

# Washington State Board for Architects meeting transcript

**July 31, 2025**

Sydney Muhle (00:00:02):

There is, we're going to have to boot the AI out.

(00:00:26):

All right, well the recording is starting and we are good to go whenever you are, Madam Chair.

Erica Loynd (00:00:33):

Great. It is now 10 o'clock on the dot and I call this regular meeting of the Architects Board to order. The board will provide an opportunity for public comment during the meeting. As a courtesy, we ask that participants to mute their mics or phone when not speaking to reduce the background noise. Please remember to unmute your microphone when you are speaking. Also for board members, to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thank you. Alyssa, at this time, would you please call role and board members? Please respond if in attendance.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:09):

I will start with you, Chair Muhle?

Sydney Muhle (00:01:12):

Here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:14):

Vice Chair Russell?

Katherine Russell (00:01:16):

Present.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:18):

Secretary Brachvogel?

(00:01:25):

Board member...

Paul Wu (00:01:25):

Do you mean Paul Wu?

Peter Brachvogel (00:01:27):

I'm here. I'm here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:29):

Okay.

Peter Brachvogel (00:01:30):

Okay. Sorry.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:32):

And then Board Member Harm?

Scott Harm (00:01:35):

I'm here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:37):

Board Member Wu?

Paul Wu (00:01:39):

I'm here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:41):

And Board Member Roberts?

Sian Roberts (00:01:43):

Here.

Alyssa Woods (00:01:45):

Okay, back to you, Chair.

Erica Loynd (00:01:48):

Great. For the approval of the agenda, I need a motion vote for approval. So first a motion to approve the agenda.

Scott Harm (00:01:56):

This is board member Harm. Go ahead.

Sydney Muhle (00:01:59):

We've had a request from staff to remove item 7.6 from the agenda. It's one of our cases that'll be moved to the next agenda. So if we could approve it, amending to remove item 7.6.

Erica Loynd (00:02:12):

Okay. Could I have a motion to approve the revised agenda to remove that section?

Scott Harm (00:02:18):

This is Board Member Harm. So moved.

Erica Loynd (00:02:23):

Second?

Paul Wu (00:02:23):

Board Member Wu, second.

Erica Loynd (00:02:24):

Any further discussion about the agenda?

Scott Harm (00:02:30):

Just real question, Sydney. I'm just getting through the items way down in the packet today. What is item seven point... I'm looking for it.

Sydney Muhle (00:02:39):

Item 7.6 is one of our cases.

Scott Harm (00:02:43):

Oh 7.6. Okay. Yep.

Sydney Muhle (00:02:44):

Yep.

Scott Harm (00:02:46):

Thank you. Sorry for that delay.

Sydney Muhle (00:02:46):

No problem.

Erica Loynd (00:02:51):

Any other discussion? Move to extend, then we do a vote. All in favor of the approved agenda with the one revision, say aye.

Scott Harm (00:03:03):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:03:05):

Any opposed? Then the agenda is set. Approval of the meeting minutes for the regular meeting minutes from April 24th, 2025. We need in motion to approve the meeting notes.

Peter Brachvogel (00:03:21):

This is board member Brachvogel. I make a motion we approve the meeting. Yes.

Katherine Russell (00:03:25):

Or the rest of it?

Erica Loynd (00:03:31):

Any discussion on any points of the meeting notes? Okay. Then a vote to confirm the meeting minutes. All in favor say aye? Aye. Any opposed? Great. Moving on to whole business. Oh, do I say it or does Alyssa say it?

Sydney Muhle (00:04:05):

No. I think we're good.

Erica Loynd (00:04:08):

Okay. So the National Council of Architectural Registration Board annual business meeting occurred in June. And so the board members who attended will give a short report out. I can begin with just some of the overall takeaways. We were in Scottsdale for annual business meeting. There was a lot of sessions about the upcoming advancements of education and examinations and experience that's going to be at the forefront of kind of evolution of NCARB's path to licensure. I was appreciative to see how much of this is aligning with what the state of Washington has as part of their plan to encourage more alternative paths into architecture. S.

(00:04:54):

O Washington is at the forefront of this and has shown us an example that these will build the pipeline for architects to come into our community. So it was a really good follow through and a lot of work that had gone into the competency report that Sian Roberts or Chair Roberts had participated in over the past years. I'll let her share a little bit more detail of that if she so chooses. The elections and things that occurred on the final day, all of the motions that happened were passed fairly cleanly and they addressed issues in most mutual agreements with other countries. Just some clarifications and one other country that we have agreed or the board meeting or the attendees voted yes to join with is South Africa. And I will say unfortunately, Chair Harm, who really put a big application to join the board as the, I will forget which exact title it was lots of second...

Scott Harm (00:06:03):

Secretary Treasurer.

Erica Loynd (00:06:05):

Secretary Treasurer. Unfortunately did not win the position but was very supportive and had a really great advocacy for what could be the future of NCARB. So appreciated all the work that board Member Harm had done to get to that point. Other attendees want to give some more details on any parts he saw?

Scott Harm (00:06:26):

Chair, very good report. The only thing I would add is someone had asked what was the limitation or the intent on continuing with mutual recognition agreements with the MRA being the acronym that everybody uses. And I think NCARB National handled it very well that their first target was other jurisdictions and countries as a specific example whose educational and experienced path more closely aligned with what the United States is currently at or more moving to. So there was a little bit of a concern, are we just going to open up our marketplace to everybody around the world regardless of their qualifications. So I think NCARB as a national leadership organization is well aware of the concern that people, I'm reading through the lines, really don't want to open it up to quite literally every country around the globe and that there is some kind of a vetting process, but I suspect it will be something that will come up probably a couple more times every time there's a new MRA proposed. Other than that, report is very good.

Sian Roberts (00:07:30):

Yeah, I was going to just add to that in that the other part of that answer was that we are focused right now on the licensure process and what modifications might be made to the licensure project process over the next 5 to 10 years. And that the MRAs will probably take a back seat to that in the short term. So that was part of that report as well. And I think it was, they did lay out their process for pathways to practice and re-looking at the licensure process, but that is going to take some amount of time, so it's going to be a slow, deliberate process. And they laid out kind of a 5 to 10 year timeline on how that would actually be implemented, which was helpful to know.

Scott Harm (00:08:22):

And then I would think also our pathways to practices a little complexity to the whole thing with other countries verifying that they're on board with those alternative pathways. So yeah.

Erica Loynd (00:08:40):

Peter, do you want to add anything to your takeaways from that conference? Sorry, board member Brachvogel

Peter Brachvogel (00:08:47):

My takeaway was, yeah, that's okay. You can call me Peter. But I found that the focus or the recognition of keeping it kind of slow as the MRAs get established was a compelling point to that. And my big concern was that just this open floodgate of people from other countries without a proper education or a background to be able to do it and the notion that we're in this transition anyway with how we're establishing the pathway that the collision of both this open door or the potential for too much open door and our new pathway system might become a problem. The notion of slowing it down and evaluating it was really what I thought was one of the most important points made. It was subtle but it was there. So that's my input to that.

Scott Harm (00:09:45):

And I would second what the Chair said, Erica, about how I was personally kind of pleased with how it's in alignment with how our state currently runs and operates with almost unlimited pathways to licensure. So it was kind of like, yeah, we're out in front kind of a thing. So it was pretty good.

Erica Loynd (00:10:08):

Yeah, I think they made a point that some of the states really do need to have support to help work with the legislatures to advocate for this path that they are working to develop over the next probably five years. And they have plans of how to help those states and I think we are one that will be a support to them and show some of the pros and cons and do you know how to anticipate significant changes to the legislation that we have in place.

Peter Brachvogel (00:10:38):

Yeah, I didn't see that we would have much change to that either, Chair. I thought that's a pretty good point.

Sian Roberts (00:10:46):

Yeah, I mean I think everybody should be thinking forward about what it might mean in the 5 to 10 year timeline and I think it will become clearer as time goes on. I don't think that conceptually there will be a change, much of a change for us, but there will likely be some legislative changes that need to be made to align with a new program. So at any rate, I think we just need to keep watching it and thinking forward to when it would make sense and what those changes need to be.

Erica Loynd (00:11:21):

And I did meet with people, so I have become a member of one of the committees that will be working through this over the next three years for the avenue of experience. So reviewing the competency program with how experience is measured for candidate architects. And so we did have a kickoff. I met the team while we were there and we have kicked off that

committee so that we can start to develop conversations about experience based on competency.

(00:11:55):

Good. Next item.

Scott Harm (00:12:04):

Good report.

Erica Loynd (00:12:05):

Item 5.2, a proposal for interior design regulation update. Sydney, would you like to share your input?

