Washington State Board of Licensure for Landscape Architects meeting transcript

February 5, 2026

Alyssa Woods (00:04):

Okay. The recording is started.

Jason Anderson (00:06):

Okay. Good morning, I am Jason Anderson, Vice Chair of the Landscape Architecture Board. It is now 10:01 AM on Thursday, February 5th, 2026 and I am calling this meeting to order. This meeting is open to the public. We will take time at the end of the meeting for a brief public comment. Participants will have no more than three minutes to address the board.

(00:29):

As a reminder, board members are not to engage in conversation during public comments. As a courtesy, I ask that all participants keep themselves on mute to reduce background noise. When a board member would like to comment on a topic, please use the Raise Hand feature in Teams. Once I've called on you, unmute yourself and state your name before sharing your comments. Please remember to mute yourself again after you finish speaking. Thank you.

(00:56):

Roll call. Ms. Woods will now call roll, confirming board member attendance. Once she's called your name, please respond by stating here or present.

Alyssa Woods (01:12):

Thank you. I will start with you, Vice Chair Anderson?

Jason Anderson (01:16):

Here.

Alyssa Woods (01:21):

Board Member Crabill?

Daren Crabill (01:21):

Here.

Alyssa Woods (01:22):

Board Member Robinson-Losey?

Sharon Robinson-Losey (01:23):
Here.

Alyssa Woods (01:25):
And Secretary Solorio and Chair LaPierre have excused absences. We have a quorum. Back to you, Vice Chair.

Jason Anderson (01:34):
All right, so next on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Is there a motion to approve today's agenda as presented?

Daren Crabill (01:44):
This is Board Member Daren Crabill. I so move.

Sharon Robinson-Losey (01:49):
This is Sharon, I second.

Jason Anderson (01:52):
We've got a motion and a second. All those in favor, aye?

Daren Crabill (01:58):
Aye.

Sharon Robinson-Losey (01:58):
Aye.

Jason Anderson (02:01):
All those opposed, nay? And seeing none. Are there any abstentions? And that would be no. Vote was approved. Next will be approval of the minutes. Approval of November 6th, 2025 minutes. Is there a motion to approve the November 6th, 2025 minutes as presented?

Daren Crabill (02:31):
This is Board Member Crabill. I so move.

Sharon Robinson-Losey (02:35):
This is Sharon. I second.

Jason Anderson (02:38):

Thank you. Is there any discussion on this topic? Seeing none. All those in favor say aye.

Daren Crabill (02:51):

Aye.

Sharon Robinson-Losey (02:51):

Aye.

Jason Anderson (02:54):

All those opposed, nay. And I'm assuming there are no abstentions, so motion passes. Next would be old business. Is there any board members who would like to provide updates regarding outreach activities?

(03:23):

Board Member Anderson, I'll start with myself. I will be in Pullman at the end of March to go ahead and provide outreach for students again, and speak of the benefits of getting licensed as a landscape architect. And anyone else? Seeing none. New business?

(03:55):

Oh, wait, if I'm open. Okay, new business, the newsletter contribution. Ms. Woods, would you like to introduce?

Alyssa Woods (04:09):

Yes. Sorry, I had to unmute myself. So this topic is to discuss board members' availability to contribute to the newsletter to help diversify the content that's being distributed and to determine a rotation among the members for contribution. So I'll pass it back to you for discussion.

Jason Anderson (04:33):

All right. Are there any board members who would like to provide updates regarding the newsletter that was passed around this morning?

Daren Crabill (04:53):

This is Board Member Crabill. I did read through it. I think it is helpful information for our constituents. I feel like there's a little bit of something missing at the end, sort of a so what kind of conclusion, but I think it's a good start. Is there a timeframe where this needs to be in by, or do we have a so what that we could include?

Alyssa Woods (05:34):

That wasn't shared with me, but if you want to reach out to me after the meeting, I can share your comments with Chair LaPierre on your behalf so that he can make some adjustments before posting the newsletter.

Daren Crabill (05:52):

When is it posting?

Alyssa Woods (05:54):

He did not share that with me. He only shared the newsletter.

Daren Crabill (05:58):

Oh, okay. Okay. Yeah, I mean, I think it is helpful. I kind of want what we're going to do next, kind of thing to sort of sum it up. It's just kind of my thought. I don't know what that is though, of course, but that's my response, first reading.

Jason Anderson (06:26):

Vice Chair Anderson, I agree with Board Member Crabill is that something, it seems like is missing at the end. And I'm more than happy to try and take a shot at adding something and sharing it with you, Alyssa, to send it over.

