

Washington State Board for Architects meeting transcript

Date: April 24, 2025

Time: 10 a.m.

Sian Roberts (00:00:05):

Okay. Looks like it started.

Erica Loynd (00:00:07):

Yeah, we're good.

Sian Roberts (00:00:08):

Okay, great. So it is 10:02 a.m., and I call this regular meeting of the architect board to order. The board will provide an opportunity for public comment during the meeting, and as a courtesy, we ask participants to mute their mics or phone when not speaking to reduce the background noise. Please remember to unmute your mic or phone when you're speaking. Also, for board members to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thank you. I'll also let members of the public who are here and would like to speak know that that comes to the end of our agenda, so you know when to expect that. Okay. Alyssa, at this time, would you please call roll? And board members, please respond if in attendance.

Alyssa Woods (00:00:53):

Okay. I will start with you, Chair Roberts.

Sian Roberts (00:00:56):

I'm here.

Alyssa Woods (00:00:58):

Vice Chair Loynd.

Erica Loynd (00:00:59):

I am here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:01):

Secretary Wu?

Paul Wu (00:01:03):

I'm here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:05):
Board member Russell?

Kathy Russell (00:01:07):
Present.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:08):
Board member Brachvogel

Peter Brachvogel (00:01:10):
Present.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:12):
And then board member Harm has an excuse absence today. Oh, back to you, Chair.

Sian Roberts (00:01:21):
Okay, so we will need to approve the agenda. Do you display that agenda or not?

Erica Loynd (00:01:34):
We do in the form of the presentation, but Madam Chair, if we could request the item 7.2 is one of our cases in which board member Harm is the case manager? If we could pull that from the agenda with board member Harm not being present, the investigators have requested that we hold off on that one until the next meeting when he is present to present it.

Sian Roberts (00:02:00):
Sounds good. So, I guess I'm looking for a motion to approve the agenda minus item 7.2. Yeah. Can I have a motion?

Paul Wu (00:02:14):
I make a-

Sian Roberts (00:02:15):
Go ahead, Paul.

Paul Wu (00:02:17):
Board Member Wu, I make a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Sydney Muhle (00:02:24):
Board Member Muhle, I second.

Sian Roberts (00:02:27):
All those in favor?

Group (00:02:28):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:02:30):

Any opposed? Okay, the motion passes, and now we will move on to approval of the meeting minutes from our last meeting, which was January 30th, 2025. Can I have a motion?

Peter Brachvogel (00:02:46):

I'd like to make a motion we approve the meeting minutes.

Paul Wu (00:02:51):

Board Member Wu second the motion.

Sian Roberts (00:02:54):

Thank you. Any comments on the meeting minutes from January?

Peter Brachvogel (00:03:01):

Nope.

Sian Roberts (00:03:02):

Okay. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

Group (00:03:07):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:03:10):

Are there any opposed? Okay, the minutes have been approved unanimously. So, we're going to move on to old business, which is the report from those who attended the regional summit, the NCARBS Regional Summit. Because Scott isn't here, it looks like it's just me and Peter who had attended. Peter, do you want to maybe start by-

Peter Brachvogel (00:03:39):

Sure.

Sian Roberts (00:03:39):

... providing some ... Yeah.

Peter Brachvogel (00:03:41):

Yeah. So, this was my first one of these summits to have attended, and I thought it was really interesting to see how the country works together and also how very independent it is in the various regions. In small group, we were ... the one that I was a part of kept circling around one particular issue that's occurring in Nevada with a very prominent

architect that's not wanting to get licensed in the US, and yet he wants to use his name as an architect all over this large project. So, that was, I guess, the highlight conversation that I had was with that group of other people from around Region Six that debated on what to do and how to go about doing this. But there were a number of different events that were occurring that were really quite good in terms of just seeing how the whole operation works.

Sian Roberts (00:04:45):

Yeah, the NCARB folks came around for a couple of presentations. And one was on the MRAs. There are more MRAs to be voted on at the next ABM. And I think our region talked earlier about wanting to understand what the big picture was for MRAs since they seem to be coming a lot now. So, the question is, is there an intent to sign as many MRAs as we can? What is behind the MRAs coming out? And so, I think we got a pretty good answer in that NCARB is not actively out there trying to get countries to sign agreements with us. These have come out of meetings that they have with other countries to talk about their licensure processes. And they've had a few people approach them, or a few nations approach them with the idea of maybe having reciprocity.

(00:05:50):

Some of them they have taken a quick look at and decided it really doesn't make sense, and they aren't aligned, and they haven't brought them any further. The ones that have more legs, I'd say, they've moved forward on. I did also hear the comment that right now ... the next topic I'm going to talk about, which is the pathways to licensure. With all of that going on, it is unlikely that they're going to have the bandwidth to pursue a lot of MRAs in the near future. So, this might be ... I don't think we need to worry about having a bunch of them coming our way and needing to decide what we should do. It felt like maybe it was going to be on pause for a while. At least that was ... Peter, I don't know if you had the same takeaway from me, but that was what I heard from Mike Armstrong.

Peter Brachvogel (00:06:49):

Yeah, that was my take on it as well.

Sian Roberts (00:06:49):

And then the other thing that we heard about again, and I know a lot of us have heard this through various meetings, but it's always ... Every meeting, we get new information on what's happening with the pathways to practice, and we started to see some diagrams of how it might work. But I think it's still very, very early days and so they're just basically trying to look at whether there are multiple ways that a candidate could demonstrate competency for any of the 16 competencies, or whether there are multiple that they would need to have to demonstrate competency. So, they're just at the early days of looking at that and trying to figure out then, okay, if we say that, for instance, you can gain this competency through experience, what does it look like to demonstrate that competency? So, what does the assessment look like? And that, I think, is probably off in the near future. It felt like that is all still really very much being developed right now. Peter, anything to add on that? I mean, we talked quite a bit about that. So, yeah.

Peter Brachvogel (00:08:07):

Yeah, the competency topic was, I think, still somewhat in its infancy in the sense that there isn't a agreement on how this can all come together among everybody, and I think it's going to be a while. That was my take was that that's going to be out there a bit.

Sian Roberts (00:08:28):

Yeah, agree. What else happened? We had our elections. I was elected secretary-treasurer for Westcarb, so I will still be on that board. And Scott was elected for second year as regional director, so he will be serving a second ... or no, sorry. Yes. Sorry. He is running for ... apologies. I'm getting confused here. So many positions. There are so many leadership positions between Westcarb and the national board. He is concluding his second year, and so he is running right now for secretary.

(00:09:18):

We also saw visits by candidates actually, and so there are a number of candidates for secretary. And there are a number of candidates for the open director positions, so that is something that we will be voting on. Scott is one of the candidates for secretary. And again, there are a couple in the open positions to make selections on. So, they came around and spoke and gave us their spiels. Tian Feng was elected as the chair. Or no, sorry, as the regional director, and Mike was elected as chair, and Celestia as vice chair. So, that's how the Westcarb elections went, and I think that's probably it. Peter, anything to add?

Peter Brachvogel (00:10:16):

No, I think you covered it. I think that was it. It was a really interesting few days of getting to know everybody, I thought. I really enjoyed it.

Sian Roberts (00:10:25):

Yeah. Well, it's great to have you there, Peter. It really is an eye-opening experience, I think, the first time you go just to understand how we fit into the bigger picture.

Peter Brachvogel (00:10:34):

Yeah, yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:10:34):

And how important it is, I think, that we're there to learn and also to contribute.

Peter Brachvogel (00:10:41):

I guess the biggest takeaway for me was the variety in this country about how and to what extent people have to train to get licensed. Right? Every state has got these different requirements, and it's so unlike, say, the medical profession, which is a level standard that doesn't have any variety regionally through the country. It's like that's it. That's your medical license in the state. And this is just surprising how varied it was. It all rolled up to be the same in the end, but getting there was very different.

Sian Roberts (00:11:16):

Yeah, and it's not only the actual getting your license but also what that license means and all the different makeups of all of the boards. We're seeing some that are architect only, some that have other disciplines, some that have many, many more public members. There's all sorts of different makeups of boards, and there's different responsibilities for boards too. There are a lot of boards that do a lot of the work that we delegate to our amazing staff at the Department of Licensing, but there are a lot of boards out there that do a lot of that work themselves. So, there is a real variety in how states do the business that we do.

Peter Brachvogel (00:11:59):

Yeah. It was a good meeting.

Alyssa Woods (00:12:02):

Chair Roberts, this is Alyssa. I was wondering, just for the sake of meeting minutes, could you explain what MRA stands for?

