way. So we have already been having that discussion about alternative pathways. We do have the ARP as we call it, and you can find more information about that on the CIDQ website as well as some of the resources we've talked about.

Sian Roberts (01:06:53):

Great. I have one last question, and this maybe is for Sydney and Elizabeth, but I'm actually not sure who, we don't have a lot of multidisciplinary or any of multidisciplinary boards. I don't know, in Washington State, at least we don't in the design profession. So I'm just curious who makes a decision about those kinds of things? Is that at the executive level, they appoint boards, who decides what the makeup is?

Sydney Muhle (01:07:21):

So that is defined by legislation.

Sian Roberts (01:07:23):

Okay. Legislation, okay.

Sydney Muhle (01:07:26):

Yeah. And so again, we just received those documents this morning, so I really haven't even had a chance to dig in on them myself. But that'll all definitely be an ongoing part of the discussion, part of the research that the staff, not just myself, but we have a legislative core team within business and professions division that works with our overall legislative and policy team. So there's a really robust group that will be digging in on this and looking at all of the different impacts on a program level, a procedural level, licensing impacts to investigations and audits. We look at all of those different pieces and how that impact would be. And then obviously with the changes to the board structure, we'll be looking at what the impact would be for us here, what the current proposal is, what the other models are.

(01:08:21):

I've seen multiple different models. Obviously with our work through NCARB, we see a lot of the different models and makeups and so we'll be doing a deeper dive on those and really putting together robustly what that looks like to make sure that we're providing that information to all of you and really getting your input and your expertise from an industry level as well as just a day-to-day how is this going to impact Washingtonians?

Sian Roberts (01:08:52):

Great thank you.

Elizabeth (01:08:54):

Is my hand raised? I can't tell. I tried to raise it.

Sydney Muhle (01:08:58):

I can't see it, but. Sorry, go ahead.

Elizabeth (01:09:00):

For some reason it doesn't work very often. So I was just going to add that there are other multidisciplinary boards. So for example, the engineers board actually regulate licenses and regulates engineers, land surveyors and onsite wastewater designers. So that's not uncommon, not unusual for our state.

Sian Roberts (01:09:25):

Okay. I was just curious why it was that we were a single discipline board, but it sounds like there's a lot of work to be done and a lot of things to be thought about. So I just want to thank you all for coming here today to share with us and make sure that we're in the loop here. We definitely appreciate, especially since you're proposing joining our board, appreciate the fact that you are coming here and talking to us, and your patience for sitting through the rest of our meeting, which obviously was long.

(01:09:55):

I will also, to the members of the public who are interested in making a comment, I'm assuming many of you are probably wanting to comment about this particular topic. We do have a few

more agenda items, but not that many. So if you can be patient and hang in there, we will have that moment for you coming up pretty soon. Any other comments from the board on this particular topic before we move on? Okay, great. Thank you again. Let's move on to items.

Michael Transon (01:10:28):

Thank you all very much.

Matthew Varsuch (01:10:29):

Thank you so much.

Michael Transon (01:10:30):

Thank you.

Sian Roberts (01:10:30):

You're welcome. Let's move on to item seven, reports. And the first one is committee task force reports. Our only committee right now is the model law committee, which is me and Erica. Erica, if you don't mind, I'll just give the update from our standpoint. Great, thank you. We have reached out to AIA Washington Council. I think we were hoping to report on this in the fall, but it did take a while to get some momentum going here. So there is a small group on AIA, Washington Council's side who would be interested in reviewing our review of our legislation and model law and maybe have a discussion about where their plots are in terms of what might be worthwhile changing. And we have our notes from the session that we had with the board that we can bring to bear on that conversation. I do not know when that's going to happen, but we will certainly report back to the board after it does. Anything to add Erica?

Erica Loynd (01:11:35):

No thank you.

Sian Roberts (01:11:39):

Okay. Dave Christensen, I believe you're unmuted if you could mute. Thank you. Okay. We will move on to item two, which is 7.2 staff reports. And I'm going to hand this over to Sydney.

Sydney Muhle (01:11:57):

Thank you very much. We are going to have some changes to who is doing these presentations, but those changes are happening right this second, so you get me for all three of these reports.

