

Washington State Board of Licensure for Landscape Architects meeting transcript

May 8, 2025

Curtis LaPierre (00:04):

And we're started. Good. Call to order. Good morning. I am Curtis LaPierre, chair of the Washington State Board of Licensure for Landscape Architects. It is now 10:01 A.M. on Thursday, May 8th, 2025. I'm calling this board meeting to order.

(00:24):

This meeting is open to the public and we will provide an opportunity for public comment later in the meeting. To reduce background noise, please mute yourself when you are not speaking. Also for board members, please help us to capture the information correctly by stating your name when you make comments.

(00:47):

Alyssa, will you do the roll call please?

Sydney Muhle (00:54):

I think I'm actually going to do it for her.

Curtis LaPierre (00:56):

You are. Okay.

Sydney Muhle (00:58):

And I also going to apologize on behalf of the board staff today, apparently we are all fighting various combinations of allergies and viruses, so we do not sound great. If we randomly have coughing fits and have to go on mute, we apologize. It has hit all three of us all at once, so please bear with us.

(01:16):

Chair LaPierre?

Curtis LaPierre (01:18):

Here.

Sydney Muhle (01:20):

Board member Anderson?

Jason Anderson (01:22):

Present.

Sydney Muhle (01:23):

Board member Robinson-Losey?

(01:27):

And board member Solorio?

Lindsey Solorio (01:29):

Present.

Sydney Muhle (01:31):

All right. And Vice Chair Crabill has a conflict and will not be able to join us today. But we have our quorum.

Curtis LaPierre (01:40):

Great. I'd like to get a motion for approval of the agenda.

Jason Anderson (01:47):

Anderson, I'll make a motion to approve the agenda.

Lindsey Solorio (01:51):

This is board member Solorio, I second the motion.

Curtis LaPierre (01:55):

Thank you. That does not need a vote, does it? I'm forgetting.

Sydney Muhle (02:03):

Yes.

Curtis LaPierre (02:03):

We only do this four times a year, so I forget. It does need a vote, you're saying?

Sydney Muhle (02:08):

Yes.

Curtis LaPierre (02:09):

Okay. All those in favor of approval of the agenda aye?

Jason Anderson (02:14):

Aye.

Lindsey Solorio (02:16):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (02:16):

Aye.

(02:17):

Okay. Now let's move on to item four, approval of minutes. I need a motion for approval please.

Jason Anderson (02:27):

I'll make a motion to approve the minutes.

Curtis LaPierre (02:30):

Thank you.

Lindsey Solorio (02:32):

This is board member Solorio, I second the motion.

Curtis LaPierre (02:38):

Thank you. All those in favor of approving the minutes? Aye.

Jason Anderson (02:46):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (02:47):

Sounds good.

(02:50):

Under item five, old business, outreach update. Jason, I think you've been out to WSU, is that right, since we last met?

Jason Anderson (03:04):

Yeah, I met with probably a group of about 10 to 15 students and gave a presentation about licensure. And at this most recent portfolio review in Seattle, I did have a couple mention to me that they appreciated the outreach in learning about licensure. So hopefully it's going somewhere.

Curtis LaPierre (03:31):

Would you say by the interaction and the questions that they had not before that had much information about licensure?

Jason Anderson (03:43):

I never get the feeling that they do, I think it's something that's just this amorphous cloud that's out there that they've heard about.

Curtis LaPierre (03:50):

Yeah, kind of out there.

Jason Anderson (03:52):

And then just because this time I went in with the numbers also of the licensed landscape architects and the ages and stuff. And really hit home with them about there's an opportunity for them if they pursue this just for longevity in the field and being licensed landscape architects and having jobs and potential in portability and they seem to be responsive to that.

Curtis LaPierre (04:25):

Great, great. As you know, that's been my concern that there's going to be a big group, in theory anyway, retiring the next five or 10 years and we're going to need folks to replace us. And Lindsey, you went to UW?

Lindsey Solorio (04:46):

I did, yeah. And I would say that that was also a fruitful conversation. I probably gave a very similar presentation as Jason. And also added in the age demographics and about how much of the professional body is retiring in the next handful of years to say there is opportunity and a place for you. And similarly, I also got the impression that the topic of licensure has probably either not come up or not been super relevant until you are about to graduate and have to think about employment and prospects. So I think it's a good thing to continue these outreach efforts so that we're talking to every class that's graduating.