Sian Roberts (00:12:10):

Mutual Recognition Agreement, and those are agreements between different countries that you can ... In other words, it's an additional portability for your NCARB certificate. So, if you have an NCARB certificate, you can easily get licensed in the countries with which we have MRAs.

Alyssa Woods (00:12:28):

Okay, thank you.

Sian Roberts (00:12:36):

Mm-hmm. Okay, should we move on to item six, new business? Anybody else have anything to share on that? Okay, let's move on to item six, new business. All right, here we go, guys. We get to elect officers, and you might be a little bit surprised that this is popping up like this. So, I'll just give you a little bit of history on how we have done this in the past because I know we have a lot of new board members. But anyway, it is elections, so we do need to elect officers for our board. We can do anything we want today, so I just want to make that clear. Anybody can nominate anybody for any position. Traditionally, we have cycled through those roles so that everybody gets a chance to be chair at some point, so that's how it has worked in the past. Interestingly, we have a couple of new board members, and Paul has a short tenure here. Scott, as well, is busy at the national level, so it might look a little bit different as we start to look for who is actually available to serve as an officer.

(00:13:52):

So, hopefully, new board members are particularly interested in jumping into that role. I think, as you've probably seen, that the chair role has some amount. The chair and the vice chair have a little bit more responsibility and a little bit more time, but really not that much. So that said, let's see, at the second meeting of every year, the architect board

holds elections for officers for the following 12 months, and we are going to need nominations and votes for the chair, vice chair, and secretary positions. The first position is to elect the chair, and at this time, I'm going to open the floor for nominations. I'm going to ask Sydney, can I nominate?

Sydney Muhle (00:14:41):

You absolutely can. The only caveat is we can't do a slate of officers. We've had a lot of pushback on that in recent years, so we've been asked to do each seat individually. So we'll need a nomination, motion, second vote for chair, vice, and secretary.

Sian Roberts (00:15:01):

Excellent. So, I'm opening the floor for nominations for chair, and I would like to nominate Erica Loynd for chair for the next year. Are there other-

Erica Loynd (00:15:20):

Do I have to accept it, or do you-

Sian Roberts (00:15:21):

Yeah.

Erica Loynd (00:15:23):

Yeah. Board member Loynd, I accepted your nomination.

Sian Roberts (00:15:27):

Thank you. Are there any other nominations for chair? Okay, I am going to call a vote. All those in favor of board member Erica Loynd being chair of this board for the next 12-

Sydney Muhle (00:15:48):

[inaudible 00:15:48] if we can get a motion and a second on that. The nomination doesn't-

Sian Roberts (00:15:51):

I'm sorry.

Sydney Muhle (00:15:52):

... count as the motion.

Sian Roberts (00:15:53):

Sorry.

Sydney Muhle (00:15:54):

I'm sorry. We've been called on that recently, so there's just-

Sian Roberts (00:15:59):
[inaudible 00:16:00] the fourth, Sydney.

Paul Wu (00:16:00):
Board Member WU. I second that nomination. Can you hear me?

Sian Roberts (00:16:04):
So, we have a nomination and a second, but we don't have a motion. Is that right, Sydney? We need a motion to vote.

Sydney Muhle (00:16:11):
If we could turn those into motions, that would be great.

Sian Roberts (00:16:14):
Okay. I move that ... let's see. How do I say that? I move for Erica Loynd to be chair of the architect board for the next year.

Paul Wu (00:16:28):
And I second that motion. Board member Wu.

Sian Roberts (00:16:32):
All those in favor?

Group (00:16:34):
Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:16:36):
Any opposed? Okay, let's see if we can make this next one smoother. This will be my goal. This is the first time I've done this. Okay. So, I am going to now open the floor for nominations for the position of vice chair.

Paul Wu (00:16:59):
Board member Wu would like to nominate Kathy for the vice chair.

Sian Roberts (00:17:08):
Thank you. Do we have any other nominations for vice chair? Okay. Can I have a motion for this vote?

Erica Loynd (00:17:29):
Board member Loynd, and I move to appoint Kathy as vice-chair of the board for one year.

Paul Wu (00:17:38):

Board member Wu second that motion.

Sian Roberts (00:17:43):

Okay. All those in favor?

Group (00:17:46):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:17:46):

Any opposed? Okay. Congratulations, Kathy.

Kathy Russell (00:17:54):

Oh, thank you.

Sian Roberts (00:17:57):

Okay, we have one more position, the secretary position. And at this point, I'd like to open the floor for nominations for secretary.

Kathy Russell (00:18:08):

Chair Roberts, I'd like to nominate Peter as secretary.

Sian Roberts (00:18:12):

Excellent, thank you.

Paul Wu (00:18:15):

Board member Wu. I second that motion.

Kathy Russell (00:18:19):

I'll make a motion.

Sian Roberts (00:18:19):

Excellent.

Paul Wu (00:18:20):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:18:21):

We actually need to do a motion, so somebody give me a motion, please.

Erica Loynd (00:18:29):

Board member Loynd, I move to appoint Peter as secretary of the board for one year.

Sian Roberts (00:18:38):
Excellent. Second?

Kathy Russell (00:18:40):
I second.

Paul Wu (00:18:41):
Yep.

Sian Roberts (00:18:42):
Thank you. All those in favor? Aye.

Group (00:18:45):
Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:18:47):
Great. Any opposed? Okay. Congratulations.

Peter Brachvogel (00:18:53):
Can I ask what that job will entail just now that I'm ...

Erica Loynd (00:19:01):
Now that we appointed you.

Sian Roberts (00:19:01):
Now that you've been elected?

Peter Brachvogel (00:19:03):
Yeah, just to [inaudible 00:19:06]

Sydney Muhle (00:19:05):
So, with the secretary position, there's not a whole lot of additional. For the chair and vice chair, we do hold meetings with them monthly just as a regular check-in to make sure that we're staying on track with everything and anything they're hearing that we can work on in between meetings. It just helps keep everything flowing in between the quarterly meetings. And then we also have meetings with them ahead of this meeting to set the agenda. So, it's not a big additional lift on them, but it is an extra hour to a max of two per quarter that will rely on them. For the secretary position, we will bring you into those discussions as needed. We have to be careful because we start getting close to quorum, and we don't want to put any of you guys in a bad position with that. Another thing is if, excuse me, if we have a really highly technical discussion that happens during a meeting, we want to make sure that we've captured everything correctly because we are not architects, and we want to make sure that we are characterizing

everything properly. We might ask you to review the minutes for us to help make sure that we captured it all correct.

Peter Brachvogel (00:20:21):

Okay, thank you.

Sydney Muhle (00:20:22):

No problem.

Erica Loynd (00:20:22):

This is board member Loynd. I just want to confirm this takes effect at the conclusion of this meeting, correct?

Sydney Muhle (00:20:28):

Correct. So, we'll be reaching out to you and Kathy to get our monthly check-ins set up, and then we also have a chair training that we will provide you with just as a little bit of a refresher on Robert's rules and the things that our chair has so heavily upon to enforce for the meeting. So, we'll walk you through all of that sometime in the next quarter, and we'll provide it to both of you in the event that, Vice Chair Loynd, you're not able to attend and Board Member Russell needs to fill in. That way, nobody's really going in blind. So, this is something new that we have been developing and are providing to all of our chairs and vice chairs moving forward.

Erica Loynd (00:21:18):

Great.

Sian Roberts (00:21:19):

Excellent. You might want to do a refresher on holding elections.

Sydney Muhle (00:21:23):

We will make sure that we build that in. That's something we actually realized this year that we need to outline a little bit better because you guys don't do this very often.

Sian Roberts (00:21:35):

Well, again, thank you. Congratulations to the new officers. And it has been a pleasure serving as your chair for the past 12 months, and I look forward to sitting back and being a board member next year. Okay, next item is item 6.3, the NCARB 2025 annual business meeting, and I think Sydney is going to lead this one.

Sydney Muhle (00:22:04):

I am. I'm just pulling up all of the different notes that I need for this discussion. So, the 2025 annual business meeting for NCARB will be held June 19th through 21st in Scottsdale, Arizona. I've joked with the NCARB staff that whoever planned Philadelphia in February and Scottsdale in the end of June probably should have switched those, but

alas, here we are, but it will be in Scottsdale the end of June. And as Chair Roberts indicated with the regional summit report out, there are five resolutions that we just received an email about this morning that I will happily share out with the board. I believe all of you should have received it. But in case something happened on someone's distribution list and you weren't added to it, I will be forwarding it shortly.