Sydney Muhle (00:12:14):

Absolutely. So this is just going to introduce the item and then I'll hand it over to our presenters. But just as a reminder to the board and members of the public, about a year ago, the board did hear a proposal from a group working toward the regulation of interior designers within the state of Washington. Part of that proposal at that time did include some tie-ins with this board and so they had brought it to the board preemptively. That group decided not to pursue the legislation in the 2025 session and they have been working with AIA Washington council on revamping and bolstering the proposal to head into the 2026 legislative session. And they have requested an opportunity to come back and present their updated proposal to the board for awareness and just to start getting information out there about this proposal coming before it appears in the legislative session beginning of the year. So with that, I will introduce Michael Transu, Megan Onley, Stacey Crumbaker, and Tammie Sueirro. Tammie of course being our executive director for AIA Washington Council. I will turn it over to them to present.

Megan Onley (00:13:42):

Thank you. Appreciate that. Again, I'll introduce myself. I'm Megan Onley, I am an interior designer at Integris Architecture in Spokane, Washington and I'm NCIDQ certified. I'm also the IIDA Northern Pacific chapter president this year. And I'll let Stacey introduce herself as we then give our update after.

Stacey Crumbaker (00:14:02):

Good morning. Thank you all for welcoming us today. I'm Stacey Crumbaker. I've been partnering with Megan on this effort on behalf of the interior designers in Washington. I am a practicing interior designer with Malum Architects, also an educational planner. I also sit on the I-Corps Practice Scope Overlap Steering Committee for those that have not heard of that effort happening in the background, over the last couple of years, as well as I am the president of the International Interior Design Association on a national level and have sat in Megan's shoes in the past locally here in Washington as well. So flip back over to Megan.

Megan Onley (00:14:49):

Yes. And Tammie is on the call and if you want to chime in you're welcome to, but I think she has an agenda item later that she's going to speak to as well. So we're here on behalf of the Consortium Interior Designers of Washington. This is comprised of IIDA, Northern Pacific Chapter and ASID Washington. As a united front, we plan to pursue legislation here in 2026, as was stated in Washington State for registered commercial interior designers. Our bill would regulate the title of registered commercial interior designers and define the scope of practice that would include stamp and seal privileges within code regulated spaces. And with this language, this would lay the groundwork for us from the last two years for our profession to be clearly defined and appropriately regulated and it would align with life safety and code impact responsibilities.

(00:15:43):

Our past engagement as stated was last October in your board meeting. So we introduced our intent to regulate the commercial interior design profession in Washington state. We've made meaningful progress since then and we just wanted to keep you guys up to date on that. We've been collaborating with AIA Washington Council since January 2025 where we have comprised a task force that has AIA Washington Council representation across their state chapter and our Washington State organizations for interior designers are also represented on this. In our task force, we have had five workshops and three leadership meetings and together we have covered past legislative efforts in Washington state. We've gone over national precedent and model language that is currently happening in the country. We've covered our education examination and experience standards for NCIDQ certified interior designers and we've welcomed the insights of the Oklahoma Joint Licensing Board that regulates architects, landscape architects, and licensed interior designers under one board in their state. Stacey, I'll pass it to you.

Stacey Crumbaker (00:16:53):

So as been digging into these conversations, we issued a joint statement to our communities really affirming our collaboration and shared goals to come to an aligned agreement on what appropriate scope of practice would be for commercial interior designers. That was the statement that we had issued to you all prior to this meeting. Since that conversation, our consortium for Interior design has shared a preliminary draft of our proposed bill language with AIA Washington. We've really focused our conversations with them on the scope of practice that we can collectively support and our shared priority is to define a scope clearly and constructively. We really want to ensure clarity for both professions and our regulators around what an acceptable scope overlap would be, and to identify very clear practice boundaries that are easy to follow and easy to understand by the broader public community as well. We're still working collaboratively to align on what that scope is as we kind of look towards the next iteration of our build language that we would share with this group.

(00:18:06):



Another area of focus has been around the regulatory board structure. So the consortium is currently recommending a joint board. Learning from our conversations with Oklahoma and what we've been seeing working effectively in other states where we would regulate registered commercial interior designers alongside architects. We feel this approach really supports responsible, oversight efficient operations at a state level and really allows for clarity in overlapping areas of practice without creating a separate board that may get into a muddy area of who's regulating who when a boundary has been crossed from an interior designer's perspective. We've been chatting through with AIA how starting to look at how that may structurally adjust the composition of the board by increasing representation of interior designers. And what we're looking towards in the next draft of the language is really paralleling some of the requirements for commercial interior design practitioners with that of the architects at least for kind of what their requirements costs, like hours of continued education so that it's very parallel to what the architects are held to as well.

(00:19:24):

Our next steps, we're working towards a revised draft of bill language by the end of August as we work in collaboration with AIA. And then in September our intent is to host town halls with both the architectural and interior design communities to really share that proposed legislation more broadly and gather feedback outside of our smaller task force group that has been knee-deep in exploring this topic. We plan to reengage the legislators we had been chatting with last year in September as we intend to build momentum towards a proposal in the 2026 session. We deeply value our growing relationship with you all as the board and between us as commercial interior designers, we really see your input as essential to shaping a thoughtful and collaborative path forward for both professions. Our collaborators, Tammie and Kyle with AIA Washington have also joined and we welcome any shares from their perspective. And then any questions, feedback, or ongoing participation with you all, we welcome that as we continue along our journey. I'll pass it over to Tammie in case she wants to offer anything or if there's any questions that you'd like to ask.

Tammie Sueirro (00:20:38):

Sure. Good morning everyone. I think that you guys hit it really quite well as to the work that we have been doing with you and not only members of your consortium but members of AIA throughout the state. We have appreciated the opportunity to work in a much slower pace, meaning starting in January and working toward 2026. I think we're getting there. I think that the first draft that we reviewed this past week is a good start. We currently have some questions which we have shared with Megan and Stacey and which will be shared with the fuller task force probably sometime here in August. And as you can imagine, most of our concerns rely rest on health safety and welfare-related issues.

(00:21:26):

As Stacey talked about, the idea of making sure that everybody understands the boundaries of each of the different professions, particularly when it comes to this regulatory board as well as people in the field, people who are accepting drawings over the

counter, or in this case probably online and for the public. I think that that is going to be an interesting opportunity for us to make sure that the public understands when an architect is needed. So I look forward to the continuing conversation. I appreciate the openness with which Stacey and Megan and her team have allowed Washington Council members to participate and have allowed us to be candid and have some tough conversations, which I know are only going to continue as we work together. So it's been good to be able to bring this up to you today.

Erica Loynd (00:22:15):

Board member, Harm?

Scott Harm (00:22:20):

Yeah, I don't know if this is for Tammie or for Stacey, and this is going to be a little nitpicky. So this slide that we're seeing, references per packet, page number 14, I've got package page 14 opened up on one of my other screens and just the nuances of, is NCIDQ now changed to CIDQ or is disbanded because there's a reference to NCIDQ. But me, I've gotten so used to saying CIDQ now. Is NCIDQ still out there or is that something that needs to be vetted out in the process?

Stacey Crumbaker (00:22:55):

Great question, Scott. I can handle this one. So CIDQ is the name of the organization, so it's the Council for Interior Design Qualifications and NCIDQ is the language of the test itself. So we typically refer to CIDQ when we're talking about the organization and NCIDQ when we're referring to the test itself. So it's kind of like the NCAR versus the AREs.

Scott Harm (00:23:22):

Okay, cool.

Stacey Crumbaker (00:23:24):

Just a little closer, which makes it a little tricky.

Erica Loynd (00:23:31):

Board Member Roberts?

Sian Roberts (00:23:34):

Yeah, thanks. Thank you both for coming here and presenting. Really anxious to see what is coming out of all this effort and appreciate all the collaborations. Stacey, I'm excited you have been part of this I-Core effort and have been a little bit just, I'm always, I ask at every end part what's going on with that. Because we've had our own incidental practice issues between engineers and architects that we've been trying to resolve over the last, I don't know how many years, and was really anxious to see what might come out of that effort in terms of good language to be able to do what Tammie was getting at, understanding really

clearly where are the boundaries, where are the overlaps and how can we be clear about that in our language?

(00:24:19):

And so of course, we're going to be entering a whole new world of that with interior designers and architects. And I appreciate that you're spending a lot of time thinking about being as clear as possible. But since I've got you here, I guess my question is what, do you have anything that you can share from that effort? My understanding is we were going to see something this summer that would include interior design, no, sorry, landscape architect engineering and architecture, but maybe not interior design? So I'm just curious how that effort might align with what you're thinking about doing locally here.