(01:12:11):

So we're going to start with the centralized investigations and audits unit reports. Our complaint status report. As of October 3rd, 2024, we have received 19 total complaints. So we have eight that are in investigative status, five that are under management review, 14 that have been closed for a grand total of 27. Now the discrepancy with those two numbers is that some of those 27 would've been received in 2023 and have been processed and closed in 2024. So that's where the difference is there. So are there any questions on that before I move on?

(01:12:49):

And if you have some assigned to you that have gone through management review that you've completed the pieces on, it may just be that it hasn't caught up in the system yet to reflect that it's done.

Matthew Varsuch (01:13:02):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (01:13:03):

Yeah, I think I had this question last time that I had a one next to my name and I wasn't sure what it was. So I just wonder if, but I know you're in the middle of some transition, but if somebody could maybe just make sure the ones that are under review aren't 2023 things that have fallen through the cracks.

Sydney Muhle (01:13:24):

Yep, absolutely. I'll work with Grace and the team to make sure that we get that cleared up.

Erica Loynd (01:13:31):

Okay, great. Thank you.

Sydney Muhle (01:13:34):

Any other questions before I move on?

(01:13:37):

All right, then we'll dive into our licensee count. So this is one that the board will be very familiar with, with our age demographics. We have a 1,619 active status over the age of 65, 1,854 between the ages of 55 and 64, 1,766 between the ages of 45 and 54, 1,389 between the ages of 35 and 44, and 425 between the ages of 25 and 34. Total number of active licensees is 7,053.

(01:14:25):

All right, and this is just a look at our renewals and new issues by month for this year. And our five-year look at our active licensee, you can see that we have had a growing number of licensees over the last five years, so you guys are definitely trending in the right direction. One thing I really love to see with this board is a lot of our programs took a slight dip in the covid years and yours was one that continued to grow even through covid, so. Board member Harm.

Scott Harm (01:15:05):

Yeah, two slides back was the... Yeah, right there. That one. Is there a publication or a link or anything that we can send to or push out through the AIA on what are your options as you get into the, I'll say the elder categories of which I'm one of them, what are your options as far as being inactive or inactive retired or just letting it expire or anything that outlines and maybe gets people to act on it so we have a more accurate record on who's doing what. But do we push out anything Sydney to tell them these are your options, just don't stop paying your dues, do something else instead, so we have that recorded. Do we have anything like that?

Sydney Muhle (01:15:48):

I don't think we actively push out any information. I'd have to double check the website to see what we do have on there, but we can certainly look in on that and see what we have and bring back some options to increase some outreach specifically regarding that.

Scott Harm (01:16:06):

Thank you.

Sydney Muhle (01:16:09):

Any other questions on the licensee account report?

Paul Wu (01:16:12):

Yes. Board member Wu here. What's the difference between inactive and inactive retired?

Sydney Muhle (01:16:21):

So that is going to be a very technical system question. I'm going to see if Deb is able to bail me out on an answer, but I believe somebody can place their license in inactive status if they have been working in Washington State but maybe aren't for a little while, but want to still have the option to go back active. And then the inactive retired is just a slightly different designation where they're in that retired status but still have the license. It's just a slight variance in how it's recorded in the system.

Paul Wu (01:16:55):

Is there any fee difference involved with registration between the expired and inactive retired?

Sydney Muhle (01:17:06):

That is what I'm going to have to dig in on.

Paul Wu (01:17:13):

Appreciate it. I'm following almost in that direction now, so.

Scott Harm (01:17:18):

Yeah. And this is board member Harm again. So the things that board member Wu brought up are kind of the things that I'm thinking we could be or should be, in my opinion, proactive in telling people, "Hey, if you do this, you still have to pay an annual licensee fee, but if you do this you don't and you can still have these opportunities or whatever." Yeah, so somebody can make a more informed decision. But I think it might also spark people to update our records so we get a more crystal clear count on the 1,619 north of 65. Really there's only like 50 that are interested in keeping their license in one shape or form kind of a thing.

Sydney Muhle (01:17:55):

Yeah. And each of our programs treats the inactive and inactive retired statuses slightly different. So I don't want to say something and have it be-

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:18:04]

Sydney Muhle (01:18:03):

... the status is slightly different, so I don't want to say something and have it be wrong, so let me just double check that information before I say something incorrect and I'll bring back some information about that at our next meeting.

Speaker 3 (01:18:15):

Appreciate it.