(00:23:04):

We do not have the text of those resolutions. We don't know what they look like. The packet is going to be forthcoming here shortly. And the, there will be two listening sessions for those later on in May for everybody to attend and get additional information about those resolutions. But three of them are, as Chair Roberts indicated, for mutual recognition agreements. One is replacing the existing one that is already in place with Canada. I believe there were some amendments that were adopted on that one last year, but there was an indication that they were still working on some additional language. Just now that we've gone through a couple of iterations of these neutral recognition agreements, I think they're trying to make sure the language is as closely aligned across all of them as possible. But the Canadian one is one that we have been signed onto for many, many years now, and so it'll just be re-upping and reaffirming that one with the updated language.

(00:24:11):

And then they are also introducing two new ones, one for Costa Rica and the other for South Africa. These were not ones that were on the list of possibilities last year, so I was pleasantly surprised to see them this year. So, we'll be looking forward to what language those have as soon as the resolutions are out. And then, there is a housekeeping item to update the NCARB certificate guidelines to replace the word foreign with the word international, so that'll be resolution number four. And then number five is an adjustment to the eligibility requirements for educational alternative in the NCARB certification guidelines. So, I don't think anything too ...

Erica Loynd (00:25:01):

... too controversial, which I think is going to be a nice change from what we've had in the last couple of years. I think there've been some resolutions that were hotly divided in each of the years that I've gotten to see these. So it looks like it'll be a pleasant change in that regard. So, again, I'll share that with the Board as they come out. How we approached this last year was, the Board designated, I believe, it was Board Member Harm, as our voting delegate for the annual business meeting and just left the votes up to Mr. Harm's judgment.

(00:25:52):

But I also know that in year's past we, as a Board, [inaudible 00:25:56] were on Mutual Recognition Agreements. So just as a reminder on these, this is really just the vote of the membership to allow these Mutual Recognition Agreements and these resolutions as a whole to be adopted by the NCARB membership. And then any changes or implementations that need to happen on our side, we can work through it as a Board and can review those a little bit closer, once they are even allowed and adopted by NCARB. So it's a multistep process.

(00:26:27):

So with the travel this year, as the Board will remember with the Regional Summit, there is a travel freeze that is still in place at the State level. And while that does not directly impact travel for this group, because this travel is covered by NCARB, it does still require that we complete travel authorizations because any attendees on behalf of the Board will be traveling on behalf of the Board, we still have to, for State liability purposes, we need to make sure that we have travel authorizations in place and those are subject to public disclosure. So we've been asked to not put our administration or the Governor's administration in any awkward positions by sending too many Board members. So they're just asking that we be judicious, especially understanding that Board Member Harm and Chair Roberts will also be in attendance, due to their positions with NCARB West Card. So with that, we will be looking for one, to two additional Board members. We've been asked, again, to keep it judicious, but I think I can make an argument for two of you to attend. So we would be looking for up to two to be able to attend, utilizing the funding through NCARB. And then from the slate of attendees, that can include Chair Roberts and Board Member Harm, we would designate a voting delegate, so that way we can get all of those pieces lined up.

(00:28:06):

Yeah, Ms. Cherlink?

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:25:04]

Speaker 1 (00:28:09):

Oh, Board Member Loynd, in light of it that there's a couple of things that I wanted to elaborate on. One, the voting with that delegated person, we do sit as a Board and communicate together about what our thoughts are because we have a, so that delegated person does not just go on their own and feel that they have to make the decision alone. We're very collaborative in analyzing the information. And at the time of the Board voting, we were also in attendance together and were able to discuss. He did make the ultimate decisions. And maybe when we had not a unified or unanimous vote, he would make the decision based on what information he gathered. But I think it's important to know that this is a collaborative and informative process, not a one person has the say and the others follow along.

Sian Roberts (00:28:58):

So I'll also just jump in Erica and state that that was possible because we did not have a quorum last year. So we had a small enough number of people that it did not constitute a public meeting, so we were able to communicate.

(00:29:15):

That said, I think any feedback that anybody has on the resolutions they have, they were part of the Regional Summit, they can always get changed between now and then. The language might look different. That you should know who those running for different positions are. So this is an opportunity now that we're all here together to get feedback

or, again, I believe it's okay, Sydney, correct me if I'm wrong, to maybe provide your feedback individually to the voting delegate...

Sydney Muhle (00:29:49):

Ah, yes.

Sian Roberts (00:29:50):

... outside of this meeting

Sydney Muhle (00:29:51):

... we would say that probably provide that to staff and then we can just put it into an aggregate, "Here's feedback that we have received," so that way it's not violating...

Sian Roberts (00:30:02):

Got it.

Sydney Muhle (00:30:02):

... any OPMA issues.

(00:30:06):

And thank you Chair Roberts for clarifying that, that, yes, we do not want to create any, the OPMA still applies even when we're not physically in the State.

(00:30:16):

And another route that we have gone in years past is if any of these resolutions get to a point that the Board feels as though we need to bring everybody together, and have a discussion, and provide direction to our voting delegates on how you all would like your vote cast, we can do that later in May, beginning of June, as well. But like Chair Roberts indicated, these can change all the way up until the vote is made.

(00:30:49):

I think that was a shock my first year was hearing how the resolutions were being changed on the floor. And what was ultimately adopted in one of the resolutions that year was not anywhere that had been documented previously. They were coming up with solutions just in the room. So that can happen. So we can provide direction to voting delegates based on the information available, with some parameters that if something were to go one way or another, this is where our comfort level lies and share that discretion with the group that is in attendance.

Speaker 1 (00:31:30):

Yeah, Board Member Loynd, the last year was a year that there was some interesting things on the ballot. And I would say for the Board members have not been able to attend, it is a very interesting thing to be a part of and watch. And the debate on the floor last year went quite long, which was interesting to see the people expressing their opinions to the overall delegation. So it's a very interesting process. I encourage you all to enjoy being a part of that and doing our diligence.

(00:32:03):

My second comment, also now, I've been to one of the meetings similar to the Philadelphia and Scottsdale one. I was able to go to the ABM last year. And like Peter experienced and expressed, it's a great opportunity for new Board members to really understand the bigger picture of what we're doing and how the States interact. And I encourage that, as much as I'm excited to attend, I think new members should have the opportunity to attend. And this does not count in the realm of your attendance, Sydney, or are you one of the people that would be a potential Board Member Executive?

Sydney Muhle (00:32:37):

There is potential for staff to attend. However, again, because we're being asked to be judicious and we do have two new Board members, I think I would defer and allow the new Board members that opportunity to go in favor of a staff member attending.

Speaker 1 (00:32:56):

Okay. So, I do recommend that Kathy attend this year, or this summer. But I also will put my name out there for the second position if that does not get taken by another Board member that has not been in a while or has a particular interest in the topics this year.

Speaker 2 (00:33:14):

I would love to attend. However, I do have a family obligation. There's a wedding I cannot miss in Montana, though. Too bad it's not in Scottsdale, can maybe swing it. But I will be making the other, next year's, it will be a priority for next year's attendees.

Scott Harm (00:33:42):

I'll throw my hat in if I know I just went to one, but I'm happy to fill that gap if that's what everybody sees is okay?

Sian Roberts (00:33:56):

Paul, are you interested in attending or...

Paul Wu (00:34:02):

No, I have-

Sian Roberts (00:34:03):

... do we have our two?

Paul Wu (00:34:06):

I have too many other obligations at this time, I can't commit, so I won't be.

Sian Roberts (00:34:11):

Okay.

Paul Wu (00:34:12):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:34:14):

Well, that worked out perfectly then. We have two interested and two available people to attend.

Scott Harm (00:34:20):

Okay. Again, back to doing it backwards, what are the dates on that?

Erica Loynd (00:34:28):

June 19 through 21st. So I anticipate travel day would likely be June 18th and then traveling home on the 20, late 21st, early 22nd, depending on flights. That is the nice thing about it being in Scottsdale, is we're only a couple-hour flight away.

Scott Harm (00:34:45):

Eighteenth through the 21st, is that what you said?

Erica Loynd (00:34:46):

Yeah.

Scott Harm (00:34:49):

Okay. Yeah, that's a nice, quick flight.

Erica Loynd (00:34:54):

Did anybody volunteer for, Evan Park, or, don't know if the appointments have come out.

Speaker 1 (00:35:00):

I have this Board Member Loynd, I did volunteer to a committee. They submitted an email that said regional people have the opportunity to sign up for committee. So I did apply and put my name forth for multiple categories. They have not sent out confirmations or acceptances yet. So I'm hopeful that by June those will be identified and I can start to, hopefully, be placed on a Board or committee and we'll be able to start interacting with that team there. That's my hope.