Stacey Crumbaker (00:24:56):

Great question on that front, and let me preface, I can share what I'm able to share about the public...

(00:25:03):

If I can share what I'm able to share of the public facing part of that community, the intent has been to put out a draft of that language in August, and I believe... I'm checking my calendar right now. There may be a moving target where that extends out to September. We are in the process of reviewing the last draft iteration, and that does include interior design, so it includes all of the sections right now. We had a few late breaking curiosities from some of our subcommittees that we're working through navigating if we need to change any of that language at the moment. But our intent is still to issue something kind of early in this fall season because we know everyone is excited to at least get their hands on our first version of that. We do see that document. It will be a document that long-term will be updated over time as we uncover what didn't work in the clarity of the language and how do we then update that.

(00:26:08):

So they anticipate it as a resource that we'll have updates over time and that they are currently exploring exactly what that a type of comments of middle process will be, where the working committee can actually take in feedback from the broader community and then start to address that through future iterations. So it's probably what I can offer right now on that piece, but it has been a very healthy conversation over the last, those of us that have been deep on the task force have been in it for about four or five years now. So it has been a long ongoing effort to look at scope overlap. And for anyone that's less familiar to what ICORE is, it is a collaboration between NCARB, CIDQ, The Interiors Group, CLARB and NCEES are engineers to really understand acceptable overlap and distinct boundaries in practice across all of the professions.

(00:27:12):

It has a larger steering committee in which I'm a member of that piece. And then each profession has a subcommittee of subject matter experts that have met quarterly or annually, depending on which group it is as we navigate through this question of what

scope overlap looks like. So because I've participated in those calls, we have a little bit of a edge at least in how we're drafting the language. Our intent is to align the language with what we're seeing in the ICORE report, and then once it's public knowledge, we'll be able to continue to navigate what feels right for Washington when we think about how that applies to us locally as well. So I don't know if that helps or if there's another question around it.

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

Sian Roberts (00:27:59):

No, that's great. Thanks.

Stacey Crumbaker (00:28:01):

Okay.

Erica Loynd (00:28:02):

Board Member Russell. You're muted.

Katherine Russell (00:28:09):

Yes, I got it. Thanks. So you've mentioned Oklahoma is a model that exists, what would be the second state that has a combined board?

Stacey Crumbaker (00:28:22):

No, it wouldn't be the second state. There's multiple combined boards. I don't have the number off the top of my head right now, but I can bring that back when we share a proposed version of what the language is, the states that currently have joint regulatory groups versus those that don't, unless Megan, you have that number off the top of your head.

Megan Onley (00:28:43):

I do not have that number, but I know Alaska is doing a joint board as well, and they're in the process of going through legislation in the state of Alaska. So it's on the governor's desk right now and they would be another adjacent state to ours that would have a joint board.

Erica Loynd (00:29:01):

Thanks. Any other questions or discussion? Excellent. The update is very exciting to see the progress you're making and I agree. I look forward to seeing the final draft you put out at the end of August, knowing that August is tomorrow. Scary.

Stacey Crumbaker (00:29:28):

Don't give me a panic.

Erica Loynd (00:29:32):

Excellent. Well, thank you for joining our meeting today and sharing your update. I look forward to hearing more. Next item, I'm going on to new business, the American Institute of Architects Washington Council legislative updates. Sydney, will you introduce this measure?

Sydney Muhle (00:29:51):

Yes, ma'am. Happy to. So this is going to be kind of aligning with some of the goals that the board has previously set and one of the priorities for this board has been working with AIA on any legislative updates or legislative monitoring that needs to go on. And so I'm going to introduce Tammie Sueirro, the executive director for AIA Washington Council, who's going to provide you all with an update on some revisions that AIA is looking to introduce themselves in 2026.

Tammie Sueirro (00:30:28):

Yeah, thank you Sydney. Again, my name is Tammie Sueirro, executive director of Washington Council. Thank you for having me here. I'm here today to update you on the proposed changes that AIA Washington Council would like to make to Washington State's RCW 18.08, our Architects Practice Act. As I've discussed with a few of you over the past year or so, we believe the ACT needs updating to better reflect our profession and align with NCARB's latest model law. I understand this board's considering procedural updates to the ACT and currently AIA's efforts are focused on updating the definition of the practice. The current definition is vague and creates complications in two significant legal areas. First, as Board Member Roberts touched on earlier, we have an ongoing issue with the definition and incidental practice. This problem was brought to your attention in 2022. I believe we had brought that forward at that time and were seeking an attorney general's interpretation.

(00:31:29):

Unfortunately, the Attorney General informed us that Washington law provides no bright line rule for distinguishing between design documents that must be completed by an architect and those that must be completed by an engineer, essentially pushing it back down to the jurisdictions to make those decisions. And we need better clarity on the scope of work that uniquely falls within an architect's purview. Secondly, we are seeing frequent violations to the qualifications based selection process that is a law here in Washington state. Under QBS, publicly funded agencies must select an architect based on qualifications with fees negotiated during or only after that selection has been made. Yet several times a year, I receive RFPs and RFQs sometimes from people on this board that improperly require fees and costs as part of the selection process. While most agencies collectively or correct their RFP with an agenda, when I point this out, some question whether their projects even require an architect or they just flat out ignore the law.

(00:32:36):

A more detailed practice definition would help us and help agencies understand when QBS laws apply. To address these issues, we propose a combination of NCARB's model law and

a recently updated practice act in California as the foundation for revising this definition. And I know from our previous conversations that you're considering procedural changes to RCW 18.08. I'd like to continue that discussion with you to understand your priorities and ensure that we can incorporate them into comprehensive legislation. Without your input, it won't be possible for me to have a thorough law update.

(00:33:15):

So lastly, as we all have been lamenting, today is the last day of July and with August being tomorrow, we have limited time to draft legislation, secure a sponsor, educate lawmakers about these important changes. So I propose if there are members interested that we schedule a follow-up meeting with members of this board who are involved in the model law work to discuss specific changes we want to pursue. And my hope is that that's something that you're interested in. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today and I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Erica Loynd (00:33:53):

Thank you, Tammie. Board members, is there any discussion or questions for Tammie about this topic? I appreciate the things that you're identifying. As practicing architects, the second one in particular, I'm very glad that you were clarifying. We're working in states that don't have that law is quite cumbersome, so I appreciate that. I would be open to joining a call with you to talk about some topics, if there's one other board member that would like to join to talk about the model law.

Sian Roberts (00:34:33):

Erica, I wonder if we keep our little committee together and I join you and it looks like maybe Peter would like to, but...

Peter Brachvogel (00:34:42):

That's [inaudible 00:34:43]. I would like to.

Sian Roberts (00:34:43):

Sorry Peter, I jumped in.

Peter Brachvogel (00:34:45):

No, no, that's okay. I would like to join too. Yeah.

Erica Loynd (00:34:52):

Sydney, how many people are we limited to having be able to join Tammie in a conversation?

Sydney Muhle (00:34:57):

Three. And if Board Member Brachvogel wants to join the model law committee, that was a committee that was established prior to his tenure on the board. So we do have space for one additional member on that committee as well.

Erica Loynd (00:35:09):

Okay. So let's set that up.

Peter Brachvogel (00:35:11):

Okay.

Tammie Sueirro (00:35:13):

Awesome. Thank you. I really appreciate it. [inaudible 00:35:15]

Sydney Muhle (00:35:15):

Thanks Tammie for all your efforts. Yeah, Tammie, I'll reach out to you and get that set up.

Tammie Sueirro (00:35:22):

All right. Thank you so much, you guys. Look forward to it.

Erica Loynd (00:35:25):

Yeah, thank you. Thank you for all the research and clarity you're putting into that. That was very clear.

Scott Harm (00:35:30):

Yeah, thank you very much. Good job.

Tammie Sueirro (00:35:33):

Anytime.

Erica Loynd (00:35:34):

Sydney, would you like to review that item for 6.2?

Sydney Muhle (00:35:41):

Yes, ma'am. I am just highlighting my follow-up item to reach out to Tammie as soon as we are done here. All right. So this is going to be a item that came out of the last board meeting. It was a request from the board to just have a brief discussion and get some additional guidance on anything addressed in the RCWs under the chapter for architects. So 18.08, that addresses performance of architects. And I believe this came out of questions that board members had operating as case managers on a number of cases recently. And where I think previously a lot of the cases that we've had have pertained to things like unlicensed practice or specific to licensure. And a lot of the complaints we've

been seeing recently have been a little bit more directed toward the performance of architects and things that architects have done just in the performance of their duties.