Curtis LaPierre (05:31):

Right, right. I'm hearing from a couple of grad students at UW that internships this summer are a little harder to find, I think it's in a climate where there's a lot of things that, private businesses anyway, consulting businesses, aren't too sure of what's happening here in the economy and are not willing to commit to internships this year. So I think, at least from what I'm hearing, they're a little bit harder to find. I don't know, did anybody talk to either of you about internships?

Lindsey Solorio (06:13):

I had one person ask me about that, but yeah, at least for me, we fall under the private business category where internships are just a lot more difficult to make happen.

Jason Anderson (06:27):

Board member Anderson. I've never had an internship just because the size of the business and the amount of work that I personally take on doesn't leave a lot of room for having somebody in the office that I'm trying to mentor, I guess. But I have had people reach out asking about internships here.

Curtis LaPierre (07:02):

If there's nothing else under outreach we can move on to new business. Item 6.0 And 6.1 is election of officers. So today the board will elect a chair, vice chair and secretary for the upcoming year. The second meeting of every year this is what we do, Landscape Architect Board holds elections for the following 12 months. We will need nominations and votes for chair, vice chair and secretary positions. Do I hear any voluntary nominations? You can nominate yourself.

Jason Anderson (07:56):

Anderson. I can step in vice chair.

Lindsey Solorio (08:05):

Board member Solorio. I'm happy to continue for secretary for this next year.

Curtis LaPierre (08:10):

One more year. Okay. But next time both you guys are going to have to move up. And I talked to Daren about that, he's totally fine. He recommended that either of you move up into vice chair

or chair position. I'm willing to serve as chair for the next 12 months. And then looking forward to either of you stepping up into that position next time.

Jason Anderson (08:58):

Board member Anderson. I'd like to nominate vice chair Crabill for chair.

Curtis LaPierre (09:08):

I think he's already been, do you remember, Sydney, if he's already been chair?

Sydney Muhle (09:15):

He has, it's been a while, but he had indicated that he was hoping to step back from a leadership role just because of the demands that he's currently facing through his employer. He was perfectly happy to surrender the couple of additional meetings in between our regular board meetings.

Curtis LaPierre (09:36):

Right. You still want to do that, Jason? I'm thinking that he would decline.

Jason Anderson (09:49):

Right? Well, that's why I ...

Curtis LaPierre (09:52):

Oh, yeah, that happened to me.

Jason Anderson (09:58):

So I will retract my nomination.

Curtis LaPierre (10:03):

Okay. All right. So I think where we are-

Jason Anderson (10:06):

Not my nomination of myself, that remains.

Curtis LaPierre (10:08):

Okay, I understand. So we have a nomination for chair, I agree to serve another 12 months. Vice chair, Jason. And Lindsey would remain as secretary. Are those three separate votes, Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (10:27):

Unfortunately we do have to do three separate motions and votes.

Curtis LaPierre (10:32):

Okay. Let's start with the secretary position please. All those in favor of Lindsey.

Sydney Muhle (10:41):

Mr Chair, we need a formal motion and second.

Curtis LaPierre (10:45):

Sorry.

Jason Anderson (10:46):

I would like to make a motion to approve board member Solorio as continuing on as secretary.

Curtis LaPierre (10:55):

And can I second that? I can. Great. I'd like to second that motion.

Sydney Muhle (11:00):

Yes, you can.

Curtis LaPierre (11:02):

Okay. All those in favor of Lindsey remaining as secretary please say aye.

Jason Anderson (11:09):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (11:10):

Aye.

Lindsey Solorio (11:10):

Aye.

(11:12):

And just to know, I will be happy to do a different role next year to relieve Daren.

Curtis LaPierre (11:19):

Great. Something to look forward to.

Lindsey Solorio (11:22):

Or you, Curtis, or both.

Curtis LaPierre (11:25):

Yes, both. And for the vice chair position I'll need a motion to approve if you could Lindsey please.

Lindsey Solorio (11:38):

Sure. I make a motion to approve board member Anderson as the vice chair.

Curtis LaPierre (11:44):

I'd like to second that. All those in favor of board member Anderson as vice chair please say aye.

Lindsey Solorio (11:52):

Aye.

Jason Anderson (11:53):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (11:54):

Aye. And for chair, if somebody could please move, make a motion.

Jason Anderson (12:01):

I'll make a motion to approve board member LaPierre as chair for another 12 months.

Curtis LaPierre (12:14):

LaPierre.

Lindsey Solorio (12:14):

I second the motion.

Curtis LaPierre (12:18):

Thank you. All those in favor please say aye.

Lindsey Solorio (12:22):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (12:23):

Aye.