Erica Loynd (00:35:30):

Great.

(00:35:33):

All right. And then the last piece of business on the AVM is, who would you like to serve as voting delegate? And then an alternate?

Speaker 1 (00:35:43):

As to Board Member Loynd, I'd be happy to be the voting delegate, give that a whirl.

Speaker 2 (00:35:52):

I'll be your alternate.

Sian Roberts (00:35:59):

Do we need a nomination for this? Is this a voting? No?

Erica Loynd (00:36:03):

I don't, as long as there's no objection from the Board, I don't think we need to formalize it.

(00:36:11):

All right, well, again, we will get all of the various paperwork and everything going with that so that we can allow you guys to start making your travel arrangements through NCARB. Thank you.

Sian Roberts (00:36:27):

Okay, great. We'll move on to item seven, I believe. Is that right?

Erica Loynd (00:36:36):

6.3 for [inaudible 00:36:39].

Sian Roberts (00:36:39):

Oh, yeah. Okay. Sorry. 6.3. Yes. Realignment of the AXP Program to the Competency Standard. And so you may have seen emails on this from NCARB, but they specifically have sent this out asking for feedback from Boards because they will be implementing this.

(00:36:59):

So I'll give a little bit of background on this because not only was I part of the Competency Standard, but I was also on the AXP Experience Program last year and helped create this alignment between AXP and the Competency Standard. And so it is pretty forward. Really what we did was take the 16 competencies and figure out which AXP categories they best fit into. NCARB's intent is not to change everything right now, so they want to keep all the AXP categories that they've had in the past and really we're just funneling the competencies under each one of those, each one of those categories. So we just did a crosswalk, which one should this be in, which one should that be in and develop that proposal.

(00:37:53):

So they're asking for feedback. If we have any feedback on this, obviously, I don't have any feedback, but if the Board has any feedback that they would like to provide to NCARB as they want to try to implement this quickly, they're going to be doing the same thing with the exam, to some degree. Just making sure that the competencies are woven into the exam. So I don't know if anybody's had a chance to take a look at it or if

anybody has any feedback that we can provide to NCARB, now would be a great time to provide that.

(00:38:32):

Obviously, you also have an opportunity to provide that individually to NCARB, but is there anything that this Board would like to say?

(00:38:39):

Okay, hearing none-

Sydney Muhle (00:38:39):

This is additional information. NCARB did send another email about it this morning that I'm happy to forward to the Board, in case you all have individual thoughts that you would like to submit, but they put together a really great blog post that just went up this morning. So I'll share That out.

Sian Roberts (00:39:13):

Thanks Sydney.

(00:39:17):

Okay. Yeah, I encourage you to dive in and just take a look at it. It's not rocket science, by any means, but hopefully, it just continues to keep all the programs in alignment as we move forward. All right, do we have any more sixes or are we ready to move on to seven?

Erica Loynd (00:39:41):

I think we're ready for seven.

Sian Roberts (00:39:43):

All right, excellent. So complaint cases for review. And I am up first, let's see if I can find where that is.

(00:39:58):

All right folks. Okay.

(00:40:11):

So this, I'm just going to go ahead and read this and then give you a little bit of background. But the complainant is a permit specialist who received a set of drawings listing an architect who was not a licensed architect in Washington State. The respondent submitted permit documents for minor TI improvements for a restaurant. The restaurant has since changed ownership. The respondent advertised as an architect and a structural engineer. After the permit specialist would not issue the permit, the drawings were reissued with a licensed architect stamp. And the architect Stated that they sometimes work for this firm, who works as a drafting company with the architect in responsible control. So a permit was issued, but no inspections have been scheduled. And it's unclear if any work has happened. And the respondent has since dissolved the company and there's no active address.

(00:41:02):

So the respondent submitted drawings erroneously calling themselves an architect. And so I'll clarify that, on the drawings, there's no stamp or anything, but on the drawing it said, architect, and then it had their name. And apparently they advertised as an architect on some of their publicly-available information for the company.

(00:41:24):

So after being told about the requirement for an architect to be licensed, the respondent hired a licensed architect and submitted a stamp plan set. And the company has since dissolved.

(00:41:34):

So this is, I think, an example of a company that I probably did a lot, did design work, didn't recognize that this was really replacing a ceiling in a restaurant, didn't realize that that required an architect stamp. There were some cultural and language challenges, I would say, in terms of how the communication happened on this. But ultimately, they understood that they needed an architect stamp in order to do this, and went out, and got a licensed architect to do it.

(00:42:15):

I would, if all of this, and now of course, they've dissolved that company, so there's really nobody to actually reach out to right now. There's no person on the other end. Typically, what I would consider some counseling on this, but it's obviously clear that this individual did understand after this process the requirement for the architect stamp. And so at this point, I'm recommending that we just close this with no further action, as there's really nobody to act to. And I believe that everybody now understands what they were supposed to be doing. So I'm not sure there's that much more we can do in this situation. So any questions about this particular case?

Scott Harm (00:43:09):

Mm-mm.

Sian Roberts (00:43:12):

Okay.

Scott Harm (00:43:15):

And then we make a motion here to just close the case, is that it Sian? Is that what you're saying.

Sian Roberts (00:43:19):

Yeah. Somebody make motion to-

Erica Loynd (00:43:25):

Make motion to accept the, sorry, motion to accept the recommendation.

Scott Harm (00:43:28):

I'll second that a motion or what [inaudible 00:43:31]?

Erica Loynd (00:43:31):

No, I don't make the motion. Somebody would need to make it.

Sian Roberts (00:43:31):

I can't make the motion.

Scott Harm (00:43:34):

Well, I'll make a motion then that the case number 196200ARC is closed with no further action.

Paul Wu (00:43:46):

Board member Wu, second that motion.

Sian Roberts (00:43:51):

Okay. All those in favor say aye.

Kathy Russell (00:43:53):

Aye.

Paul Wu (00:43:53):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:43:56):

Any opposed?

(00:43:59):

Okay, the motion passes.

(00:44:02):

And now, as we said earlier, we've taken 7.2 off of the agenda because Scott isn't here with us today. So we're going to move on to 7.3, which is Vice Chair Loynd's case.

Erica Loynd (00:44:18):

Case number 3258-00ARC is related to a complainant who addressed the Board because they were having a situation with their architect that was not performing the services that was written in their contract. They have significant scheduled delays and lack of performance based on the agreement that was made. And I've been waiting for the project for many years.

(00:44:44):

The respondent is the licensed architect and does hold an active business license. The communication indicated the issues were really related to the contract schedule and the scope of work that was agreed upon. And reviewing the RCW, there's no direct

correlation to schedule or contract misrepresentation in the law. This is specifically more of a contractual dispute. So it's determined that this is not within the jurisdiction of the Board. And I propose closing with no further action because it's not pertinent to the Board.

Scott Harm (00:45:22):

Well, since I'm good at making motions now, this is, remember r [inaudible 00:45:29], I move that we close case number 32500ARC with no further action.

Paul Wu (00:45:39):

Board Member Wu, again, I second that motion.

Sian Roberts (00:45:44):

Is there any discussion about the case?

Paul Wu (00:45:48):

So, one question. So did we recommend them go through their contractual litigation instead of coming to the Board for resolution?

Erica Loynd (00:46:01):

I did not make any recommendations to them because it's outside of the purview of the Board. So we just confirmed that this was outside of our jurisdiction.

Paul Wu (00:46:15):

So we don't make further actions, we don't take further actions on that?

Erica Loynd (00:46:21):

That is my understanding, correct.

Paul Wu (00:46:22):

Okay.

Grace Hamilton (00:46:22):

This is Grace, the Investigation Supervisor, I did want to just point out that we do, in our closure letter, we do let them know that they're able to proceed with this civilly. So they will be informed of that option that they have.

Erica Loynd (00:46:43):

So, we see these cases on a relatively frequent basis. And I think they're particularly challenging because this one seems to be not too, or too ambiguous, in that it appears to truly be a contractual, like scope of services, what was the scope of services and the schedule committed to? But often, you're in a position of, it's clear, for instance, that there was no, that this was not an architect who was completely incompetent. Right?

And who was so egregious in their duties that they would need to, for instance, be considered for removal of a license, correct, this was just...

Grace Hamilton (00:47:35):

Correct. There was no.

Erica Loynd (00:47:40):

What, sorry, go ahead.