Sydney Muhle (01:18:16):

Absolutely. All right, well then moving on to our master action item review list. We've already talked about the model law committee statistics for our law exam review. I think we probably need to revisit what that looks like. We had requested some management analyst support, but that's been quite a while, so we need to relook at what that looks like and if that information is even still pertinent to the board. Outreach is ongoing with universities and NCARB, as we've already discussed earlier in this meeting. We'll continue to work with AIA Washington Council as we move into legislative session with today kind of being our kickoff, so we'll be working with Tammy and her team to make sure that we're having those ongoing discussions as we move into legislative session. The list of alternative pathway programs in Washington State, that is still ongoing. We're working with Chair Roberts to get that compiled. And then-

Speaker 4 (01:19:22):

So can I mention that I do have a list. I didn't realize I was supposed to provide it to board staff, so I can maybe send that to you, Sydney. I do think that Lake Washington is the most robust program for us to be talking about, but I can certainly provide the list of the research that I've done to you and then I am not sure what we do with it, but maybe we can just talk about that at that time.

Sydney Muhle (01:19:45):

Yeah, so what we do with that is we keep a running list of contacts and different outreach places, and that way as board members change, we have that consistent list moving forward.

Speaker 4 (01:20:01):

Yeah. The other thing that's changed is that some of the programs that had better, more robust programs that we visited in the past no longer seem to have the same. I think instructors come and go and programs come and go, so the degree programs that we used to go, we had contacts with and went to visit, some of them no longer exist. So anyway, in the same way the board members come and go, instructors come and go.

Sydney Muhle (01:20:31):

Absolutely. So yeah, we just kind of create a central repository for that information.

Speaker 4 (01:20:37):

Okay. I'll send that to you.

Sydney Muhle (01:20:39):



Okay. And then again, as we've already discussed that Chair Roberts and myself have already been working with AIA on outreach opportunities and that will be ongoing discussion. So that'll actually probably drop off the action item list as that's already ongoing.

Speaker 4 (01:20:58):

Yep.

Sydney Muhle (01:21:00):

Are there any questions on that?

Sian Roberts (01:21:04):

All right, well that was it for the reports. Thank you.

Sydney Muhle (01:21:09):

Okay. The moment you've all been waiting for. We're looking forward to hearing from the public right now. This is unusual for us, so glad to have some people here. The public may address the board on matters within the board's jurisdiction, either verbally during the meeting or by submitting written comments in advance. Verbal comments are limited to one three-minute comment. Written comments are limited to no more than 500 words and must be emailed to the board staff no less than two business days prior to the meeting. 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.

Sian Roberts (01:21:52):

Sydney, have we received any comments in writing?

Sydney Muhle (01:21:55):

No, ma'am.

Sian Roberts (01:21:57):

Okay. All right. Well let's go then. Do we have any members of the public who would like to make a comment?

Dave Christensen (01:22:05):

I would, yeah.

Sian Roberts (01:22:06):

Sorry, go ahead.

Dave Christensen (01:22:08):

Okay. My name's Dave Christensen. I don't know, my image isn't coming up here. Just briefly wanted to make the board aware. I've been president off and on in the Northwest Washington chapter of the AIA for many years and now it's a section in Seattle. And one comment I know from many, many firms that I know is the amount of time that we all know that jurisdictions take

to permit reviews. It's really gotten really terrible in the last several years. And there's several jurisdictions around the United States that allow self-certification by architects to self-certifying projects if there are not any critical areas or any unusual planning issues. This is a big affordability issue for cost, time on a lot of projects. I've had Alex Ramlin and I have been working on this and he's probably going to present something in the next legislative process next year, but I just want to make you aware that I am kind of pushing this.

(01:23:04):

I've been working a little bit with WABO and the AIA. There's a lot of jurisdiction. I know New Jersey State has just passed a self-certification process, and there's a lot of details involved in how that happens. We all have the liability no matter what. Jurisdictions don't. So I just wanted to know, one is whether this has ever come up before in the state, and I could provide a lot more detail next time we meet in the future here. But a lot of work has gone into this so far, but it's something for some reason I'm pushing because everyone doesn't have to do it, but if you want to do it can. I know I have done it in the past on some native reservations where there was no jurisdiction to review my plans, and ironically, they were just one of the best set of plans I've ever done because nobody's double checking it. I had time and I wasn't scrambling to vest the project because it takes so dang long to get permit views happened. So anyway, that's something I'm in process. I'm curious to know if this has ever come up before and there's more to come from me. Thanks.