(00:36:53):

And so the board had requested some additional clarification on where that's addressed in the RCWs as well as the Washington Administrative Code. So taking a look at the RCWs, most of our RCWs do pertain to licensure itself, but we do have a chapter in the RCWs 18.08.440 that outlines when the board can take action on a license under the board's authority. And the grounds for that would be things like offering to pay, paying or accepting either directly or indirectly a substantial gift, bribe, any other consideration that could influence or reward a professional work. Other things would be untruthful or deceptive practices, reports, statements, testimony, having a financial interest in the bidding floor or performance of a contract to supply labor materials for a construction project, signing or permitting a seal on drawings or specifications that were not prepared or reviewed by that architect or willfully evading or trying to evade the law.

(00:38:18):

And not just 18.08, but any governing laws, ordinances, codes, regulations, any and all of the above. It is a little bit further defined in WAC 308-12-330 where it discusses the standards of professional practice for architects. And those include topics like competence, conflicts of interest, full disclosure, compliance with the laws and professional conduct, just kind of drills down on those main five from the RCW on what specifically those look like. So I'm happy to provide any additional detail that the board would like, but I also know that the board has quite a bit to get through today. So I can also share links to these for the board to take a look at just as you guys are reviewing those cases, hearing more of the things that are going on out in the industry and we can provide any further clarification from there.

Erica Loynd (00:39:25):

Board Member Roberts.

Sian Roberts (00:39:28):

Elizabeth was going to add something. I'd rather have her go first.

Erica Loynd (00:39:30):

Yeah. I see her pop up. Yeah. Elizabeth, would you like to share?

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (00:39:36):

Yeah, I just wanted to reiterate the importance of this step for you guys because what you will get from the DOL staff is an investigation report and I'm not sure what else you received, but I suggest everybody really spend their time reviewing everything in those reports and also looking at the statutes and the WAC, taking some time to look at those and making sure that you think that all of the potential violations are there because if you rely too much on... I mean you're the experts, so you guys need to...



(00:40:33):

If you think there's more information out there that you need, don't hesitate to ask for it. But again, when you get any kind of document, make sure you look through it carefully. And then also at the RCWs and the WACs. I can't emphasize enough how important that step is and don't be afraid to go back to the staff and/or I don't know how you do that if you do it through Sydney or somebody else, but don't be afraid to go back and say, "Look, I see more or I need more evidence or information." So that was my pitch.

Erica Loynd (00:41:11):

Board Member Roberts.

Sian Roberts (00:41:13):

Yeah, and thanks Elizabeth. I think this question actually did come from doing exactly that. And I think that one of the things that we are confronted with pretty often is this question of competence. And it's really one word in the WAC, right? There's not a lot of description of what that means. And I think that maybe is something that, at least in my mind, we get a lot of cases where it's clear that there's been an issue on a project and a client is unhappy and we're trying to see whether this is an issue or not, and the only thing that could potentially be an issue would be competence. And then what does it mean for a board to determine that an architect is not competent and is there any further illumination that could be given to clarify that particular piece piece?

Erica Loynd (00:42:23):

Elizabeth, do you have a right answer to that?

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (00:42:31):

Sorry, I'm so good about muting myself. So a couple of things there. One is the DOL is relying on your knowledge of the "standard of care" is in the industry. So something jumps out at you as, oh, this is definitely outside of what we would find to be an adequate standard of care, that is competence. That said, if you really have a question about whether competence is met, your prosecuting attorney could do a little more research about that particular fact scenario and see if we can find any information about competence in general. I could also try to give you some definitions of competence in case law. It's tricky, but mainly it's about the standard of care.

Sian Roberts (00:43:43):

Okay. That is actually helpful to understand that the competence would be linked. So if we find that somebody is operating outside of the standard of care.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (00:43:52):

Yes, exactly. And you are the experts. And so for example, if this went to hearing, then you would be the one who would testify as to this is the standard of care and this is why it's not

met. Sometimes if it's a very controversial case, they'll bring in another. So you might have a couple of people that can speak to standard of care, but you would definitely be one of those people.

Sian Roberts (00:44:21):

Got it. Thank you very much.

Erica Loynd (00:44:25):

Board member Brachvogel.

Peter Brachvogel (00:44:28):

Yeah, I was just going to pick up on what Sydney was saying. Yeah, I'd love it if you could send me the links, that'd be great.

Sydney Muhle (00:44:36):

Absolutely. I'll share that with the board as soon as we're done.

Peter Brachvogel (00:44:39):

Okay. Thanks.

Erica Loynd (00:44:40):

Yeah. Yes, I agree. The links would be, I guess part of just... There's many different locations where things could be found and just where sometimes somebody may point to one as the main driver, knowing that there's some other locations that we could just do the overall thorough review would be really helpful.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (00:44:59):

Yeah, I think there's actually... There's your WACs, I mean your RCWs, and then there's another set that's generally applied to all of the DOL boards and then there's also your WACs. So there's basically three locations that you can find things. And then if you're in doubt, there's nothing wrong with consulting. At least in my mind, there's nothing wrong with consulting your prosecuting attorney who could probably look into it in a bit more depth. But those are the three resources and I think definitely do not forget about your WACs. Those are important.

Erica Loynd (00:45:49):

Very good. Any further discussion or questions? All right. I'm moving into section number seven. For complaint cases, we have removed one of the cases in the revised agenda, so we will not do 7.6, number 2025-010338, that one we'll hold for the next session. For each of these, the case managers will present their own cases and then at each time we will do a motion to approve or deny the recommendation by the case manager. So the first one, 7.1 would be with Board Member Harm.

Scott Harm (00:46:35):

Yes. Thank you. So yeah, case number 2024-03-0483-00ARC. Essentially this is pretty cut and dry. The respondent was called to our attention that the respondent was, I'll use the word stamping loosely, stamping documents with I'm assuming self-created stamp that completely mirrored the stamp for ourselves as licensed architects but only changed the words to be a licensed designer, if I remember correctly what they used. So they were misusing or misapplying an implied stamp that presented them as something in my opinion that they're really not, especially since we don't have registered designers in the state of Washington. The person was contacted, immediately removed the stamp as evidenced by some examples submitted. We did, however, discover in the individual's website that they were referring to themselves as a provider of architectural services. And so there was a follow-up with that and to make sure that that was also removed.

(00:47:50):

You can see if we don't have it up, my case manager's report, I'm sorry, maybe I should have shared my screen. I put in there a letter of education and this is the name where I or maybe chair could use some advice. I did put in a letter of education. Since submitting this, I have received a draft letter of education to be sent to the respondent. I think it's perfectly fine to send it the way it is, but I don't know, I'm at a loss to remember if I've had this happen before, if we need to approve that actual letter or just go by my recommendation that we should go ahead and forward the letter of education to the respondent to say, "Shame on you. Don't ever do this again. And we're going to be watching you for a while essentially."

Sydney Muhle (00:48:33):

So Grace can correct me if I'm wrong, but typically we send you that draft letter of education and as long as it's good to go, then you guys are good to approve the case manager recommendation. We don't send anything until the board determination.

Scott Harm (00:48:50):

Okay. There you go. Thanks. Yeah, and I've reviewed and it's very thorough, very good.

Erica Loynd (00:48:54):

Very good. Before we do discussion, do we have a motion to-

Scott Harm (00:49:02):

I'm sorry madam, can I just jump in for one quick? Sydney, I need a clarification for you. In getting ready for this, I think this all transpired, some of you know that I've kind of, with air quotes "recently retired." My case manager's report while it has my signature, the date is missing. So I don't know to crossing the T's and dotting the I's kind of a thing if we need to, as a matter of record, fix a date to it. But I couldn't find the date in the last two days. So I think what it was was in my old work computer that I didn't manage to remember to

download when I retired. So I don't know if that's an administrative thing where just to make it official, you do have to insert a date.

Sydney Muhle (00:49:43):

Yes, and Grace can find the date that you sent.

Scott Harm (00:49:45):

Okay. That's right, that's right. I was looking for even emails to Grace to find. It was like, "Wah."

Sydney Muhle (00:49:51):

Okay, we'll make sure that that gets done.

Scott Harm (00:49:53):

Okay, thank you very much.

Erica Loynd (00:49:57):

Do we have a motion to approve case number 0483?

Speaker 1 (00:50:01):

[inaudible 00:50:03]

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

Erica Loynd (00:50:01):

... case number 0483?

Sian Roberts (00:50:04):

Member Roberts. I move we approve the case manager's recommendation for case 0483.

Peter Brachvogel (00:50:08):

I'll second it.

Erica Loynd (00:50:08):

Mm-hmm.

Peter Brachvogel (00:50:08):

Brachvogel, I'll second it.