Grace Hamilton (00:47:41):

Board Member Loynd, there was extensive email correspondence between the complainant and the respondent related to, in particular schedule delays and the impact it was having on that person being able to complete their project. And I found it to be an unfortunate, that's opinion, I don't think I should say it, but it was definitely related to, "My project is not meeting my project schedule." Not that the work was not meeting life, safety, or any architectural components. It was very directed to time and availability of the architect to provide the services to the person.

Sian Roberts (00:48:35):

So this is one thing that I think would be helpful for our Board to maybe dive into a little bit more in the coming years is, and maybe talking to some other folks, or some other State Boards about where that threshold lies for consequences for architects, in terms of their delivery of service or their competence as architects. So where does that line exist? At this point, I don't think we've seen any that rise to that level. But really, we are here to make sure that architects are, indeed, protecting health, safety, and welfare of the public. And at what level is it, to what level does an architect need to not live up to that expectation? And so I think it's something for us maybe to talk to some other Boards about and have a better handle on ourselves.

(00:49:45):

Paul?

Paul Wu (00:49:46):

Yeah I think this is a gray area where the delivery of architectural service. And part of our delivery is provide service to the clients on a timely matter. And I think this, again is, even though it doesn't have effects direct-

(00:50:04):

... is that even though it doesn't have direct effects onto life safety, but it does have influences on the performance of architectural surfaces and the service we provide to our clients. So I think probably we need to look at this as a gray area that, again, further discussion may define whether this is within our jurisdiction or not.

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [00:50:04]

Sian Roberts (00:50:31):

Right. And I think what I do when I have these cases, Paul, is I go right back to the statute, and I read the RCW, and I look for the area that you can use. And the standard's pretty high in terms of what an architect would need to do. Kathy?

Kathy Russell (00:50:54):

It just seems like we don't have all the information in this case. Because whether it had been inferred that it was the architect's fault that it was delayed, but there are a lot of reasons a project may be delayed that are out of an architect's realm of control. So I think that we would not want to be punitive against lead times or any type of outside influences that an architect can't control. And yeah, I appreciate the health, safety, welfare aspect and focus.

Erica Loynd (00:51:33):

In response to that, before Peter [inaudible 00:51:35]. That was part of the evaluation that I did as well of what information, because they provided such detailed correspondence between them and the timelines between things were long, and communication really was directed in a certain focused way that led me to really feel it was a schedule and a capacity issue, not being aware or available to do the work that was being requested. They had the skills to do the work, it was an availability issue of prioritizing this project, which made it seem more directed to, "I'm not getting my service", rather than, "I hired somebody who doesn't know how to do the work." And that's why I [inaudible 00:52:27] to really addressing what the RCW requirements were stating and trying to find that, is there any broaching over that or getting close to that. And I found no, it was a capacity or scheduling issue directly.

(00:52:42):

But I appreciate your comments. I agree, there's a lot of other unfortunate circumstances that come up in people's work, especially in this timeframe. They wanted the project built by 2021, and it still to this time has not been completed. So it's been a very long period of time, but also at a time when there's a lot of contingencies that were going on that were out of everybody's control for the situation, from Covid times and onward.

Sian Roberts (00:53:12):

And this board is not in the business of trying to resolve a dispute between an architect and an owner. It's really about whether there are grounds to sanction an architect. And if you look at the RCW, it's really mostly about issues of fraud, issues of conflicts of interest, those types of things. Or just if it really gets to the point where an architect is incompetent. So those are kind of the points at which we have jurisdiction. A conflict between an architect and an owner about design services, we're not going to resolve that. The only thing we would do would be to sanction the architect if we believe that it rises to that level. Sorry, go ahead Peter.

Peter Brachvogel (00:54:03):

Yeah, so I guess the only place that I would see our involvement being there is when it conflicts with life, health, safety, and welfare. If there's something about the behavior of

running the job that actually puts somebody in danger, then I think that there's some wiggle room for the board to have some position in this. But I think that's a very hard thing to find and certainly not something, I agree, that we need to be involved with. I mean, if the running of the job was so out of whack with the expectations of the owner, that should have been discussed all along so that at least there could be some understanding of expectations. It is fraught with this profession anyway.

Sian Roberts (00:54:56):

Thank you, Peter. Maybe what I'd ask is, because these ones are so difficult, Sydney, if we could get some counseling on the RCWs as it relates to performance of architects or actions of architects, and when we should be considering any kind of action against an architect. I think it would be helpful, especially with a couple of new board members, to maybe go through some of those areas of the RCW. Is that something we can request?

Sydney Muhle (00:55:34):

Yes, we will absolutely add that to an upcoming agenda.

Sian Roberts (00:55:38):

Thank you. Okay. Oops. Elizabeth.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (00:55:46):

Yeah, I would be happy to-

Sian Roberts (00:55:47):

Just the person who needs to do that for us.

Sydney Muhle (00:55:51):

We'll be reaching out to Elizabeth on this one.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (00:55:53):

Yeah, I was just going to say I'll be happy to assist with that I think. But the most important thing to keep in mind is no matter... I mean, a lot of these are going to come through because of a dispute between an architect and a client, because the client is typically the one who's going to issue a complaint. So if it does affect the health, safety and welfare of the public, including the client, that is when you take action. So just because it comes from a client and there is a dispute, doesn't mean you shouldn't be involved. You're looking for potential issues of safety for the public. So if it's about money, those are the times you don't get involved. If it's about payment under a contract, you definitely don't get involved in those. But otherwise, yeah, you do get involved with those types of issues. So I would be happy to assist with clarifying that.

Sydney Muhle (00:56:59):

That'd be great. We'd appreciate it.

Peter Brachvogel (00:57:00):

Great.

Paul Wu (00:57:01):

Board member Wu here, I got a question. Are we involved with the quality of architecture services.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (00:57:15):

I couldn't get my mic to go back on. To the extent that I think quality definitely is affecting the health, safety and welfare of the public, and professionalism. So unprofessional conduct, right? It's not just limited to health, safety and welfare, it's related also to professional conduct. And the standards of the practice of the average architect, so to speak. So you're looking for whether they're performing to the standards of what you would expect from a professional architect, if that makes sense? So there will be instances where the quality of their performance is at issue.

Paul Wu (00:58:20):

Thank you.

Sian Roberts (00:58:22):

Well, to that point, this is one. But again, the standard of care is kind of where we go there.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (00:58:32):

Yeah, exactly. Standard of care. Thank you.

Paul Wu (00:58:38):

Okay, we have a motion and second.

Sian Roberts (00:58:42):

Okay. Are we ready to call a vote?

Paul Wu (00:58:47):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (00:58:47):

Okay. We do have a motion, right? Yes. All those in favor of accepting the case manager's recommendation to close with no further action, please indicate by saying aye.

Peter Brachvogel (00:58:57):

Aye.

Sydney Muhle (00:58:58):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:58:58):

Aye.

Paul Wu (00:58:58):

Aye.

Sian Roberts (00:59:00):

Any opposed? Okay, thank you. That was a good conversation.

Peter Brachvogel (00:59:06):

I have one. Since we're on this topic and we're done with these three. If you don't mind, I just have a quick question. So I've got a case on my hands that Grace sent over to me that looked like habitual conman, and I don't know quite how to couch the one-page response that I have to send back. Does anybody have any advice on how to respond to this? Grace, can you help me out with that a little bit?

Sydney Muhle (00:59:37):

Board member-

Sian Roberts (00:59:37):

Looks like Elizabeth-

Sydney Muhle (00:59:39):

... we actually can't discuss that because it's not on the agenda, but I can work with Grace and we'll get a response back to you, and if we need to we'll bring Elizabeth into the discussion.

Peter Brachvogel (00:59:52):

That's perfect. Yeah. And Grace, I know we had a conversation about this and I appreciate it. I just started reading through the file and it's just so lengthy and goes back so many years, I just didn't know where to go with this.

Kathy Russell (01:00:03):

Yeah, we can just set up another meeting and discuss it.

Peter Brachvogel (01:00:06):

Okay. That's great. Thank you.

Kathy Russell (01:00:08):

You're welcome.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (01:00:09):

Yeah, I was just going to repeat what Sydney said. I was going to be like, "Oh, stop talking." Can't talk about [inaudible 01:00:17]. There's two reasons. One is it's not on the agenda, and two, we don't want to expose the entire board to any specific cases because if it turns into a formal action, then the board has to come into it with independence and no prior knowledge.

Peter Brachvogel (01:00:43):

Fair enough.

Sian Roberts (01:00:43):

We all have to recuse ourselves, right?

Elizabeth Lagerberg (01:00:46):

Yeah. But no problem, no harm done.

Peter Brachvogel (01:00:50):

Okay. That's why I'm secretary.