Sian Roberts (01:24:15):

Thank you. I believe we're limited in how we can respond to that, but we appreciate your comment. We'll be looking for future information on that.

Dave Christensen (01:24:26):

Has this come up before at all, self certification?

Sian Roberts (01:24:29):

Well, all of us, we're all short-timers here, so we haven't been here forever. It has not, in my term it has not come up.

Dave Christensen (01:24:38):

Okay.

Speaker 5 (01:24:38):

We can certainly add this to the agenda for next time to discuss if the board wants to or if staff wants to research that or if this is a topic on the agenda, you can have a deeper discussion. But right now, because it's public comment and it's not on the agenda, we have to wait for any further discussion until the next meeting.

Sian Roberts (01:25:02):

So if the board is interested in this topic, I'll add it to the next agenda.

Sydney Muhle (01:25:08):

Would members of the board be interested in discussing this?

Erica Loynd (01:25:13):

This is Board Member Loynd, I'm interested to hear their comments.

Scott Harm (01:25:16):

Yeah, as the Board Member Harm, I as well is pretty interested and agree somewhat with what Dave presented.

Sian Roberts (01:25:25):

So if we can maybe have staff do a little bit of research on this and then we can bring it to the board for the next meeting?

Sydney Muhle (01:25:31):

Yep.

Sian Roberts (01:25:33):

Thank you, Sydney. All right. Next comment from Richard from Astoria.

Richard (01:25:40):

All right. Richard Balkans from Astoria, Oregon and owner of Astoria Building Design, in response to the discussion regarding interior design regulations. Now as a building designer, a lot of times interior design would be incidental to what we do sometimes with projects, probably very much as it may be with architects. And as such, my concern is how would the interior designer licensing registration requirements impact other stakeholders like building designers, design build contractors that might do a project that involves interior design aspects. I would think it would be great that we would have the conversations with the various parties involved and with the professional associations like the American Institute of Building Design in contact with the BIDQ and IIDA and all those other parties so that we could try to make sure that if there are regulations that are made in this thing to not have a negative impact where competent building designers are being essentially legislated out of being able to provide an interior design oriented service to a client.

Speaker 5 (01:27:42):

If anyone has anything to say on this, this was on the agenda, so if anyone wants to respond, that's okay.

Sian Roberts (01:27:53):

Any comments from the board on this? Are you done, Richard? It looks like you are.

Richard (01:27:59):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (01:27:59):

Okay. Thank you. Yeah, there are a lot of implications that we're not, we're unaware of how this would impact other folks. I think it's fair to say that this isn't a decision that the board is going to make, so while we appreciate your input for consideration, we don't get to decide whether

interior design gets regulated or how it gets regulated. So that would be, I appreciate your comment, you may find more traction with an audience that has some ability to address that more directly. I see we have a comment, but I don't think we're entering into a group discussion here at this point. I'm looking to Sydney and it sounds like this might be something where there's two other parties at this meeting who maybe need to engage more directly and outside of the venue of this particular meeting.

Sydney Muhle (01:29:02):

Yeah, so I think what we can do is make sure that we incorporate those questions into the compilation of things that we look at as this proposal moves forward. And we'll make sure to get that information to Mr. Transient as well so that if there's any outreach that they can incorporate with what they're doing on the legislative side of this, that they're getting all of that information as well.

Sian Roberts (01:29:29):

Great. Thank you. Sydney. Yeah, we're happy to kind of make the connections here, but this might not be the forum for that particular discussion. Do we have any other public comments? I'm not seeing any hands up, but I might not be seeing everybody on, so I'd ask if anybody does have a comment to go ahead and say something now. Okay. All right. Well thank you all for hanging in there throughout this meeting to make your comments. We appreciate that. All right, moving on to item number nine, conclusion. So announcements. Do any board members or staff have any announcements or additional reports that they'd like to make at this time?

Scott Harm (01:30:25):

Yeah, this is a board member-

Sian Roberts (01:30:27):

Go ahead Scott.

Scott Harm (01:30:28):

Yeah, Board Member Harm. Having just come back from the NBE, NBC, I'm sorry, I'm using acronyms. Member Board Executive, Member Board Chair meeting hosted by NCARB in Fargo, North Dakota. I'm not going to do a full report out, but one that did get a lot of attention, it was Representative Greg Erny from the state of Nevada informed the board that they have a true community college that is now developing or has developed a five-year undergraduate professional degree program. And it's getting a lot of attention in the groups pursuant to supporting community colleges and such like ICORE and anything else. So it was very interesting the alternative pathways that this was one that's really in an advanced stage of development, so I thought that was pretty interesting.