Scott Harm (00:50:17):

Thanks.

Erica Loynd (00:50:17):

Any discussion or questions for Member Harm? Okay, to do a vote for approval of this case report, all in favor say aye.

Group (00:50:30):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:50:32):

All opposed? Very good. Next case number will be to Board Member Russell.

Katherine Russell (00:50:42):

This is case number 2024-07-1709-00AFC. This was an LLC that advertised itself as a permitting service, and they received a complaint that they were advertising as an architectural service. The investigation didn't show that they were advertising as an architecture service, but they are consulting with a licensed architect when they are in need of a signature and a stamp.

(00:51:26):

And so further investigation was into whether this was a rubber-stamping, or whether there was oversight and supervision in the creation of any documents that were needing a stamp. So they contacted the consulting architect, and they confirmed that they do oversee all the work, when they're working as a consultant to the permitting LLC. And they're all have their current business licenses. The consulting architect is licensed. So at this time, even though it's not a traditional architectural-firm model, the architect is overseeing the work, his work that he's signing. So I do recommend that we close with no further action.

Erica Loynd (00:52:33):

Okay. Do I have a motion to accept the case report by Member Russell?

Peter Brachvogel (00:52:43):

Brachvogel. I recommend we approve per Russell's recommendation.

Sian Roberts (00:52:53):

Board Member Roberts. I second.

Erica Loynd (00:52:55):

Any discussion or questions for Board Member Russell? All in favor of approving, say aye.

Group (00:53:04):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:53:06):

Any opposed? Very good. Moving on to your next one, Board Member Russell?

Katherine Russell (00:53:14):

Sure. Case number 2025-01-0310-00ERC. There was a complaint of a person advertising that they practice architecture without a license. And investigating into it, the investigators found a woman was advertising herself on her web page as a licensed architect in Mexico, having lived in the state of Washington. But her main business that she was offering services for was advertising or mentorship in mysticism. She referred to her architectural training as part of her background and skill set, of helping her have a broad understanding of things. So she was asked to clarify the descriptions on her web page, and also to clarify that she was no longer a Washington State resident. So she's taken off any references even to her skill set as an architecturally trained person. So she did comply with all requests, and my recommendation is that we close this with no further action.

Erica Loynd (00:54:42):

Just a motion to approve this case report?

Peter Brachvogel (00:54:49):

I'll make a motion that we approve this case report.

Scott Harm (00:54:53):

Paul, you need to come off mute so you're ready there, buddy.

Peter Brachvogel (00:54:58):

I'm off mute.

Scott Harm (00:54:59):

You keep raising your hand and we'd go by you.

Peter Brachvogel (00:55:02):

Oh, I should probably raise my hand first. Yeah.

Erica Loynd (00:55:05):

No, it's passed Paul. I think he was referring to Paul.

Peter Brachvogel (00:55:07):

Oh.

Scott Harm (00:55:08):

Oh, yeah. Paul just physically raises his hand. Yeah. So, take yourself off mute, Paul.

Erica Loynd (00:55:14):

So do I have second?

Sian Roberts (00:55:24):

Board Member Roberts. I second.

Erica Loynd (00:55:27):

Any discussion or questions for Board Member Russell?

Scott Harm (00:55:31):

So if I wanted to get a mentorship in mysticism, can I reach out to this? Sorry. I don't know how architecture ties into this though, I'm...

Sian Roberts (00:55:39):

Is she a licensed mystic?

Scott Harm (00:55:40):

It's a head twister. It's a head twister at least.

Erica Loynd (00:55:46):

All in favor of approving the recommendation by Board Member Russell, say aye.

Group (00:55:51):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (00:55:53):

Any opposed? Very good. All right, the next item is a case from myself, Board Member Loynd. So, 2024-12-3661-00ARC. This is regarding the misuse of a stamp on a project. They thought the stamp was used without the knowledge of the architects, and there were confusions of the people that were the person signing the drawings. There were multiple conversations with the firm and the owners. They found that the firm is outside of Washington State. They shared their documents indicating where the stamp was incorrectly used, or inadvertently, because of the issues with the digital programs that they used. There were clarifications, as they were an out-of-state company, and didn't know exactly how to use the Washington protocols.

(00:56:50):

The education has been shared with the firm and the owners through the investigation, and the modifications to the procedures to not have inappropriate stamps anymore. And they have confirmed appropriate registration of their business with the Secretary of State for the State of Washington, and all misunderstandings have been confirmed. So I recommend closing this with no further action.

(00:57:15):

Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (00:57:17):

Madam Chair, I apologize. I did not include on your annotated agenda for you to hand off the running of the meeting for your cases, because you can't-

Scott Harm (00:57:27):

Yeah, I almost jumped in.

Erica Loynd (00:57:28):

Sorry.

Sydney Muhle (00:57:29):

Oh, you're fine. You can't, technically, vote on it. So I think we're fine if we hand it off to Vice-Chair Russell right now-

Erica Loynd (00:57:34):

Okay.

Sydney Muhle (00:57:35):

... just to call for the motion, vote-

Erica Loynd (00:57:40):

Okay.

Sydney Muhle (00:57:40):

... or motion and second, discussion, and vote.

Katherine Russell (00:57:43):

Okay. Can I entertain a motion for this, accepting the recommendation.

Scott Harm (00:57:52):

Paul.

Sian Roberts (00:58:00):

Board Member Roberts. I move we accept the case manager's recommendation.

Katherine Russell (00:58:05):

Is there a second?



Scott Harm (00:58:06):

Board Member Harm. I'll second that.

Katherine Russell (00:58:10):

It's been moved and seconded to accept our case manager's recommendation for this. Is there any discussion?

Sian Roberts (00:58:18):

I was a little confused by this one, so I just want to confirm, I think, what the case manager is saying, is that there was inappropriate use of stamps. However, the individuals performing the services were licensed appropriately. And so is that the case? Is that what's happening here?

Erica Loynd (00:58:42):

Right. Yes. If I can visualize it again, they don't have the actual document. It was where they placed the stamp, or how the actual affixing of the stamp, because it didn't follow the Washington State protocols of what, where, and how the stamp would be used.

Katherine Russell (00:58:57):

Okay.

Sian Roberts (00:59:01):

Okay. But everybody who was doing the work was appropriately licensed and...

Erica Loynd (00:59:04):

Yes. Yes.

Sian Roberts (00:59:05):

Oh, okay.

Erica Loynd (00:59:05):

Okay. Thank you.

Scott Harm (00:59:07):

Except for they did have to go ahead and register as a business, correct? Is that correct?

Erica Loynd (00:59:12):

I believe they were already confirmed-

Scott Harm (00:59:14):

Okay.

Erica Loynd (00:59:15):

... to be a registered business.

Scott Harm (00:59:17):

Okay. Thank you.

Erica Loynd (00:59:18):

They just are located out of state.

Scott Harm (00:59:20):

Okay, thanks.

Katherine Russell (00:59:23):

Any other discussion? Questions? All in favor?

Sian Roberts (00:59:30):

Aye.

Scott Harm (00:59:30):

Aye.

Peter Brachvogel (00:59:30):

Aye.

Katherine Russell (00:59:33):

Any opposed? It passes. So we'll go on next to the next case for Erica, our Chair.

Erica Loynd (00:59:46):

The case number is 2025-01-0031-00ARC. This was a complaint made against a firm that was operating without a license. The investigators worked to communicate with the respondent, but they were not able to find or locate the company through the addresses that were provided, the Department of Revenue or the Department of Licensing. There was no record of the business, and no communication was provided. They did have a reference stating architectural services on their website, but because we can't find the people, there was no way to show if they were actively practicing.

(01:00:28):

So I opted for a letter of education to the system, and if they are found or provide any more business, then they shall be required to duly license their company for the services that they're providing. But there was not the ability to directly talk with the people, because we cannot locate them. So we have put forth a letter of education that will be submitted following approval by the board.

Paul Wu (01:01:04):

So am I to understand that there's no contact with the offending entity?

Erica Loynd (01:01:13):

Correct. The investigators could not find them through the addresses or the information on their websites or anything. They were non-responsive.

Paul Wu (01:01:23):

So how do we contact or make known to these phantom operations?

Katherine Russell (01:01:34):

Should we put a motion on the floor before we discuss? Or...

Sydney Muhle (01:01:39):

You don't have to. And sometimes when you have a tricky case like this can help inform what the motion is going to be.

Paul Wu (01:01:45):

Right.

Sydney Muhle (01:01:46):

But I think Grace can help provide some clarification for you guys.

Paul Wu (01:01:49):

Yeah?

Katherine Russell (01:01:49):

Grace, could you please [inaudible 01:01:52]?