Jason Anderson (12:24):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (12:25):

Great. I think that takes care of our election of officers. Thank you for those who volunteered.
(12:35):

Moving on to item 6.2, the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Board, or CLARB, licensure summit and meeting coming up. And Sydney, you have some information.

Sydney Muhle (12:53):

I do. And unfortunately please bear with me, my packet just completely froze, so give me a second to try and reopen it.

Curtis LaPierre (13:04):

While you're doing that, I just looked up, now remind me what city that's in.

Sydney Muhle (13:13):

It's going to be in Lexington. Sorry. Thank you for bearing with me. It'll be in Lexington, Kentucky, September 17th through 20th. And this will be the combined licensure summit as well as the annual meeting for CLARB.

(13:30):

So with this we would be looking for a couple of volunteers willing to attend on behalf of the board if you are able. Last year nobody was able, so we did not have any representatives from the board attend in 2024. And we've communicated with CLARB that the ability to have a hybrid annual meeting would be great. Especially when it's on far on one coast or the other, that does add complications and additional travel days. And that when a large number of our board members are small business owners or that there's a huge impact to your work and home lives to be able to go for this length of time. That it would be great if they could take that into consideration. And also understanding the flip side of that, when the conference is on the west coast, the east coast is experiencing that. So we did put that forth. I don't think that it has been planned as a dual attendance option for this year. We haven't received anything if they're going to allow virtual attendance. But we'll continue to communicate that with them.

(15:00):

There is also a small complicating factor that may impact this or I may be saying this and we won't need it. There is currently a travel freeze at the state. Even though travel for this event will be covered by CLARB. Because of that travel freeze, it does add some complicating factors on the staff side for us to put through all of the travel authorizations and everything that we have to on behalf of the board. So we've been asked to keep our attendance to a small number if possible. And the reason being, because CLARB is covering the attendance, it's fine, the travel freeze is really for travel that we have to fund through the state. But it is something that we do still have to do travel authorization for, and those are open to public records disclosure. And we don't want to have to put our agency or the governor's office in any sticky situations where they're having to answer, well, why does one board get to attend while all of these other people have been frozen and different questions like that. So we've just been asked to keep attendance minimal, to one to two people if we're able to, just to help them navigate any political waters that may come up.

(16:25):

Now that is with the caveat that the travel freeze could be lifted at any point in time. We've received absolutely no information or indication on when that will happen. We can presume at the start of the new fiscal year, July one, that there would reasonably be a new set of rules, but we have not received any definitive information to that effect. So the travel freeze could continue into the new fiscal year. So please just bear with us as we navigate those waters.

(16:55):

But with that, if anybody is able and willing to attend, we will start coordinating that travel.

Lindsey Solorio (17:04):

I could attend based on the dates.

Curtis LaPierre (17:10):

I'm sorry, did you say you could or could not?

Lindsey Solorio (17:12):

Yes, yeah, I could attend virtually or in person, however that works out.

Jason Anderson (17:23):

Board member Anderson. If it is hybrid I can attend virtually. Unfortunately, I've got a conflict on those dates that I'm not a hundred percent sure about right now. But I know on the agenda there's another meeting, is it an either/or thing?

Sydney Muhle (17:52):

No, somebody could attend both or one or the other or none. That's entirely up to the board. And we'll be discussing the next one. But that one is going to be a couple of weeks later in October in New Orleans. That one will have that travel freeze caveat because this won't be anything covered through CLARB or ASLA. This is something that we will have to fund through the state. And so that other event will be subject to whatever's going on with the travel freeze at that time.

Curtis LaPierre (18:37):

I can attend those dates as well. I think importantly, Sydney, what I looked up this morning was, is there a direct flight to Lexington? No way, not even close. However, one of our team works out of Ohio. And I asked him, "Well, how do you get to Lexington?" And he said, "Oh, you just fly into Cincinnati and it's an hour away by car." So you'd have to rent a car. But I checked on, just on Alaska that I fly mostly, and there's direct flights at reasonable times and they're actually pretty cheap. It was \$326 round trip for a direct flight into Cincinnati.

Sydney Muhle (19:33):

Wow.

Jason Anderson (19:33):

Nice.

Curtis LaPierre (19:35):

Pretty cheap.

Sydney Muhle (19:35):

That is good to know. And it always seems that for our landscape architects, and our geologists face this well, there's never a direct flight to wherever the conference is actually at.

Curtis LaPierre (19:46):

So to recap on that, it sounds like I could go, Lindsey could go or attend virtually, and Jason could attend virtually but not in person. Is that all correct?