Sian Roberts (01:01:01):

Okay. We'll move on to item eight; reports, and 8.1.1; the model law committee, which is myself and a board member or vice chair [inaudible 01:01:15] to provide a report. I believe there's no action in this passed, unless?

Erica Loynd (01:01:22):

This board member [inaudible 01:01:23] correct. There's no action. We were waiting for following actions that are slated to happen later in the year. So there's no actions that we've been taking on at this point.

Sian Roberts (01:01:35):

I guess the one thing that we did, and I can't remember who I've said this to and who I haven't, but one thing we did here at the committee summit was that the task force that is working on the I-Core group that is working on trying to better define the practice of engineering, architecture, interior design and landscape architecture, is expected to have some results by this summer and it may or may not include interior design. That's what the other three I think have gotten to a pretty good point. So we can be expecting some direction from them, whether that is something that we choose to implement or not. And I know AI Washington Council is leading that and looking at those issues as well. So hopefully we'll have some clarity here in the next few months. And that's all I had on that. So, outreach committee update?

Erica Loynd (01:02:52):

[inaudible 01:02:52] I'll speak on behalf of the outreach committee. So the outreach committee consists of board member Kathy and board member Paul. We've had two

meetings since our last session. And the goal of this group is to reinvigorate the outreach to, in particular the more technical schools in our state. So Kathy's got a great connection to schools on the east side of the state, and Paul and I have a lot of connections to schools on the west side. And so we had a meeting to re-align which institutions have expressed interest. So we have some email correspondence with Lake Washington Technical School. They're still very interested in having a session where we can present the path to licensure to their students. And we're working with the board staff to set up a meeting in the month of May with them where board member Wu and I will attend. And we also are going to try to have the NCARB licensure advisor, Neha Gale, to join us. So I'm going to be reaching to her to see if she would like to attend at the same time.

(01:04:10):

And then on the eastern side... Oh, and we're also then reaching out to University of Washington to reinvigorate that because we have commonly met with them. So we're doing some outreach to University of Washington, anticipating a little closer to graduation would be a good time to go in, late May, early June. On the east side, we are reaching out to SCC, I believe that's right, Kathy?

Kathy Russell (01:04:36):

Spokane Community College.

Erica Loynd (01:04:37):

Yeah, Spokane Community College and Washington State University to have similar presentations. So Kathy is being the appointed person for the eastern side, and we'll also invite the NCARB Eastern Washington advisor to join and present with her.

(01:04:57):

We are pulling together presentations and we have the presentations that were used in previous years that we're going to update. I did try to find or review the information on NCARB's website. And they've done a lot of advancements over the past few years. And where they used to have a kind of staple presentation, they now have a much more interactive and dynamic interface for candidates that involve more video entries, some blog posts and different ways. I think this is really rooted in the concept that everybody learns in a different way or has a different way of accessing information, so they're adapting their platform to that. So there's a good amount of different ways to pull the information.

(01:05:39):

So we're going to update our existing presentations to make sure that we don't have any erroneous or out-of-date information. And then do a walkthrough of the website so that people can be familiar with the links and opportunities within the website rather than trying to cut and paste all their information into a single presentation. I think that education of how to find the detail will be more beneficial to the students. So we anticipate those meetings happening then. I believe there was an email this morning that SCC is ready for early June for the meeting.

Kathy Russell (01:06:14):

They would like to have it before the AIA National Conference, June 3rd.

Erica Loynd (01:06:20):

So it was a productive couple of meetings over the past couple of months to make sure that we can meet with the students before the end of their school year. Any other additional comments, Paul or Kathy?

Kathy Russell (01:06:37):

I'm going to also see if WSU would like to attend the SCC meeting to have some direct contact with potential students that might want to end up attending WSU, as a recruitment for them.

Erica Loynd (01:06:51):

That's a great idea.

Paul Wu (01:06:52):

So for the next step, I got the chair of the UW Architectural School. Who's going to make the first contact with them? Is that Erica, you're going to do that or the board?

Erica Loynd (01:07:08):

I thought the staff members, Alyssa and Sydney were going to help with the initial points. Is that correct, Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (01:07:16):

Yeah, that was my understanding.

Paul Wu (01:07:19):

Okay. So just let me know what dates are set and-

Erica Loynd (01:07:24):

Paul, we did identify some dates that [inaudible 01:07:28], you were going to write back. Did you send which ones of those work for you? I don't think I saw that response.

Paul Wu (01:07:34):

No. I was waiting for the response from the other side, from the university, and see what dates... a date going to be [inaudible 01:07:44]. As far as our meeting is concerned, I'm available on all those days.

Erica Loynd (01:07:48):

Okay. Yeah, so Sydney if you could use those dates that we emailed and see if any of those work for Lake Washington Technical School. And then we can also look for [inaudible 01:07:58].

Sydney Muhle (01:07:58):

Yeah, we will reach out to both and see what we can get scheduled.

Paul Wu (01:08:06):

Yeah.

Sian Roberts (01:08:07):

That's great. I don't suppose you want any more suggestions?

Erica Loynd (01:08:11):

Sure.

Sian Roberts (01:08:13):

But I think it's been a while since we've been in front of AIA in any way, and I have met with the board before just to kind of give an update on what's happening with NCARB, which seemed to be appreciated. I've also been to the Young Architects Forum and done a little spiel before their happy hour, which I think was appreciated. What else? And then Paul, I can't remember how that all came together. We had a group of candidates, kind of a little open forum where we gave a presentation. And so anyway, every year or two maybe there's some sort of engagement point, but we may want to see what might make sense next.

Erica Loynd (01:09:12):

I remember, I sat with you on one of those AIA virtual presentations right when I joined the board, so it had to have been early '24, '23.

Sian Roberts (01:09:23):

That's right. Because NCARB had been doing... We and NCARB, yes. So maybe we've connected recently.

Erica Loynd (01:09:34):

Yeah, that'd be good. That's a good idea. I can-

Sian Roberts (01:09:37):

Because there's a number of different ways we can engage there and we can mix it up a little bit, which is nice.

Erica Loynd (01:09:43):

Great. I know that you were interested in building on this conversation as well, Sian. Is there any desire to join Paul and I at these sessions that we have planned?

Sian Roberts (01:09:55):

Yeah, if I'm available for the Lake Washington. I wouldn't schedule it around me, but if you want to let me know when the Lake Washington Technical College is, I'd like to attend that one.

Kathy Russell (01:10:07):

Another thing that we are discussing that potentially in the fall, is putting together informational flyers to send to high school counselors, guidance counselors, into tech programs in the high schools and middle schools for guidance on how to get their students into the architecture field.

Erica Loynd (01:10:31):

Yeah, we were hoping to get that ready for... We're going to be a little slow over the summer as students are on break as well, and then are doing internships. And then kind of prepare that for early fall when people are back at school and looking at the full year.

Sian Roberts (01:10:47):

Yeah, and of course, ACE does a great job at that age group, so making sure they're aware that that is an opportunity. I guess it maybe depends on where you are, whether there are opportunities for ACE, but they do such a great job of introducing our industry to young people.

Erica Loynd (01:11:05):

Yeah. ACE graduation, they have scheduled their graduation event that they have for this year's team, and I believe it's coming up in the next... I think it's like May... Just scrolling really quick to my calendar of when that may be. It is on June 10th is the ACE Annual Graduation Event, which is a great event and it's located in Seattle, and bring all the teams together and recognize the graduates that are going on to college. And they do have a scholarship opportunity for those graduating seniors which is exciting.

Kathy Russell (01:11:45):

We've struggled to get ACE going on the east side. It's always lacked volunteers.

Paul Wu (01:11:56):

A little bit personally involved in here. Just participated as a judge at the TSA, the Technical Students Association, the Statewide Architectural Competition in Spokane. I think that's probably in the high school level, try to promote architectural design and technical students' involvement in architecture.

Sian Roberts (01:12:30):

That's great.

Erica Loynd (01:12:32):

One more last question-

Sian Roberts (01:12:33):

Erica, I wondered...

Erica Loynd (01:12:34):

Oh, sorry.

Sian Roberts (01:12:35):

Oh, sorry. I was going to say, I wonder if you're involved in ACE, I wonder if there's a way for a very quick five, maybe not at the graduation, but in the beginning of the program, I know there's a big event. Maybe we can have two minutes of air time just to explain what licensure is as a part of their introduction to.

Erica Loynd (01:12:59):

And I think that I can reach out. We've been, our firm is sponsoring and we have a large team, so I think they would be responsive to just having some people. So I can reach out to the group and see if that's possible. One last question, just to make sure that we don't go over [inaudible 01:13:22], Sydney. For these presentations, what is the limit of people from the board that can present together?