Grace Hamilton (01:01:51):

The address that we are sending the letter of education to was the... It's just the address that was provided to us by the complainant. Also, but when we drafted the letter of education, it was re-verified about the website, and that's actually been completely taken down. It's not an active website anymore either. So we were just going to send the letter of education to the address that was provided to us. But whether they get that or not... There was no contact made back from the respondent.

Paul Wu (01:02:32):

Do we have a chance... Board Member Wu here. Did we have a chance to contact the complainant? Can you hear me?

Grace Hamilton (01:02:45):

To contact the complainant that-

Paul Wu (01:02:48):

Right. That this is happening. That we...

Grace Hamilton (01:02:52):

Well, we do contact them. If you guys to choose to close it, we will contact them with the closure letter as well, letting them know the outcome of the case. But are you meaning to see if they have additional contact information for them?

Paul Wu (01:03:06):

Right.

Grace Hamilton (01:03:07):

Yes. So that was done, yeah.

Paul Wu (01:03:09):

Okay.

Grace Hamilton (01:03:09):

And they provided all the contact information that they had and the investigator tried contacting through those avenues and was not, no efforts were returned from the respondent.

Sian Roberts (01:03:25):

What is the evidence that they were providing architectural services? Did they try to submit plans somewhere? Or was there just somebody saw that they were... Yeah.

Erica Loynd (01:03:37):

Yeah, I believe it was references on their website in particular. It was not that somebody had submitted drawings, or was noted as being the architect of record for a project. So it was a website that the complainant had come across it, referenced architecture...

Sian Roberts (01:03:55):

I see.

Erica Loynd (01:03:56):

Yeah.

Katherine Russell (01:03:56):

Okay.

Sian Roberts (01:03:58):

Okay. And now they no longer... We can no longer... Well, we don't know if they even exist anymore, is that right?

Erica Loynd (01:04:06):

Yeah, correct.

Sian Roberts (01:04:06):

Okay. Okay.

Katherine Russell (01:04:06):

Can I entertain any motions on this?

Paul Wu (01:04:15):

Yeah. I, Board Member Wu, I move to approve the recommendations to close the case as presented.

Sian Roberts (01:04:26):

Board Member Roberts. I second.

Katherine Russell (01:04:30):

It's been moved and seconded to accept case manager's recommendation. I believe there was also letter of education. Can I... All in favor?

Group (01:04:48):

Aye.

Katherine Russell (01:04:52):

Any opposed?

Erica Loynd (01:04:59):

Okay.

Katherine Russell (01:04:59):

All right.

Erica Loynd (01:05:00):

Thank you very.

Katherine Russell (01:05:00):

Back to the Chair.

Erica Loynd (01:05:03):

So 7.6 shall be removed from the agenda today, and we will discuss that at the next board meeting. So for legal deliberation, are these two... I read the precursor part, right, Sydney?

Sydney Muhle (01:05:20):

No ma'am. You don't need to. That's just there in case we need to have an executive session on these.

Erica Loynd (01:05:26):

Okay, so I will pass this over to Aaron Smith, to discuss these two deliberations on the table.

Aaron Smith (01:05:33):

Good morning. I'm AAG Aaron Smith, the prosecutor. I'll discuss number 2024-06-1591-00ARC. This is in the matter of Kyron Brimmer, license number 23033730. The short version of this: in/around February of 2024, Brimmer submitted plans the city of Bellevue for a deck repair project for some apartments in Bellevue, the region at Bellevue Way Apartments. The plans included notes and drawings that were copied from another architect who'd worked on the project, without consent or knowledge of that architect. He was just issued a statement of charges with violations of RCW-18083703-A, for signing and sealing a document prepared by another architect for that agreement between those parties; violation of RCW-18084404, for signing or permitting a seal to be affixed to any drawing specifications that were not prepared or reviewed by the architect; and RCW 1823513011, misrepresentation any aspect of the conduct of this business. The SOC was duly sent out with the above charges, and warned that failure to respond would lead to a default. No reply or response been received. Thus, he's in default under RCW 34054401, and the sanction that has been proposed is a \$1,000 monetary penalty.

(01:07:15):

Shall I continue to the next one? Or should I...

Erica Loynd (01:07:20):

Sydney, do we do each one, one at a time?

Sydney Muhle (01:07:22):

Correct. One at a time.

Erica Loynd (01:07:26):

Okay. Before discussion, should I move, or make a motion?

Sydney Muhle (01:07:30):

It's up to you. You don't have to. I see that Board Member Roberts already has questions.

Erica Loynd (01:07:37):

Yeah.

Sydney Muhle (01:07:37):

So you guys can absolutely have discussion ahead of time, and then discuss the actual motion once it's made.

Erica Loynd (01:07:44):

Okay. Board Member Roberts?

Sian Roberts (01:07:46):

Yeah, sorry. My question is actually not about the case. It's procedural. And maybe things have evolved here in terms of procedures within DOL. My recollection of the last time we did this was, even the case manager could not be in on the discussion. And maybe it was because it'd gotten to a different point, but I seem to remember, it was a similar kind of situation, and we had to... It was a smaller, closed session that discussed this. So that is not how this needs to happen, now? I'm just confirming procedural, what we should be doing. Also, here it says that it looks like we're supposed to not have visitors in this, and I don't think we've made that change either.

Sydney Muhle (01:08:29):

No. So the executive session is only just in case you guys need to go into executive session to receive advice from Elizabeth as your legal counsel. So if there were legal questions about the case specifically that you guys needed to discuss, Elizabeth... We would pull you guys into an executive session with Elizabeth, and she could answer those legal questions for you, so that she's not doing that and providing that legal advice in a public space, and violating any attorney-client things.

(01:09:02):

So that's not a requirement to go into that executive session. The decision on these cases does have to be made in public. That can't be done in the executive session. So similarly to like when we approved the cases just immediately prior to this, where we're approving the case manager recommendation, these are just ones that instead of the no action, or letter of education, needs kicked out into the prosecutorial side, and have now gone through that part.

(01:09:34):

But just like the case manager for those cases couldn't participate in the vote exactly. They're providing that information to you guys. They can answer questions pertaining to the case from the case manager standpoint, and anything that Mr. Smith cannot provide for

you guys, they can provide that input. You guys can also ask questions of Grace's, the investigator supervisor. And then if you feel like you need some legal advice, then we can certainly do the executive session. That's just on there as a precautionary. It's not a requirement. But the action is done here in public.

Sian Roberts (01:10:13):

Thank you for the clarification.

Erica Loynd (01:10:15):

Yeah, that was helpful. So should I request first, so the board members need to go into an executive session.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (01:10:23):

I mean typically... Sorry, I'll raise my hand.

Erica Loynd (01:10:26):

It's all right. Go ahead, Elizabeth.

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (01:10:28):

I was going to say, typically when you deliberate any of these cases, you do it in executive session. It's true that you, for deliberation purposes under the APA. But again, you don't have to. It's just that's kind of typically how it's done, because you often discuss legal issues. So, yep, just wanted to say that.

Sian Roberts (01:11:03):

I'm going to go ahead and make a motion that we... Well, what are we making a motion? That we...

Erica Loynd (01:11:10):

Is there somebody who would like to make a motion to... What? Also is the case manager who originally did this one supposed to be exempt from everything?

Sydney Muhle (01:11:19):

Right. They're supposed to abstain from the vote.

Erica Loynd (01:11:24):

Right, so-

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (01:11:26):

That's all they abstain from though. They can discuss. They could present, they can answer questions, but they can't vote.



Erica Loynd (01:11:35):

So can I pass this to Vice-Chair Russell to hold the motion?

Sydney Muhle (01:11:42):

Sure.

Katherine Russell (01:11:47):

Board Member Roberts, did you have a motion that you were wanting to-

Sian Roberts (01:11:51):

I did. I was going to move that we accept the recommendation for the fine in this case.

Paul Wu (01:12:02):

Board Member Wu will second that motion.

Sydney Muhle (01:12:07):

Just one clarification. Are you guys, so with these slightly different from the case manager reports, it would be moving to accept the entire default order.

Sian Roberts (01:12:19):

Default order. Thank you. That's the word I was looking for. I move that we accept the default order in case 1591.

Paul Wu (01:12:25):

I'll second that motion again. Board Member Wu.

Katherine Russell (01:12:32):

Is there any more discussion on this? All in favor?

Group (01:12:41):

Aye.

Katherine Russell (01:12:43):

Any opposed? It passes.

Erica Loynd (01:12:47):

Okay. Now back to Mr. Smith.