Daren Crabill (06:50):

I mean, it might be ... Sorry, Jason. It might be just like the board is aware of this discrepancy and will continue to investigate potential adjustments that can happen and keep the board sustainable into the future while we're still providing blah, blah, blah. Something like that, I think might be enough for now. Just a thought.

Jason Anderson (07:25):

I also ... Board Member Anderson. I think I would like to have a full board discussion of it. I'd almost like to push it into the next meeting if that it works with Chairman LaPierre's schedule.

Alyssa Woods (07:43):

Okay. I can add that as an action item to ask Chair LaPierre when this is to be posted. Oh, go ahead.

Daren Crabill (07:56):

I was just going to ask Jason, to what end?

Jason Anderson (08:02):

Well, I just feel like this was kind of sprung on us this morning and I haven't really had a chance to digest it. And I just ...

Daren Crabill (08:10):

Okay.

Alyssa Woods (08:15):

What we can do is you can ... I believe as long as there's not a quorum, I can set up a meeting between two board members, so that there is no quorum. We can discuss what the conclusion should look like so that we can get it done as quickly as possible.

Daren Crabill (08:35):

That's what I was going to suggest as well. Sorry Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon Robinson-Losey (08:39):

This is Sharon. So my issue is actually in the second paragraph when it's said, "How is that possible and justifiable?" I believe that's the turning point of this argument that makes it somewhat negative, and that's where the tone starts to change and you feel like you need that summary or statement at the end to close it up to make it, not necessarily a feelgood, but make it, "Oh no, it's still worth being a landscape architect."

(09:09):

And I just think redoing that paragraph with some of the suggestions that you had. For instance, we are aware that this is more. We just don't have the numbers that the other places have, and you can actually justify it within the paragraph so that you don't leave people questioning, "Yeah, how is that justifiable? I don't want to do this."

(09:34):

So I just think that it's just a matter of wordsmithing a little bit and then including your summary pieces in the dialogue.

Daren Crabill (09:43):

I think that's a good call-out, Sharon. That is a really good catch on ... It does change the tone of it. I think there's some edits to be made. It's a good start. And then if Jason and Curtis want to get together in the meantime to see if we can smooth it out a little bit, I think that'd be great.

Alyssa Woods (10:08):

Okay. I'll add that. If the Vice Chair Anderson is in agreement, I will add that as an action item to set up a meeting with both you and Chair LaPierre to discuss some final edits before that newsletter is posted.

Jason Anderson (10:29):

Sounds good to me, Board Member Anderson. I'm assuming we don't need to vote on this since we are making that-

Alyssa Woods (10:38):

No.

Jason Anderson (10:38):

Okay.

Alyssa Woods (10:41):

Yeah, there's no vote required, but I do think that the intention of this discussion was also to see the availability for others to contribute as well, and to kind of determine a rotation so that there's a diverse perspective.

Jason Anderson (11:04):

Sounds good.

Alyssa Woods (11:07):

Is that something that maybe we could determine? Sydney, I may ask you this because of OPMA. Does it have to be decided in this board meeting or could ... If I was organizing it, would I be able to have conversations with each one determining when they would be able to take on a newsletter, in what cadence or does it need to be discussed right here?

Sydney Muhle (11:38):

I mean, ideally we'd like to discuss it here since we do have members of the public present, but it's definitely something that staff can facilitate in the background. But I think Chair LaPierre was really looking for if other members of the board were willing to take the lead on a rotating basis on these WASLA newsletter submissions on behalf of the board just because Chair LaPierre has submitted a significant number of them, and his fear was that it would just kind of become a standard responsibility of whoever the chair was and just kind of fall 100% on that person.

(12:22):

So he was hoping that other board members would be willing to take the lead at different points throughout the year so it never fell on any one individual for the entire duration and could be rotated through. In addition to offering those diverse perspectives and diverse content, knowing that each of you works in a different sector of this industry, and to give you all of that opportunity to share different things that you're seeing.

Jason Anderson (12:56):

Daren, you had your hand up?

Daren Crabill (12:58):

Yeah. Board Member Crabill. Do we provide ... How often do we provide something to-

Sydney Muhle (13:10):

I believe they've been done quarterly.

Daren Crabill (13:13):

Really? We have that much to say?

Sydney Muhle (13:17):

You know, I think we've had a couple of quarters where we've resubmitted similar content just trying to drive home a particular point, but I think that's also kind of where Chair LaPierre's struggle has been, is figuring out what that diverse content would be from quarter to quarter. And wanting to make sure, feeling that the newsletter participation is very vital and it's a really awesome opportunity for the board to reach the licensing base for this program.