Jason Anderson (20:07):

Can I get a quick clarification though, Sydney, are you required to attend the whole time?

Sydney Muhle (20:15):

No, you are not required to attend the whole time. And really it's the same cost either way. So if you can attend a portion, I think there's certainly merit to both the licensure summit as well as the annual meeting, but if you can only attend one portion or the other, we can facilitate that as well.

Jason Anderson (20:42):

Okay. So if something happened where Curtis and Lindsey couldn't attend, I would be able to at least probably do partial. I'm expecting to move a college student the weekend before, so I would need to be back before the 20th.

Sydney Muhle (21:06):

Okay. Then we can begin the process for Curtis and Lindsey's travel. We'll do travel authorizations through our site. And then the actual travel itself, as we get a little bit closer, we'll get additional information on how to book that. But I believe it's going to be booked specifically through CLARB. So we'll get you that information to book your flights and all of that when the time comes.

(21:34):

The other piece with this event is we will need to designate a voting delegate and an alternate. So which of you would like to be the delegate and which would like to be the alternate?

Curtis LaPierre (21:50):

Lindsey, why don't you be the delegate?

Lindsey Solorio (21:54):

Okay.

Curtis LaPierre (21:59):

And I'll be the alternate.

Sydney Muhle (22:07):

All right. We've got that down. There are no other questions on this one, then we can move on to the other event.

Curtis LaPierre (22:16):

Okay, go ahead please.

Sydney Muhle (22:20):

All right. So the other one that we have on the calendar is the ASLA Summer Licensure Summit that they're doing collaboration with CLARB. This one will be held in New Orleans, Louisiana, October 10th through 13th 2025.

(22:41):

Again, this is one that the travel will not be covered through CLARB, so this will fall under whatever is going on with the state's travel at that point. But what we would like to do is, if somebody is able and willing to attend, we will still begin that process. And just take it step by step and see what is going to happen. Because the governor could lift the freeze tomorrow and we would not know about it. But at the same time he could leave it in place for another year. And we don't know until it's announced. So we will just continue to communicate. But we'd rather have it on the calendar, be planning attendance in the hopes that we will be able to send to someone if any members of the board would like to attend, rather than waiting until the last minute and hearing the travel freeze got lifted. Yay. And not be on anybody's calendar at that point.

Curtis LaPierre (23:42):

You're looking for volunteers then?

Sydney Muhle (23:46):

Yes.

Jason Anderson (23:48):

Board member Anderson, I can do those dates.

Lindsey Solorio (23:54):

Board member Solorio, unfortunately I could not attend virtually or in person on those days.

Curtis LaPierre (24:05):

Chair LaPierre, if they have a, what do you call it, virtual, I could attend, but I can't go to New Orleans.

Sydney Muhle (24:20):

All right. Then if the board is okay with us anticipating sending board member Anderson, then we will begin planning his travel for those dates as well. Again, just please remember that caveat that there's a big portion of this that's outside of our control and is residing with the governor's office. All right.

Curtis LaPierre (24:43):

All right. We're ready to move on to item 6.4, legacy practitioners. If anybody doesn't know what that is, that's people like me with more than 25 years of being licensed, either in Washington or another CLARB approved jurisdiction. Legacy practitioners and professional development hours, requirements for license renewal. And why this came up, a little bit of background, is I've received a couple of calls from people I know, and who've been practicing for a long time and said, "Hey, I'm trying to renew, but there's a question online and it says have you completed all your professional development hours and you check yes or no." And unfortunately there has not been a way to say I'm a legacy practitioner and I'm exempt from the full PDH requirement and have completed, I guess, it's four PDHs at that point. So that's where that is.

(26:02):

And that sounded like something that was just a website adjustment by staff, is that correct, at some point? And I know that's not an easy thing to do.

Sydney Muhle (26:17):

It would be a form update on our site. And we can certainly work with the forms team on getting an additional question added in there specifically for legacy practitioners. Because I believe the question right now specifically calls out the 24 PDH hours. And I spoke with Anisa yesterday and she said, yeah, she does get a lot of questions from legacy practitioners who don't feel comfortable saying yes because they've completed the number that they're supposed to, so they check no because of that 24 hours. So we can work with them on rewording that and making it more inclusive for our legacy practitioners in this allowance for them. So we will, as long as it's okay with the board, we'll work on updating that form.

Curtis LaPierre (27:06):

Right. It is a little uncomfortable to have to lie, but yeah. Go ahead.