Aaron Smith (01:12:53):

Thank you. The next case is 2024-10-2623- 00ARC. This is in the matter of Gracie Reedy. In this case, Reedy submitted floor plans to the City of Linwood Development and Business

Services Division for daycare. They indicated that Rady was the drafter and designer. Reedy does not have a license to practice architecture in Washington State. As such, she was charged with a cease and desist of unlicensed practice of architecture under RCW 18235150. She was also charged the violation of 18083101, for practicing architecture without a license, violation of 1823513011, misrepresentation in the aspect of conduct of business or profession and violation of RCW 1823513015, engaging in unlicensed practice. The SOC and cease and desist was duly sent out, which warned that failure to reply would result in a default. There was no reply, so this was a default under RCW 34054401. Sanctions that are asked for in this default are a \$6,000 monetary penalty and issuing of a cease and desist from unlicensed practice under RCW 18235150. Thank you.

Erica Loynd (01:14:16):

Board Member Roberts?

Sian Roberts (01:14:21):

Yeah, this was my, I'm the case manager here, and I just want to add a little bit of detail to this. That Grace Reedy was identified as the designer on the drawings. The stamp was a legitimate stolen Washington State stamp for a licensed architect here in Washington State. And so they had taken somebody's stamp and put it on the drawings here. And it was, the client had... And this is something we're going to increasingly see here, and we heard about it at the end card meeting. The client found this design service on the internet through some sort of service...

(01:15:03):

A design service on the internet through some sort of service and this entity that they never really met, this Grace Reidy who we're not sure actually exists, they provided the services, they affixed somebody else's stamp to it and somehow the city of Linwood figured this out. So anyway, this is a thing. It is happening and I would guess that we are going to see this more and more as we go forward.

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

Erica Loynd (01:15:33):

Thank you for that clarification. I have one question because this person was not licensed, this is a cease and desist, not a removal of a licensure, correct?

Peter Brachvogel (01:15:45):

Correct.

Erica Loynd (01:15:46):

Okay. Do we have a motion to move forward or to approve the default order? That was what it was called, right, default order.

Peter Brachvogel (01:16:01):

Yes. Board member Brachvogel. I make a motion we approve the default order.

Paul Wu (01:16:01):

Board member Wu, second that motion.

Erica Loynd (01:16:08):

Any further discussion or questions? Board member Harm?

Scott Harm (01:16:10):

Yeah, Sian, I think it was your case. So we have no, I'm flipping around in the report, so we have no evidence that Grace even exists. So are we currently finding someone who simply may not exist or can we climb the food chain and go through the company that was associated with Grace Reidy? I'm confused.

Sian Roberts (01:16:37):

Yeah, I think there's a dead end there and it's kind of the way these things work.

Scott Harm (01:16:42):

Oh, yeah.

Sian Roberts (01:16:43):

So there was an address and the address did appear to be a home but owned by not a Grace Reidy. So it's that kind of situation. And of course it's through an internet service that doesn't take any responsibility for the people that advertise through their service. So it was that sort of inability to be able to actually track somebody down.

Scott Harm (01:17:06):

Yes, it's a wholesale business kind of a thing. Yep. Wow. Yeah, you're going to see this.

Paul Wu (01:17:14):

Board member Wu, I have a question. So how would these legal decisions on fines be assessed if there's no other entity at the other end?

Elizabeth Thompson-Lagerber (01:17:26):

I was going to, this is Elizabeth, I was going to suggest that on another occasion that we have another discussion generally speaking about these types of cases that are going to arise more and more and maybe even have a task force to come up with some strategies. I know it sounds like it's come up at a national meeting, so there's probably information that can help, but we can't discuss that in this right now. This isn't the type of place.

Scott Harm (01:18:00):

Yeah. Board member Harm. I would solely fully support what Elizabeth is suggesting and I know we could seek assistance from the really well versed individuals at NCARB National because it is a big topic, even though we didn't cover it in our report, it is a growing topic and it would be nice to have a task force if we could just get ahead of this on what we want to do, including the use of third party identification to verify signatures. I know we can't talk about it, but I think we should probably jump into this because it's going to get worse.

Erica Loynd (01:18:36):

Agreed. And I appreciated that many states are dealing with this. It's not a few states, it's many states across the country. Board member Roberts.

Sian Roberts (01:18:47):

Yeah, just really quickly, I think in this case the individual whose license was copied did express a, "Oh gosh, what do I do now?" Obviously this board can't really do anything to assist in that. But again, understanding more about how this is happening and how we can assist licensed architects in this kind of situation. It's really unfortunate for the licensed practitioner.

Erica Loynd (01:19:17):

I agree. Any further discussion? Board member Brachvogel?

Peter Brachvogel (01:19:27):

Yeah. So Sian, did the architect that got his or her stamp boosted, did they have any idea how that occurred?

Sian Roberts (01:19:46):

Sorry, I'm struggling with a mute button there. No, they did not know any of the individuals listed on the plan set. They did not know the client. They knew nothing about it.

Peter Brachvogel (01:19:57):

Wow. I mean, because we have these digital stamps that run around now, it's pretty amazing actually. Anyway, it's an observation. I'm happy to be on whatever task force that Scott talked about a minute ago if that comes up, so.

Erica Loynd (01:20:15):

We will add that to the next agenda items so that you guys can properly discuss it.

Peter Brachvogel (01:20:20):

Very well then.

Erica Loynd (01:20:21):

Okay, thank you. Any further discussion?

(01:20:29):

We've already made a motion to vote on this, right, and removed. So a vote to approve the default order. All in favor say aye.

Sian Roberts (01:20:38):

Aye.

Paul Wu (01:20:38):

Aye.

Peter Brachvogel (01:20:38):

Aye.

Scott Harm (01:20:38):

Aye.

Erica Loynd (01:20:38):

All opposed? Thank you very much.

Aaron Smith (01:20:47):

Thank you. That's all for me today.

Erica Loynd (01:20:49):

Thank you very much Mr. Smith. Moving into our reports for the committees and task force reports, we have two updates. So the model law committee report, myself and board member Roberts to provide a status of this. Do you want to start?

Sian Roberts (01:21:09):

I think we added Peter to our model law committee today.

Erica Loynd (01:21:14):

Very good. Welcome Peter.

Sian Roberts (01:21:17):

But yeah, there's no status. There's no update since the last board meeting. I anticipate there will be next time since we are about to engage with a Washington council on this.

Erica Loynd (01:21:28):

Great. For the outreach update, the outreach subcommittee. I will begin. I'm on this committee with myself, board member Wu and board member Russell. We have

successfully had two meetings with local schools. So board member Wu and I presented at Lake Washington Institute of Technology, a really great program with a lot of passionate people and the professors are very driven to work with us on the alternative paths to licensure. So we presented the process of the board, how the board is comprised, and also the paths that are aligning with our architectural laws in alignment with Encarve. So we did give the background of what processes and things can happen with Encarve and they're very excited to see how the students could continue their career and feel validated that the work that they're doing is an asset to the industry and our pipeline. Board member Wu, do you want to add anything about our session?

Paul Wu (01:22:39):

No. Board member Wu doesn't have anything else to add to your eloquent answer to that. So yeah, I agree.

Erica Loynd (01:22:45):

It was very fun. Board member Russell, do you want to share the sessions that you shared, you performed?

Katherine Russell (01:22:55):

Sure. I presented at Spokane Community College, their architectural technology classes. The first and second year students joined. It was voluntary and there was probably about 40 students attended and the previous presentation were gracious enough to share their slideshow. So I presented the same presentation that was seen at Washington and it went very well, there very excited program. A lot of them feed into the WSU system. Some just go into practice. There's a lot of openings in the Spokane area and they're a good program and a lot of, I think there was five students the next day or the day after went to the national AIA, which was one of their teachers.

Erica Loynd (01:23:55):

After those sessions, the outreach committee has not met. We met once to just debriefed and plan the rest of the summer and we'll reconvene as it gets closer to the fall semesters to potentially do outreach at the University of Washington and WSU. And we are kind of ground sourcing what other agencies or institutes would like to have this information. But we are looking forward to more presentations with the group and we have meetings scheduled later this fall, so we will have another update at the next meeting. Very good. Moving on to our next session. The public... Oh, we're not on public. No. Okay. Next I'll move to staff reports. So I'll pass it over to Sydney to do staff reports.

Sydney Muhle (01:24:49):

And we will keep this quick. So we'll start with our complaint status report and we have one case that is currently in intake status, four that are under investigation, five that are in a legal review, I believe that includes the two from today, eight that are in a management review, including the five from today and 11 that have been closed for a grand total of 29.