Daren Crabill (13:51):

Sure.

Sydney Muhle (13:51):

Wanting to make sure to maintain that rather than having it fall off or be a once-a-year kind of bloop that people scan over. That he'd like to see it stay consistent so that when there are those big things the board wants to put in that newsletter, people are really paying attention.

Daren Crabill (14:09):

Yeah. I mean, before you've said it was happening mostly quarterly. It seems like maybe twice a year would be appropriate, but anyway, just thinking about the particular topics that might be reasonable to share about. It's like it's not a lot. I think this is a really good one to touch on because it affects the licensure in a real way and it's clearly something we've heard about over the years.

(14:51):

So I think this is a really good topic to bring up and share the whys. But yeah, four, I'd be hard-pressed to come up with four.

Sydney Muhle (15:06):

And this discussion can absolutely wait until the next meeting when Chair LaPierre is back, Alyssa can share the board's feedback with him as can Vice Chair Anderson when they're doing their next agenda-setting and checking in, in between now and then.

(15:28):

That way, Chair LaPierre can be kind of prepared to help lead the discussion since this was an item that he had requested, and might lead to a more robust conversation in a couple of months.

Jason Anderson (15:43):

Board Member Anderson, does it make sense to keep it regularly on the agenda, like outreach that we are having a discussion about it, and what topics we feel might be important for the upcoming quarter and then assigning it to a board member?

Sydney Muhle (16:03):

That's at the discretion of the board. There's nothing that would prevent you from doing that. I think that's a great idea, but it's really going to be up to the discretion of the board.

Jason Anderson (16:30):

I think I would like to table this discussion until the next meeting and get it on everybody's radar, so to speak.

Alyssa Woods (16:53):

I'll add that to our action items.

Jason Anderson (16:57):

Perfect. Next, moving to reports, staff reports.

Alyssa Woods (17:11):

Oh.

Jason Anderson (17:13):

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Alyssa, I forgot. Next topic under new business would be the discussion on possibility of combining the Landscape Architects Board with the Architects Board.

Alyssa Woods (17:27):

Yes. So this item was requested by Chair LaPierre and is based on the proposal to regulate interior design as part of what is currently the Architect Board. Chair LaPierre wanted to introduce the idea of a broader multidisciplinary board to regulate all three professions. I will now hand the discussion back over to you, Vice Chair Anderson.

Jason Anderson (17:56):

Does anybody have any thoughts upon combining our board with the Architects Board?

Daren Crabill (18:12):

Well, this is Board Member Crabill. This also seems strange that though since the chair brought this, put this on the agenda, but is not here to lead the discussion. It seems strange to do so without him because he put it on here for a reason.

(18:39):

I would be curious about what advantages there are or challenges there might be. I mean, the first one that comes to mind, of course is the topic we were just talking about. Obviously, numbers matter and that would be immediate change likely, I would imagine, to the costs of licensure for our licensees. So that's one advantage.

(19:14):

I would be curious how board meetings are run when it's a multidisciplinary board, and what the makeup of that would be by discipline, and whether it's not just a one-sided conversation. I would also be curious what the architecture board would think of that potential. So I think it's a worthy conversation just to check in on even if I assume our bylaws allow for something like this to happen.

(19:50):

So I think there's a conversation to be had and it's probably a one to do just to check in on a regular basis just to make sure as things evolve over every few years, that we are open to modifying and making the right choice for us and our licensees and what makes sense from our staff's perspective of, it's a lot to do for staff to keep things rolling.

(20:28):

So I wonder what kind of efficiencies there are there, if any. So I think it's a worthy conversation to have, but it seems like we're missing ... To do it with a full board would seem appropriate.

Jason Anderson (20:46):

Board Member Sharon?

Sharon Robinson-Losey (20:49):

I absolutely agree with Daren. And for me, I'm not a landscape architect. It would have to be clearly defined as to why we would want to merge these without the monetary aspect, because I think that's really important. But as a person just trying to grapple with, "Now, why are we doing this?" and somebody who might be searching out licensing at the state level on the state website sort of thing.

(21:20):

I think that without Curtis and without Lindsey, I think that we can't have a good discussion about this because you need all the experience you can possibly get from those of you who work in that field to see whether or not this would even be advantageous in any way, shape or form.

(21:38):

So yes, keeping it on for future discussion, but as just the member at large, I don't know. It doesn't really make a ton of sense to me.