Lisa Baker (27:13):

Lisa Baker, landscape architect. I have a question about, it's for-

Sydney Muhle (27:22):

Mr. Chair, for public comment we would have to have the entire board okay to take public comment on this portion and we'll need to do our time limits as well. And for members of the public, we have to be really careful about answering questions on this, we can really only take statements from you, we can't really provide answers during the public meeting.

Curtis LaPierre (27:48):

Lisa, is that all right to wait for just a few minutes here?

Lisa Baker (27:51):

Okay. Yeah. Sure. Okay.

Curtis LaPierre (27:52):

Okay. Yeah, we got public comments coming up here pretty quick. Thank you. Okay. It sounds like we can move on from that. That staff will look at what changes need to be made to avoid people lying.

(28:11):

Item seven, complaint cases for review. I think board member Anderson, you were a case manager on a recent case, do you have one to present?

Jason Anderson (28:34):

Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (28:36):

So with this, you would just read your complaint or your case manager report, if you don't have it handy, I have it up and I'm happy to read it on your behalf.

Jason Anderson (28:48):

Can you please read it on my behalf, I didn't realize.

Curtis LaPierre (28:53):

Sorry, I didn't mean to ambush you there.

Sydney Muhle (28:56):

That's okay. No, that's okay. This is the hard part, with a couple of our boards, that don't have very many cases to review, is we don't always get to remind everybody how this goes. So that's okay.

(29:07):

So this will be case number 2024-11-3346-00LA. The complaint summary is I received a case file on 1/24/24. In the file the complainant alleges the respondent violated RCW 1808420 as it

relates to an unlicensed practice. The complainant claims respondent is practicing landscape architecture without a license.

(29:40):

The facts of the case are in this file appeared to be no material illustrating a violation of RCW 1808420. The respondent refers to themselves as a landscape designer in the documents. The respondent's client refers to the respondent as a landscape designer. The work appears to be well within the work of a landscape designer. The respondent does not appear to be practicing landscape architecture without a license. And the case manager's recommendation is to close this case with no further action.

Jason Anderson (30:22):

Thank you. Sydney.

Curtis LaPierre (30:27):

Any questions from the board on that one?

(30:35):

Just one clarification, Jason, this was a alleged practice violation, not a title, it wasn't somebody presenting them or offering to do business as a landscape architect?

Jason Anderson (30:54):

No. They present themselves as a landscape designer.

Curtis LaPierre (31:01):

Okay. And so it was practice not title. Okay.

Jason Anderson (31:06):

Yeah, it was practice.

Curtis LaPierre (31:07):

Just wanted to be sure I was clear. Okay. No further questions on that one. We'll move on to reports. We have-

Sydney Muhle (31:18):

Mr. Chair, if we can go back on that one. We do need a motion and a vote whether to accept the case manager recommendation.

Curtis LaPierre (31:26):

Yeah. The recommendation of course was to close with no further action. I need a motion to approve that.

Lindsey Solorio (31:32):

I'm sorry, Curtis, did you say you're making a motion or you're going to-

Curtis LaPierre (31:40):

No, I need a motion please.

Lindsey Solorio (31:43):

Okay. This is board member Solorio. I move to close the case with the recommendations of the case manager.

Curtis LaPierre (31:50):

And I'll go ahead and second that. All those in favor please say aye.

Jason Anderson (31:56):

Aye.

Lindsey Solorio (31:58):

Aye.

Curtis LaPierre (32:00):

Aye. Great. Thanks Sydney for that reminder.

(32:04):

Moving on to item eight, reports. We have 8.1, committee task force reports, the 8.11, the Washington Administrative Code review update. Sydney, I think you have an update.

Sydney Muhle (32:22):

I do. And I desperately wanted this to be under old business for approval this meeting. But when I sent the updated rules document to the committee and to our advising assistant attorney general, there were a couple of additional items that had been caught. And so we are working through the process on how to line out those last couple of things. I'm hoping to have that done by next week and then get committee final approval so that we can send it out to the full board. I am hoping. I really want this across the finish line. But unfortunately it was one of those that it was just things that had not been caught to that point. And so we want to make sure that all of it is addressed correctly this one time. And then get it all done correctly this first time.

Curtis LaPierre (33:18):

Right. We'll catch it next time.

Sydney Muhle (33:20):

Next time.

Curtis LaPierre (33:22):

Okay. Item 8.2, staff reports, complaints, status report, Sydney.

Sydney Muhle (33:31):

So we had one that was in a management review that will now move to closed. We have three other ones that have been closed. For a grand total of four.