Sian Roberts (01:31:23):

So is it a bachelor's degree then? So it's not-

Scott Harm (01:31:25):

Yeah, I think that's-

Sian Roberts (01:31:25):

It's a five year B-Art degree. It's just being delivered by a, I mean it's not really a community college at that point. It's a, yeah. Okay. I understand. Interesting. Did anything else come out of that, Scott? I'm just curious. We're really fortunate we have a regional, region chair. Is that what it is?

Scott Harm (01:31:59):

Regional director.

Sian Roberts (01:32:00):

Regional director. We have a regional director. Thank you. I always get that wrong. We have a regional director represented at the national board here on our board, which is a fortunate position to be in. So are there any other NCARB updates you think that the board benefit from hearing Scott?

Scott Harm (01:32:17):

Yeah, I was looking at, let me share, yeah, I was looking over my notes. The biggest thing I think I stated earlier, the big calorie burn on that full day and a half of nonstop meetings was the alternative pathways. To what extent is NCARB looking at it right now. The official official statement is we're just considering everything including but not limited to a test free licensing process where you just do it through experience and then somehow a portfolio review is done. But that was the largest portion it because of the executives there and how would it affect model law and rules. The large portion of that whole event was topping on that discussion. There were only a few jurisdictions that were vocalizing their displeasure with the idea and thinking that there would be no way to work around with interstate, but that's something that's being worked at the NCARB staff level.

(01:33:16):

But other than that, it seemed to be a very supportive program and people getting more and more interested with it. There is a continued slow but steady growth on the ICORE integrated, no, it's IPAL, integrated Path to Licensure. I think they said every year there's three programs that get approved to do it. So it's just a steady increase in incline also under the vein of alternative pathways, but not working on your licensure and your examination while you're still attending university classes is the big picture idea of integrated pathways to licensure through architectural programs. So it's good to see that that's getting garnered support not only from universities and colleges, but also from jurisdictions that they're seeing this is a valuable alternative pathways essentially in affordability and getting people to practices early as possible.

Sian Roberts (01:34:17):

Yeah, it's interesting that we don't have one in Washington, an IPAL program.

Scott Harm (01:34:22):

I think WSU was.

Sian Roberts (01:34:25):

No.

Scott Harm (01:34:26):

Nope. Okay. Well I sit corrected. Yeah, I don't think, good because I don't think I stated in the meeting that we had one night. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. This is me looking surprised because I really did.

Sian Roberts (01:34:38):

Unless they did it in the last year.

Scott Harm (01:34:40):

No, I'm sure they didn't. I'm sure I'm just not keeping track.

Sian Roberts (01:34:42):

I mean they've got a four plus one and a bit kind of thing. But I think Sydney has some updates.

Sydney Muhle (01:34:51):

Yeah, I just wanted to provide a quick update to the board on our appointments. We did conduct informational discussions with several applicants over the summer, provided those notes back to the governor's office. Unfortunately with the upcoming election, a number of members of the governor's office staff have already left to pursue other opportunities knowing that so many changes will be happening in the governor's office in the next few months, so that has very much slowed down our appointment process. The original indication that we had gotten was that they were still working on it and we're hoping to make the appointment fairly quickly, but a lot of that communication has also ceased as well. So I think at this point it's fair to anticipate that we will not be having any new appointments prior to the election and we'll be waiting for the new governor's office staff to get up and running.

(01:35:51):

We'll continue trying to get those as best we can, but with only two weeks left until election day, I just don't know that it's going to be all that likely. I'm anticipating hopefully sometime during the first quarter of 2025, but I think we are still a little ways out from the appointment. So I wanted to let you know that all of that has been done. We did have a couple of applicants from Eastern Washington we were very excited to talk to, so all of those notes and everything are with the governor. We're just waiting and hoping and you guys are not the only board that's being impacted by this. I think you guys are just the ones happening to feel it most directly because we are down to our minimum for quorum. So we'll keep pestering them and hoping for the best, but I think we're waiting for a little bit.