Jason Anderson (21:52):

Sydney, I was going to actually follow up on a question to you, is can you elaborate on the financial implications that you shared with Chair LaPierre and I in our agenda meeting?

Sydney Muhle (22:13):

Absolutely. So in terms of the financial changes that this would bring about, there really wouldn't be a whole lot because the landscape architect program would still be a standalone and is still statutorily required to be self-funded.

(22:29):

So there would be a few minor impacts in terms of the staff components, but the board staff would still be doing all of that work on behalf of the program. It would just be fewer meetings. So there would be an impact. It just wouldn't be a very large financial impact in that regard.

(22:51):

The only way that we could really create a big cost savings to the point where it would impact fees, the way that I think the board and the public would like for it to would be to do a complete restructure of the landscape architect profession that kind of tucked it up under another profession, such as the architects.

(23:19):

And there are a lot of complications and risks that come with that, including that landscape architecture would become an endorsement to an architect license, and I don't think that this profession really has an appetite to go that direction based on previous years' discussions.

(23:37):

So it wouldn't necessarily be that big financial impact, but there are also definite pros and cons to having a multidisciplinary board. And so I did just want to share some additional background in the conversations. This came up for Curtis, excuse me, Chair LaPierre after the CLARB conference last year, and he had interacted with several members of other multidisciplinary boards in different jurisdictions.

(24:09):

So this is not a brand-new model. A lot of states across the country do use this multidisciplinary board model, but then again, there's just as many who also use the standalone. So it's not a one-size-fits-all for anyone. It really is dependent on what is best for your jurisdiction and your licensees.

(24:30):

But having those discussions with several of the other jurisdictions, Chair LaPierre did see a lot of benefit in being able to have direct conversations with the architects representing their regulation and have those direct conversations in board meetings versus trying to pass that information back and forth through staff, or trying to get somebody to come to an additional meeting. There's some complications and some struggles that occurred over

the years there. And then I think we've even experienced from time to time on our side that it makes the process take longer.

(25:15):

So I don't know what all of those conversations were. I do wish Chair LaPierre had been able to be here, but I think his intent with going ahead and asking that to stay on the agenda was just to start to socialize the idea. I think he fully anticipated this would be a much bigger, broader discussion, but he didn't want to start too far down a road if every member of the board just had an immediate, "Nope, don't even want to talk about it." And then there was just kind of a no harm, no foul. "Let's not go down that road."

(25:43):

But I think if the board is open to at least exploring what it could potentially look like, given that there is a group in Washington who is pushing for the regulation of interior design, and that would add to positions to the Architect Board representing those interior designers, I think he was kind of going, "Okay, well is that an opportunity then to create this multidisciplinary and maybe give the design professions under one umbrella, a bigger voice together?"

(26:15):

But again, didn't want to do that and go too far down that road with those discussions if there was just no appetite. And so I think that's why he didn't want to wait too long. We'll talk about it more during the legislative update later on in the agenda, but that interior design regulation proposal did get introduced this legislative session. And as well, again, we'll talk about it in a minute.

(26:39):

I don't know that it's going to go too far this year, but I think knowing that it was introduced, he'd rather start having those discussions earlier and be able to be prepared down the line should that roll forward rather than trying to be reactionary and catch up down the line.

Jason Anderson (27:03):

Thank you, Sydney. Any other questions? Seeing none, I think we can go ahead and move to reports. Staff reports, annual program report?

Alyssa Woods (27:24):

Yes. So I will touch on this for you all. So we have the Landscape Architects complaint status as of January 7th. There was a grand total of nine complaints and all nine have a status of closed. The complaints created between 2021 and 2025, as you can see there, the most that there has been during each year was nine complaints, and at the lowest it was between 2022 and 2023, or there was two complaints and then three complaints.

(28:06):

For the landscape architect licensee account, as of January 7th, 2026, there was a grand total of 889. There was 32 between the ages of 25 and 34, 193 between 35 and 44, 279 between 45 and 54, 223 between 55 and 64, and 162 that were 65 and above.

(28:39):

For first issues and renewals in 2025, we can see that there are no expired licenses. Everyone has been renewing, and it shows a good trend of first issues as well. Then for active licensee counts between 2021 and 2025, you can see that there was an upward trend between 2021 and 2023, or I mean 2024. And then it has remained pretty consistent between 2024 and 2025.