Sydney Muhle (01:13:29):

We can do up to three.

Erica Loynd (01:13:31):

Okay, great. So yeah, Outreach Committee has gotten some good updates and we will do the presentations and then we are going to go on a quarterly meet up. And we've scheduled those to be in advance of the board meetings so that we can get any open items onto the agenda. So I feel like the schedule for the summer through the fall is in a good cadence to be able to provide updates here at the meeting.

Sian Roberts (01:14:01):

Nice. Great work guys. That's a lot of energy and a lot of action. Well done. Okay. And next are the staff reports. So I'll turn it right over to Sydney.

Sydney Muhle (01:14:17):

Thank you very much. All right, well as always, we'll start out with our complaint status report. This is current as of April 1st. So at that point we did have one case that was in complaint intake, four that were in investigations that had not yet been assigned to case managers. We have five that are in a legal review, eight that are in a management review, and 11 that have been closed, for a grand total of 29 cases. And I believe that's going back into 2024. So are there any questions on the complaint status report?

Erica Loynd (01:15:00):

This is board member Loynd. Just for clarification, are the ones that we close today in this list? Are they listed under management review or closed already?

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:15:04]

Sydney Muhle (01:15:10):

Those would be in the management review, and we can't close them until you guys decide.

Erica Loynd (01:15:15):

Okay. Just checking. Thanks.

Sydney Muhle (01:15:17):

Yep. All right. If there are no-

Sian Roberts (01:15:24):

It's probably more in legal than I've seen in a while.

Sydney Muhle (01:15:27):

... Definitely more in legal than we've seen in a while. Just more cases than we have seen in a while. So, I'll have to chat with Grace and kind of see if there are any things emerging or maybe if it's just that there have been an uptick in projects in the last couple of years. And so, that's kind of inevitably led to an increase. I came on and joined the board during the Covid years where we were, I don't want to say lucky, but lucky if there was one complaint case per year. And I know it had been a relatively low number in the immediate pre-Covid years as well. So, we are seeing an increase, and so Grace and I will take a look at what it is that is leading to that increase, and if there is anything that we can do in terms of education or outreach to assist with that. All right. Then we'll move on to our licensee account report, and I do want to preface this by saying that the licensee account report is going to change a little bit moving forward. We will still be providing these numbers to the board in your meeting packet, but we will not be presenting them verbally during the meeting. The reason being that these numbers don't shift a lot on a quarterly basis. There might be some slight variations up and down depending on renewal statuses, renewals being made, different things like that. But it really doesn't shift a whole lot on a quarterly basis. So, we'll be moving the verbal report into a more robust annual report that we'll provide during the first quarterly meeting for all of our boards. This is not just happening for the architects, it's for all of our boards.

(01:17:22):

But we're finding that presenting these on a quarterly basis is kind of leading to more confusion for a couple of our boards and going, well, why aren't we seeing big shifts? Or if we did see a number shift here or there, what's the cause? And really, it could just be that their expiration status hit harder that month. So, to kind of level that out and really provide you guys with a more robust picture, we're going to roll that into a bigger annual report to show you guys the trends. So, you will still have the numbers every month, but we just won't be doing public presentation. So, with that, we have 7,117 in active licensees. We have 105 that are in an expired status, five that have been placed into an inactive status, and 26 that are in an inactive retired status, for a grand total of 7,253.

(01:18:23):

[inaudible 01:18:30].

Erica Loynd (01:18:32):

This is just a clarification question and maybe just to put it on the record, but in the bottom category for age classification between 25 and 34, does that just mean the youngest person that's licensed is 25, and it could be 24? There's not a rule that you have to be 25 to be licensed.

Sydney Muhle (01:18:48):

Correct. If we had anybody under the age of 25, that would be an additional category below that.

Paul Wu (01:18:54):

Is the question, what is the inactive retired status?

Sydney Muhle (01:19:04):

So, that is for, and Alyssa can jump in if I say anything incorrect, but that is for our licensees who have chosen to leave active practice and move themselves into a retired status. It does put them into a slightly different category versus our inactives in that there's just some, if they choose to go back active, there's a different set of requirements that they have to do versus our inactives, which I think tend to be more architects who are based out of state, are licensed here, don't want to completely give up their license in the state, but don't want to have to pay that annual fee. They place it in that inactive status without completely giving it up. Our inactive retirees are more likely to bring their license back active in different circumstances, so it just has a slightly different set of requirements that they need to come back active with.

Paul Wu (01:20:09):

I think the status may be something that I will be going into in the near future.

Sydney Muhle (01:20:20):

All right. And if you want to go to the next slide, Alyssa.

(01:20:25):

All right. And this is kind of just where we're sitting for the year. As you can see, there's always just that variability from month to month in our new issues and renewals. And if we want to go to the next one.

(01:20:39):

This is the big one. This is the one we all like to see. This is our five-year look at our licensee counts. As you can see, the architect profession has been trending in a positive direction, including coming out of those Covid years, which I really appreciate seeing. Not all of our professions had that same fortune post-Covid, so it's very good to

see the dips that we saw in education and licensure did not impact your profession. I believe that's it for the licensee count report. Are there any questions?

(01:21:17):

All right. Then we'll move on to our legislative update. So, I'm just going to really quickly go over the legislation that had been proposed that we reviewed at our last meeting. The big one that will impact our board was the proposal to move the architect program into our business and professions account umbrella, that 06L account designation. That bill has passed both the House and the Senate and is awaiting the governor's signature. So, we're very pleased that that has moved forward.

(01:21:58):

There were two different bills that impacted the permitting process. So, while not under the purview of the board, does impact the profession and could end up resulting in complaints down the line. So, we had one that was for the self-certification of plans on small auxiliary buildings. That one was House Bill 1353. That has passed both chambers and is awaiting the governor's signature. So, we do anticipate that one becoming a session law.

(01:22:37):

And then, the other one was Senate Bill 5729. That was for streamline permitting. Specifically, it had requirements for additional liability insurance for both engineers and architects. We did work on getting some feedback back to the legislature on that one, but that one did not pass. It did pass the Senate where it originated, but it did not pass the House. Now, that being said, nothing's over until it's over and they're supposed to adjourn here in the next few days, but we have seen a couple of zombie bills rise from the dead that we thought were dead and gone. So, while that one has not passed and we don't have any indication of it coming back at the moment, we had one come up for a different profession just two days ago that we thought was dead-dead and it has risen. So, I won't say that it's completely dead, but I don't have a whole lot of hope for it.

(01:23:43):

But, again, that's Senate Bill 5729 if anybody wanted to take a look at it. And then, the other one that we had discussed at our last meeting was updates that had been proposed to the Professional License Review Act Report. As a reminder, that is a report that the department is required to produce to the legislature every year, reviewing 10% of our licensed professions per year for 10 years, and then kind of resetting the clock. While the Arctic program has not been up for that review yet, we do want to have it on everybody's radar because, at some point, this board will be involved in that.

(01:24:22):

So, we had discussed it and I had shared the report with the board after the last meeting. There had been some proposed changes to that report requested by the legislature, but that bill did not pass. It didn't even get seen to make it out of its house of origin. So, while it didn't move forward this year, it definitely gave us some indications for things that they're looking for and additional information that they're wanting that report to contain, and some things to monitor for next year. So, are there any questions on the legislative update?

(01:24:59):

Okay. Then I'm going to hand it over to Alyssa. Oh, go ahead.

Speaker 6 (01:25:03):

Yeah. So, on Senate Bill 5729, that's streamlining bill. So, you said that that's dead in the House, but did it overreach or was it, you don't think it's going to come back? It sounds like it was really a good thing for keeping people moving along.

Sydney Muhle (01:25:27):

I hate to say that anything is dead. It wasn't an overreach. It really didn't have the momentum behind it, I don't believe. And I see Alyssa's hand is raised, so she may have some additional insight. She also provides representation for the engineer's board. And I know that it was definitely high on their radar. It had much broader impact for them than it did for us. So, go ahead Elizabeth.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (01:25:54):

Yeah. If you read the, I mean, the concept of the bill is good. I think everybody agrees. It did have some strange bits to it that kind of got in the way, I think, of the intent. And one of them was that the engineers' board would be responsible for making sure that architects and engineers had a \$1 million bond, I believe. And so, that kind of was tricky with the rules, how the engineers would be responsible for architects and how they would ever enforce that.