Curtis LaPierre (33:43):

Okay. And the other three, I assume, were just handled by letters from ...

Sydney Muhle (33:53):

I'm not 100% certain. Maybe I could phone a friend with Grace, but I would imagine that those were closed for no jurisdiction.

Grace (34:02):

Yes, that's correct, Sydney.

Curtis LaPierre (34:11):

Okay, understood. Moving on to 8.22, the licensee count report.

Sydney Muhle (34:16):

All right. And with this, I want to start this conversation that the licensee count report is going to be treated a little bit differently moving forward. Because these numbers don't change a whole lot from one quarter to the next we've been asked by our division leadership to move these from a quarterly report out to, we will still provide the data in your packet every month, but we won't take the time during the meeting to review them verbally in public.

(34:50):

Again, it'll be in the packet and also publicly available, if the public wants to review it, they can always request that from us, and we are happy to share it out. But we will be providing this on an annual basis. We'll be doing an annual report at the first meeting of the calendar year for all of our boards moving forward. And that way it really shows the trends a whole lot better when you look at it year over year, whereas quarterly it really adjusts very little.

(35:22):

So with that, we have 884 active licensees across all age categories. 19 that are in an expired status. And three that are inactive. For a grand total of 906. Here we go. This is just a look at our new issues versus our renewals for 2025. That's always going to be a wider variable no matter what month we look at. And we can go to the next one.

(36:05):

This is the one that I'd really like to highlight is it's our five-year overview. As you can see, not a very large licensee base, but it is very steady and very mighty. So have had some steady growth, coming up on a hundred over the years between 2020 and 2024. We're seeing a slight dip so far to date. But we're still very, very early in the year. That slight dip could be due to a whole lot of factors. And it's not a large enough dip for me to be concerned about it at this point. I think looking at it closer to the end of the year and seeing where we end up will ... Again, the snapshot was just what was grabbed on April 2nd, so it could be that we just had a rather large chunk that was in renewal and dropped down slightly.

Curtis LaPierre (37:04):

Could be. It's just a little over 1%, but we'll have to keep an eye on that and see where it goes.

Sydney Muhle (37:09):

Yeah, definitely we'll keep an eye on and see where it's at. But at this point, not too concerned.

(37:17):

All right. Any questions on the licensee count report? Okay.

(37:24):

Then we had also had a question at the last board meeting to discuss the timeline for processing in-state applicants for licensure versus reciprocity applicants. Most of those in-state are going to be applicants by examination versus reciprocity are typically already coming to us licensed and are just looking to gain additional licensure in Washington state.

(37:57):

So again, I had a chat with Anisa yesterday. And she said once we receive all of the completed applications, so all of the documents, whether it's an exam or additional documents that we need from a reciprocity applicant, takes about two weeks to complete the full process. Anisa has to go through and check a lot of different pieces to that application. There can be a little bit of back and forth on, hey, I need this additional information. So it takes about two weeks to complete that process. But that is after they complete all of those requirements.

(38:47):

If a reciprocity applicant does have their CLARP certificate, that does make it a little bit faster because everything is already in the CLARP system. Anisa can look them up and everything goes a little bit quicker. If they do not have that and they're just unlicensed in Colorado, and now looking to gain additional licensure in Washington, but they don't have that certificate, it makes that license portability a little bit slower. It can be done. But that's where we see that timeline extend out into that two week window because they're having to submit all of the additional pieces where the CLARP record would have everything right there. We're having to review each one of those documents one by one to make sure that they complete. So that's where that timeline can stretch a little bit.

(39:39):

Other things that can add to that timeline are just if, again with a reciprocity applicant, if they don't have that certificate and we're having to gather all of that information, if it takes them time to pull all that together, we really can't start our full review for approval until we have that completed application. So making sure we get all of those completed documents can add to that timeline a little bit.

(40:04):

So were there any additional questions that we could answer on this one?

Curtis LaPierre (40:14):

It's good to know about the CLARP certification because I talked to other staff from other states and had them say, "No, that doesn't matter, that doesn't do anything for you." I thought, well, it really should.

Sydney Muhle (40:31):

It should. There is value to it. It does make the license portability a lot faster and simpler, it's a much smoother process. It's not that it can't be done without it, it just definitely takes longer and puts a whole lot more responsibility to submit all of those documents back onto the applicant.

Jason Anderson (40:52):

Board member Anderson. I just went through reciprocity with Montana and Oregon. And I did CLARP for both. And with Montana I had my license within a week. Oregon took better than a month.