Sian Roberts (01:36:40):

It would be a great kind of lame duck activity, wouldn't it? Okay. Thank you for the update Sydney. Appreciate it. We'll stay patient. Any other announcements from anybody on the board? Erica?

Erica Loynd (01:36:59):

Board member Erica Loynd. I just have a quick question. The regional NCARB summit is due, on my calendar I had it placed on the February 27th through March 1st, which is fairly close to the next meeting. When do we need to start arranging things for that? Attendance and things?

Sian Roberts (01:37:16):

We probably need to start arranging that here soon, so we'll be reaching out to the board and just checking availability and see who we're able to send. A portion of that is going to tie into Board Member Harm and Chair Roberts' connections with the programs that they're already involved in with NCARB and whether they'll be attending on behalf of those. And so that kind of changes our numbers and our dynamics, so we'll be reaching out to everybody and getting that going over the next month.

Erica Loynd (01:37:50):

Perfect. Just want to make sure that for January 30th will be I think too close.

Sian Roberts (01:37:55):

It'll be very tight. Yeah. I guess probably also worth mentioning, sorry, that we are are hosting a West NCARB meeting here in Seattle in a couple of weeks actually. We're going to host the meeting actually in our office. I would love to say, because the only reason I'm on West NCARB is so that I can get funded to go to the meetings, but apparently we're having some financial issues, so I'm not sure that I'll be funded to go to the meetings so we'll see. We'll figure that out as we go along.

Scott Harm (01:38:33):

Yeah, and I, of course, until I rotate off, we'll be funded by NCARB as being part of the board of directors.

Sian Roberts (01:38:42):

Okay. We'll move on to item 9.2, requests for future agenda items. So are there any additional future agenda items we haven't yet discussed that board members would like to request for the next meeting? I guess I would like to maybe formally request that if there is any activity that has been, or any progress that's been made in kind of pulling together what the interior design legislation might be looking like, if maybe that can be put on the agenda and if Sydney, the board can receive any progress or information that might be beneficial to us in the meantime.

Sydney Muhle (01:39:31):

Yes, we will absolutely have that as an agenda item for the January meeting, and then we'll always be keeping the board informed in between meetings, providing status updates. Then just for the board's awareness, once we're in legislative session and legislation drops, we do keep very close tabs on where it's at in the process and any changes that are made and anything that we need to send to the board and receive input back that'll be happening. We try to do as much of it as we can ahead of time because generally once we're in legislative session, our legislators are wanting that input provided within about 48 hours and that puts everybody under a very tight time deadline to get those responses back, so we'll do as much as we can ahead of time. But just so that the board is aware anytime you see those during session, I apologize now for the tight time deadline that we're going to give for responses, but that's just the nature of session.

Sian Roberts (01:40:34):

Thanks. And then any other future agenda items? Okay, item 9.3, review of action items and items for next meeting. Sydney, are you, is that your job today too?

Sydney Muhle (01:40:52):

That is.

Sian Roberts (01:40:53):

Wow. Okay.

Sydney Muhle (01:40:55):

So I'm going to do my best to capture all of them, but my notes were kind of spotty as we were going through the presentation so I will phone a friend with one of our program specialists, Sandra, who handles our minutes behind the scenes as well. I'll be returning the demographic trends in January. Again, I apologize that that wasn't available for today. The legislative update we just discussed, that'll also be an agenda item for the next meeting. The model law committee report, Chair Roberts was going to share additional information at the next meeting on their ongoing discussions. We have some information to bring back regarding our inactive and inactive retired statuses and how all of that works, so we'll bring back that additional information as well as working with our centralized investigations and audits unit to make sure we're clearing up any management review statuses that are lagging behind. I think I captured all of them. Sandra, did I miss anything?

Sandra (01:42:04):

I think so. I did pop into the team's chat that you and I have just in case, but I think you've covered everything that I had.

Sydney Muhle (01:42:13):

Okay, good.

Sian Roberts (01:42:17):

Okay, well I think that is everything we have for today, so thank you all for your time and for your attention. The time is now 11:43 and this meeting is adjourned.

Scott Harm (01:42:34):

Thank you.

Speaker 6 (01:42:34):

Thank you. Goodbye.

Sydney Muhle (01:42:34):

Thanks everyone. Bye.

Scott Harm (01:42:35):

Thank you to the public. Thank you.



Sian Roberts (01:42:38):

Bye.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:42:40]