(01:26:36):

And so, that was one of the oddities of the bill. And I think there was something else too, that made it unpalatable to some of the, I think some of the probably people in the house. So, I think it could go next year if it were rewritten, and again, made more palatable. You're right. First, it limited the ability of local jurisdictions to review. Originally, it stated that if an architect or an engineer had stamped a project, the local jurisdiction couldn't do anything further. And then, they added in that they could do additional reviews. So, it kind of lost it's, it became sort of vague in what it was trying to accomplish. Anyway. It needs more work, I think.

Sydney Muhle (01:27:37):

It definitely does, and our legislative staff provided that feedback back to the legislature that we don't want the boards trying to set rules for the other side. And so, if it were going to move forward, a minimum needed to have, to separate out, each board would set the rules for their professions.

Speaker 6 (01:28:02):

Okay. Well, I hope it makes it someday. Would've been nice if that happened 30 years ago, but...

Elizabeth Lagerberg (01:28:09):

I think there's a lot of people in agreement with you on that. That's how come it made it out of the Senate, but it just wasn't quite what everybody wanted, which of course, nothing ever is. And Sydney's right, I have seen bills appear in the budget, like they disappear and then all of a sudden there's language in the budget that creates this law. So, nothing is over until it's over.

Speaker 6 (01:28:36):

Okay.

Sydney Muhle (01:28:37):

And that's exactly what happened with our zombie from two days ago, is they found a budget provision that impacted that bill, so they resurrected it through that. So, yep if anything changes and this does become a zombie and comes back to life, we will certainly notify all of you once we are aware of it.

Speaker 6 (01:29:00):

Okay, great.

Sydney Muhle (01:29:01):

All right. Are there any other questions on the legislative update? All right, then I'm going to turn it over to Alyssa to review the master action item list.

Alyssa Woods (01:29:11):

Thank you, Sydney. So far, we have the model law committee with Chair Roberts and Vice Chair [inaudible 01:29:20], so that's still in progress. I do remember them saying that there was nothing to report as of right now, but there will be later. And then, the statistics for the law exam that is currently on hold. And then, staff reaching out to AIA to monitor legislation impacting the industry, and then sending out legislative updates relevant to the board, that is still ongoing. Chair Roberts and staff will reach out to Tammy with AIA to coordinate additional outreach opportunities. I believe that is still in progress. And then, for this last one right here, it says, "Chair Roberts and staff to coordinate Washington dates and travel." But this has moved over to the outreach subcommittee, so that was something that they spoke on earlier that they're trying to currently coordinate.

Speaker 5 (01:30:15):

I'm sorry, Alyssa, can you go back to the one right before that? Because to be honest, I have zero recollection of what that was. I have a feeling this is closed a long time ago, but I'm actually not sure what this is all about.

Sydney Muhle (01:30:30):

This could be, I'll jump in on this one. It's probably one we could go ahead and remove because I think we have a pretty good pathway and communication going on with AIA Washington Council to coordinate any outreach opportunities that come up. But I think

it's also one that, based on the discussion earlier, is also being rolled into the outreach committee's work. So, we can just move it into that body of work.

Speaker 5 (01:31:01):

Okay. Thanks.

Speaker 3 (01:31:03):

So, board member, if there is a discrepancy, maybe during the public comment, somebody in the public could comment on what they want?

Speaker 5 (01:31:11):

Yeah, good point. If anybody in the public who knows what that was supposed to be and wants to let us know, we'd be happy to take it on.

Alyssa Woods (01:31:27):

Okay. So, moving on, it says, "Staff to contact board members to coordinate and carve regional summit travels." So, that's been complete. And then, "Staff will monitor demographic trends annually." So, that will stay in progress and that will appear on the agenda annually. And then, I've been assisting the outreach committee in scheduling meetings. So, we have scheduled a meeting in July, and then we scheduled another one in September. So that is still, it's complete, but it's something I'm actively doing. And then, Ms. Muhle will share the Professional Licensing Review Act Report with the board along with the links to the bill discussed during the legislative update. So, that was handled after the last board meeting, so that is complete. And then, it says that I would coordinate the regional summit travel and registration for board member Brachvogel, and I worked with him on that, so that is also complete. Back to you, Chair.

Sian Roberts (01:32:33):

Okay. Thank you, Alyssa. All right, it's time for public comments. So, 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 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. Sydney, have there been any comments submitted in writing?

Sydney Muhle (01:33:13):

No, ma'am.

Sian Roberts (01:33:16):

Okay. Are there any members of the public here today who would like to make a comment? And I see Tammy's hand up. Go ahead, Tammy.

Tammy (01:33:27):

Good morning. Thank you. Yes, there is an opportunity available for outreach with Washington Council. So, we have invited members of NCARB to come and speak to our board on May the 21st, particularly about the new change in competencies. So, if there's somebody here that would like to attend that as well, you're welcome to let me know and I'll get that invitation to you.

Sian Roberts (01:33:52):

Tammy, I would be happy to do that. If you want to put my name on there, having been part of the competency group, I'd be probably a good candidate for that if I'm available.

Tammy (01:34:05):

All right. All right. It said 4:00 on the 21st. I'll get that invitation to you.

Sian Roberts (01:34:08):

Okay, excellent.

Tammy (01:34:12):

The only other thing is 5729. So, if anybody would like to have more information from us as to why we came in opposition to 5729, I'm happy to do that. We were part of a fairly large contingent of people including the engineers, [inaudible 01:34:28] was there and [inaudible 01:34:30] were there because, as Elizabeth shared, the bill is just not ready for prime time. There was a lot of really concerning components to it. One of the biggest ones, in my opinion, was the lack of real specificity as to what a project would be considered complete containing, and that it really wasn't specific enough about what types of projects they were talking about. So, I don't want to take any more time on that, but anybody interested, I'm happy to share more about that. And that's all I have for you today.

Sian Roberts (01:35:07):

Thank you, Tammy.

Speaker 6 (01:35:08):

Yeah, Tammy, I'll call you later or reach out to you later. Maybe we can talk about it a little bit more.

Tammy (01:35:13):

Yeah, sounds great.

Speaker 6 (01:35:15):

Okay.

Sian Roberts (01:35:18):

Are there any other members of the public who'd like to make a comment?

(01:35:27):

Okay. Hearing none, thank you for your comments and the floor is now closed.

(01:35:37):

Okay. Do any board members or staff, I'm onto 10.1 right now. Do any board members or staff have any announcements or additional reports they would like to make at this time?

(01:35:52):

Okay. 10.2. Are there any additional future agenda items that have not yet been discussed that any board members would like to request for the next meeting?

(01:36:06):

I am actually going to add something to this list. I remember that at some point we had talked about reviewing the board delegations on a regular basis, and I'm realizing we have two new board members here who I think it, really again, helps us understand what we do, what staff does, what authorities we have, what authorities we've delegated. So, I would ask that maybe we have the opportunity to review delegations in an upcoming meeting. It doesn't have to be the next meeting.

(01:36:42):

Anybody else?

(01:36:43):

Okay. 10.3. Alyssa, could you review the action items from today's meeting?

Alyssa Woods (01:36:55):

I can. There is actually quite a few this time. So, I have captured that we will move board member Harm's case to the next meeting, and then we will schedule, board staff will schedule the training for Erica for the chair training. And then, we will also schedule the chair and vice chair check-in. And then also, Sydney said that she would forward the NCARB annual business information to the board. And then, I will work with board member Brachvogel and Vice Chair Loynd on travel. And then, let's see. I believe that an agenda item that was requested was counseling on RCWs related to performance of architects. So, that can be added to the next meeting.

(01:37:55):

And then, Grace Hamilton will work with board member Brachvogel on a case. And then, also, we would work with Vice Chair Loynd's and board member Wu's available dates to schedule for the Lake Washington presentation, NUDUB. And then, also include Chair Roberts on the official date for the Lake Washington presentation. And then, Vice Chair Loynd said that she would reach out to ACE for a potential presentation. And then, also, you had requested that we would review the board delegation at the next meeting. Was there anything that I may have missed?

(01:38:47):

It was quite a bit of time.

Speaker 3 (01:38:51):

Especially if we're finishing a little early.

Sydney Muhle (01:38:55):

And we are, aren't we? Very nice. This is the first time we finished early in a while. That's good. So, I'll take this opportunity to adjourn the meeting. The time is now 11:41 and this meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

Elizabeth Lagerberg (01:39:13):

Thank you.

Paul Wu (01:39:13):

Thank you.

Speaker 5 (01:39:13):

Thank you.

Sydney Muhle (01:39:15):

Thanks everybody. Bye.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:39:17]