Sydney Muhle (41:10):

Wow.

Curtis LaPierre (41:15):

Interesting. Okay. All right. No other questions, we can move on to item 8.2.3, the legislative update.

Sydney Muhle (41:27):

All right. With this one there's not a whole lot to report. We have seen the end of the legislative session for now. We hope that they are truly done. The state budget is still hanging out there. I think the governor's going to be running up against a really short timeline here to sign it or to request that the legislature come back for a special session. And we've received no indication one way or another how that's going to go.

(41:58):

But that does not necessarily impact the board directly. So for legislation that does impact the board, at the last meeting we had given you guys an update about the 06L proposal, the move to move the landscape architect account under the business and professions umbrella account to provide just some additional security and breathing room around if we have a large case that needs to move forward through prosecution and maybe into the court, those attorneys fees can add up really quickly. And those are a really large program fiscal impact really quickly. And can lead to rapid fee increases that we don't want to have to do in order to cover for one single case.

(42:55):

So as a reminder, this will hopefully allow that breathing room under this account so that we can space that out or gain back those large fiscal hits over a period of time rather than needing to immediately do a fee increase to cover those to get our fund health back up. So that proposal did pass both the House and the Senate. There was one additional caveat that the Senate added that was adopted by the House to require that the Department of Licensing provide annual reporting to the legislature on the revenue and expenses for each individual profession under that account. So that has been added. And that was in the approved version. And I believe it has been signed by the governor. So that will take effect July one of this year.

(43:55):

The other one that we had updated you guys on was that there is a proposal out there for regulation of interior designers. And while it doesn't directly impact you guys, it does appear to have some impact to our architect board. And just in case of ripple effects, we wanted to make sure it was on your guys' radar. That proposal, from what we understand, is still being worked on in the background. It did not get introduced at the legislature this year. They're hoping to introduce it next session.

(44:29):

But there's a whole variety of factors in there that we are not exactly privy to. We are getting a lot of information through the grapevine right now. But that is being worked on with a separate group representing the architects. So we'll keep you guys posted as we have anything additional. But it'll probably be toward the end of the year, looking into next legislative session before we know anything more about that. But it was not introduced for this year.

Curtis LaPierre (45:03):

Understood. Any questions on any of the legislative issues?

(45:13):

I think we'll move on to 8.2.4, review of the master action item list.

Alyssa Woods (45:23):

So I'll go ahead and handle this one. So for the first one, Mr. Crabill and Mr. LaPierre will review and update the current WACS. Which I believe, Sydney, that's the one that we're waiting to finalize and then hopefully get on the next agenda, correct?

Sydney Muhle (45:45):

Yeah.

Alyssa Woods (45:46):

Okay. So that's still in progress. And then outreach to UW and WSU, that's ongoing. We heard about that during our outreach portion. And then staff to request from CLARB the age demographic data of test-takers timeframe clarification. That is still ongoing.

(46:06):

And then we're keeping recruitment as an ongoing priority as well. And then board staff will provide additional info about interior designers and possible crossover into landscape architects. So that will appear under our legislative updates. Whenever we hear anything Sydney will share out in that portion at the meeting.

(46:29):

And then, let's see, staff will update the 2025 goals to include middle grades and high school outreach. This item will be on the next meeting agenda for approval. So that is complete. We've already done that.

(46:41):

And then, Ms. Muhle will contact CLARB regarding outreach resources for introducing youth and students to the profession. And I believe that is still in progress.

(46:53):

And then, okay, I believe that was it for our master action item list. So back to you Chair LaPierre.

Curtis LaPierre (47:03):

Great, thanks, Alyssa.

(47:05):

Let's move on to item nine, public comments. We're now entering our public comment period. 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 500 words and must have been emailed to the board staff no less than two business days prior to this meeting. In response to public comments, the board is limited to either requesting the matter be added to a future agenda for discussion or referring it to staff. Inflammatory comments or language will not be permitted.

(47:51):

Board staff, do we have any written comments to be read by staff?

Sydney Muhle (47:57):

No sir, we do not.

Curtis LaPierre (48:00):

Okay. If you'd like to make a comment, I think that Lisa is available, please unmute your line, state your name and share your comments with the board. As a reminder, please mute your line once you've finished.

Brent Chastain (48:33):

This is Brent Chastain, I'd like to make a public comment.

Curtis LaPierre (48:36):

Okay, go ahead please.