Any questions on the complaint status report before I move on? Nope. Okay. Then we will move on to our licensee count report, which as a reminder for everyone, this has been provided to the board and the packet that public can always request copies of it, but we'll no longer be providing a verbal report out at these meetings. Our goal is to move these into a more robust annual report that will show much more comprehensive data in those year-over-year changes. So any questions on the licensee count report?

(01:25:53):

Nope. Okay. Then the next one before I hand it off is the board had requested an item for review of the board authorizations at the last meeting. Completely coincidentally, I also had our compliance team reach out to me right around the exact same time and said, "Hey, now that we've had those existing authorizations for a couple of years and we've fleshed out some internal processes, we'd like to take a look at them." Each of our regulatory boards has some slightly different authorizations. And so just to get everything as closely aligned as we can for staff who are working in all of these programs, we'd like to have a discussion about what that looks like.

(01:26:41):

So we're working with them and the AG's office on the potential changes that they're requesting. And then we will bring that to the board for the board's input once we have flushed out exactly what they're looking for. So I included this item for today's agenda because I didn't want the board to feel as though we just ignored the request, but wanted to provide that report out that they are under review with staff and we'll be bringing those to all of you with recommendations as well as the explanations for each of the recommendations and what that means behind the scenes with what staff does on behalf of the board. So are there any questions on that?

(01:27:27):

Board member Roberts? You're still muted.

Sian Roberts (01:27:34):

Sorry, just a clarification, Sydney. So the board will be presented with a proposal from staff for updated board authorizations at some point in the future, is that what I'm hearing?

Sydney Muhle (01:27:45):

Correct. I'm hoping this fall, but please bear with me because we're going to be shorthanded this fall. It might be early 2026 before I can get them in front of you guys, but we will be presenting those to you in the not too distant future.

Sian Roberts (01:27:59):

Okay, great. Thanks. And I think for the newer board members, as you go to the national organization meetings, you'll notice that all the boards operate a little bit differently and clearly have different authorizations to the agency that they're under and they operate either more independently or more dependently. So it's just interesting to understand

where we are and where we want to be as a state and what staff is actually doing for us too, which is always illuminating. Look forward to seeing that, Sydney.

Erica Loynd (01:28:42):

All right, I think we're ready to turn it over to Alyssa.

(01:28:53):

If you're talking, you're muted.

Alyssa Woods (01:28:55):

No, my computer is just a little bit slow. I'm here. So from the meeting in July of 2024, we had coordinate with AIA for outreach opportunities into monitor legislative updates. So that is ongoing. We're continuing to do that. January 30th, 2025, we had said that staff will monitor demographic trends annually and that is ongoing. From October 24th, 2024, the outreach committee will coordinate Lake Washington dates and travel. That is now complete. From April 24th, 2025, we put down to move case 2024 030483-00 ARC to the next meeting and that is now complete. From that same meeting. We have scheduled training for the chair and vice chair and we have completed that and we have also scheduled chair and vice chair and then Sydney will send NCARB annual business meeting information to the board. That is also now complete.

(01:30:13):

And then we also had work with chair Loynd and board member Brachvogel on NCARB Travel, that is also complete. And then for the model law committee with board member Roberts and chair Loynd, that is in progress and I do have it down that we will be adding Secretary Brachvogel to that committee. Then we have counseling on RCWs related to performance of architects. That is now complete. Grace Hamilton will work with board member Brachvogel on a case that he had questioned during the April meeting and it's listed as in progress, but I'm going to assume that we now have that complete. And then the next one is staff will provide a budget update that is still in progress. Chair Loynd will contact ACE for a potential presentation. I believe that's still in progress. Is that still the case?

Erica Loynd (01:31:18):

That will be the case. The point that was happening there, there was a celebration of the graduation for the ACE students right around that time of the April date. So I did attend the ACE graduation, but I could not find right person. It was more of a celebration and got caught in the events that were going on. So I do think that it's viable to go and still contact with them to have a presentation in their next session. They will be starting with their students in, I believe January or February is when they start their new program. So this fall I will keep that on my list of things for myself to do to have that meeting with them.

Alyssa Woods (01:31:59):

Okay. I'll notate... Oh, sorry.



Sian Roberts (01:32:02):

Oh, sorry.

Alyssa Woods (01:32:03):

No, I was just going to say I can notate that for Sydney as well so that when you meet for your outreach meeting, that's something that you can all follow up on.

Erica Loynd (01:32:13):

That'd be great.

Alyssa Woods (01:32:18):

Was there something else? Was that you, vice chairman.

Sian Roberts (01:32:23):

That was me, board member Roberts. I was just going to quickly say they have a really good, pretty extensive introductory session to all of, and that might be a good opportunity. There are presentations and that kind of thing.

Erica Loynd (01:32:37):

And we'll put it on the outreach committee and make sure that we reach out to them. But it was a great presentation. They had great students this year and a lot of excitement at that event and gave away a lot of scholarships, which was very exciting to see.

Alyssa Woods (01:32:51):

Okay, and I'm just taking note real quick so that I can add this to the action items.

Sian Roberts (01:33:04):

Okay. Then we have to review board delegations and I believe that's actually what we just went over. So we can now mark that as complete. You'll see that as complete when we go over our action list at the next meeting. And that is all from me. So back to you chair.

Erica Loynd (01:33:26):

All right, we'll go into 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 shall not be permitted. Sydney, have any comments been submitted in writing?

Sydney Muhle (01:34:05):

No, ma'am.

Erica Loynd (01:34:06):

Very good. Is there any member of the public on the call that would like to address the board? Going one time. Last call. Very good. Thank you very much for those that didn't it. And the floor is now closed. In conclusion, are there any announcements that anyone would like to share from the board or are there any additional reports that they would like to make at this time? Okay.

(01:34:53):

Are there any additional future agenda items that we may not yet have discussed that any board member would like to request at the next meeting? You're so worried we were going to finish late, now we're going to finish early. What's going on? And then action items. So Alyssa, would you please review the action items from today's meeting?

Alyssa Woods (01:35:18):

So we will be moving item 7.6 to the next board meeting and that was the case. That was one of your cases, Chair woman. And then, let's see, I am not sure, I don't think I had anything else. I feel like there was something when we looked at the master action list that we said we were going to go over at the next meeting, but if there's anything new for agenda items,

Scott Harm (01:35:54):

Was there a discussion on some, I'll call it a task force regarding the pirating of stamps and all that. We had somebody volunteer to be on a commission. Is there any action item in any of that maybe, Alyssa? Yeah,

Erica Loynd (01:36:09):

We're going to be adding an item to discuss the professional services offered through those online service websites to the next meeting to figure out where the board wants to go with that. But because we can discuss it at this meeting, so that'll be one. We'll be scheduling time for the model law committee now, including board member Brachvogel with AIA and Tammy to discuss upcoming legislation. We'll be sharing out the links for the RCWs and the WACs that we discussed earlier pertaining to the performance of architects. I'll be sending those out this afternoon. And I think that was all that I captured, but it looks like board member Wu has something he'd like to add.

Paul Wu (01:37:03):

Yes, board member Wu want to be included in this task force that you just discussed.

Sydney Muhle (01:37:10):

Okay. I don't think we can establish the task force at this meeting because it wasn't on the agenda, but we will talk about establishing that at our next meeting.

Paul Wu (01:37:20):

Thank you.

Erica Loynd (01:37:25):

Okay. All right. With no further action items or comments, I believe this meeting-

Alyssa Woods (01:37:30):

Oh wait, I thought we were covering just agenda items. I do have another action item. So we're going to ask that Grace add the date to case number 2024-03-0483-00 ARC for board member Harm. So that was one that I needed to capture. And I believe also just the follow-up for the ACE presentation with that outreach committee. I'm sorry, I thought we were only covering the future agenda items, so.

Erica Loynd (01:38:06):

Okay, so that's all the action items that you have, right?

Alyssa Woods (01:38:08):

Yes.

Erica Loynd (01:38:13):

And I have it today that I think... Oh, board member Brachvogel.

Peter Brachvogel (01:38:20):

Hi. Yeah, Grace, the case that I'm on, is that going to be brought up in the next board meeting? In the next board packet?

Grace Hamilton (01:38:30):

The one that we discussed about?

Peter Brachvogel (01:38:32):

Yeah.

Grace Hamilton (01:38:34):

I see that we discussed it. I don't see that it's ready to go for the next meeting, so if you want to, we can discuss that after or offline.

Peter Brachvogel (01:38:47):

Yeah, fair enough. Okay.

Erica Loynd (01:38:55):

Okay. Okay. With no further comments or action items for the next meeting, I would say the time is 1139 A.M. and this meeting is adjourned.

Paul Wu (01:39:05):

Bye.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:39:08]