(29:19):

And I believe that this might be it for the annual report and then it goes into the legislative update. Were there any questions before I move on from the annual report? All right. Seeing none, I will move forward. And for the legislative update, that will be Sydney's team that will give that update.

Austin Koller (29:51):

Hi. Yeah, this is Austin Koller, Management Analyst of Department of Licensing. We haven't seen any bills this year that we think, directly impact the Landscape Architect Program. We did in the last couple of days, like Sydney mentioned, saw the proposal for licensing commercial interior designers brought forward.

(30:13):

It's pretty late in the process, so we don't expect it to move this year, but we know they've been doing a lot of work on it over the last couple of years. So we are expecting it to come back next year. Pretty close to the language that we were expecting to see. It's modeled really closely on the current architect licensing laws. And like Sydney mentioned, it's adding two board positions for the interior designers on the Architects Board.

(30:46):

That's all I had for the legislative updates. Happy to answer any questions if anybody has any. And if not, I'll pass it back to Alyssa.

Alyssa Woods (31:07):

We have the review of master action item list, and so we have the review and update to the current WACs and that one is still in progress. We have outreached to UW and WSU, and that is still ongoing with Vice Chair Anderson and Chair LaPierre.

(31:28):

We will keep recruitment as an ongoing priority and board staff will provide additional info about interior designers and possible crossover into landscape architects. That is also ongoing. Staff will contact CLARB regarding outreach resources for introducing youth and students to the profession. I believe that is still in progress as well. Staff will work to update the form regarding disclosure of legacy practitioner status. That is in progress. And outreach article for WASLA newsletter. That is also in progress. We just had discussion on that.

(32:07):

Some of these things are still in progress because we did have staff changes. So we're trying to get into the swing of things with Sandy now being the lead for the boards and commissions, and figuring out where we're at with our action items. Are there any questions? Okay, we can move forward.

Jason Anderson (32:35):

Public comments. I will now open the floor for the public to address the board and share their thoughts, concerns and requests. Written comments shall be submitted at least two days prior to meetings by emailing DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov. Members of the public, while you are addressing the board, please remember each member of the public is limited to one three-minute comment.

(33:03):

Comments submitted in writing count as your three minutes. Comments must be on matters within the board's jurisdiction. Board members are limited to directing staff to study the matter further or requesting the matter be scheduled for later discussion. Ms. Woods, are there any comments that were submitted in writing?

Alyssa Woods (33:27):

We did not receive any.

Jason Anderson (33:29):

All right, thank you. Do we have any members of the public wanting to speak? If so, please raise your hand. Okay. Seeing none, I think the floor is now closed. Now conclusions, announcements. Does anybody have any announcements?

Alyssa Woods (34:10):

I do, and let me find it. So I wanted to announce that Chair LaPierre's term had ended in September of 2025, but he has offered to serve until a replacement has been appointed. Additionally, Board Member Robinson-Losey's term will end in September of 2026. If she's interested in continuing to serve as a public member, she may reapply through the Governor's Office.

(34:33):

Additionally, if any members of the public are interested in applying to serve on the board and would like to learn more, they may contact us for more information at DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov or apply directly through the website for the Governor's Office. That's the only announcement that I have.

Jason Anderson (34:53):

Thank you. I see no further announcements. Oh, Sharon, you had something?

Sharon Robinson-Losey (35:05):

I do. I am not going to reapply for the position as it stands right now. Change in my family's situation is that my daughter is being deployed and I will become point person for my granddaughter who will be living with me. So I think that's going to be my focus now for a little bit of time. So I won't be reapplying for this.

(35:27):

Hopefully, you guys have gotten some really great people who want to step in and take over, but I kind of need to do something else right now. Thanks.

Jason Anderson (35:40):

Sharon, thank you for your service and your daughter's service. 9.2, request for future agenda items. Does anybody have any items they would like to request? Seeing none, Ms. Woods, do we have a review of the action items?

Alyssa Woods (36:08):

Yes. So I will schedule time with Chair LaPierre and Vice Chair Anderson to make edits to the newsletter. I will add item 6.1 to the next meeting to continue discussion on the newsletter, and I will also add item 6.2 for a continued discussion around combining the Landscape Architect Board to the Architect Board. And if there's anything else that I've missed, please let me know and I'd be happy to add it.

Jason Anderson (36:41):

Thank you. It is now 10:37 AM on February 5th, 2026 and this meeting is adjourned. Our next meeting will be via Teams on May 7th, 2026 at 10:00 AM.

Alyssa Woods (37:06):

Great. Thank you.

Jason Anderson (37:12):
Thank you.