Brent Chastain (48:39):

My name is Brent Chastain, license number 1202. I want to thank the board for taking the time to review the complaint I filed, number 2024-11 3346. I want to express my concern in the decision that the board has made that it does not appear the company in question is not practicing landscape architecture. Based on my understanding of RCW18.96.30, which defines landscape architecture-

Sydney Muhle (49:10):

Sir, excuse me.

Brent Chastain (49:11):

Yes.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerberg (49:11):

Go ahead, Sydney.

Sydney Muhle (49:13):

Unfortunately, we cannot take comments during the public comment portion on any cases. So if you would like to submit something in writing expressing your concerns you're certainly welcome to.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerberg (49:32):

The reason for that is that the board itself has to remain impartial and can't learn anything about any specific cases or too much detail in case it does ever come before the board as a hearing. The board itself is not part of an enforcement process, it's the individual case managers that look at those facts.

Brent Chastain (50:02):

Then what do I do if I feel that the decision is incorrect? I feel like it was identified as a title, I mean, in my opinion it was a practice violation, which I can cite all the code parts. And it sounds like it was reviewed as a title violation, which I don't believe it was a title violation. I believe it was a practice violation.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerberg (50:27):

Then again, it's best to submit those comments in writing so that the staff and the case manager can review those comments. Because they're the ones at this point that are able to look at those comments and make decisions or further information, if you feel like you're submitting further information about a specific complaint, they're the ones that would look at that.

Sydney Muhle (51:01):

And if you would like, you can submit that to the email address in blue on the screen, the DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov. And we will route that to the appropriate group to address your concerns.

Brent Chastain (51:15):

Okay. I just have to voice. I have concern that the investigation is not being reviewed properly because the quoted RCW was for architecture and not landscape architecture. And I have communicated out to the individual who is actually online with us today about the information. And I've only been provided with submitting for basically a Freedom of Information Act on that course. And so I don't see how I have any other recourse to this other than going to the board.

Sydney Muhle (51:53):

If you can submit that to us again at that email address, I will reach out to you directly and work through your concerns with you. And then make sure we get it to the appropriate channels.

Brent Chastain (52:08):

Okay, great. Thank you very much.

Curtis LaPierre (52:13):

Thanks, Brent. Other, I think Lisa Baker, did you have some testimony that you wanted to give?

Alyssa Woods (52:32):

It looks like she's unmuted, but maybe her mic isn't working at this time. So I would recommend that if she'd like to, she can also email the DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov and give her statement. And then if needed we can bring it before the board next time. So, there is that option as well if you're not able to get your mic to work.

Curtis LaPierre (53:09):

Yes, if you are trying ... Okay, we can hear you now.

Lisa Baker (53:15):

Okay. Well, it was just a quick question asking about the legacy practitioner for PDH is required every two years then if you're a legacy practitioner, is that verification?

Sydney Muhle (53:32):

Unfortunately, we're not able to answer that question, but again, if you email that I will make sure that the appropriate people get a correct response back you.

Lisa Baker (53:38):

Okay, thank you.

Curtis LaPierre (53:46):

Okay. Any further public comments? Hearing none.

(53:55):

We'll move on to our item 10, conclusion. Are there any announcements from the board members or staff that you'd like to share? Hearing none.

(54:11):

Any requests for future agenda items? Any of the board members like to have something on the next agenda? Hearing none.

(54:27):

Let's go ahead and, Alyssa, if you would please review the action items from today's meeting.

Alyssa Woods (54:39):

Okay. I have to read my own handwriting, so give me just a moment. So I've captured that I will work with Curtis and Lindsey on travel authorizations and registration and potentially travel accommodations for the annual business meeting I believe.

(55:00):

And then for the other meeting, the summit that's in October, I'll work with Jason on a travel authorization registration and travel accommodations pending the travel freeze and where we're at with that during that time.

(55:16):

And then also, staff will work to update the form regarding the disclosure of legacy practitioner status.

(55:25):

And then I also captured, I know that this one is more tentative, but we're hoping to add to the next agenda, the WAC review for approval at the next meeting.

(55:44):

Is there anything I've missed?

Curtis LaPierre (55:49):

I don't think so. I think you got it all. Thank you.

Alyssa Woods (55:52):

Awesome. Thanks.

Curtis LaPierre (55:56):

It is now 10:57 A.M. Thursday May 8th, 2025, and this meeting is adjourned. Our next board meeting, don't have that, sorry. August.

Sydney Muhle (56:20):

August 14th.

Curtis LaPierre (56:21):

Sorry. August 14th. Thank you very much.

Sydney Muhle (56:27):
Thank you everyone.