

# Washington State Board for Architects Meeting Transcript

April 20, 2023

Roch Manley:

It's now 10:02 AM and I call this regular meeting of the Architect Board to order. The board will provide an opportunity for public comment during the meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage participants to mute their mics or phone when not speaking to reduce the background noise when others are speaking. 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. Susan, would you like to please do the roll call for us?

Susan Cooley:

Sure. Chair Manley.

Roch Manley:

Here.

Susan Cooley:

Vice Chair Harm.

Scott Harm:

Here.

Susan Cooley:

Secretary Cooley.

Board Member Roberts.

Board Member Wu.

Paul Wu:

Here.

Susan Cooley:

Board member Lloyd.

And board member Benner.

Benner:

Here.

Sydney:

And board member Roberts just logged in.

Roberts:

I'm here everyone. Hello.

Susan Cooley:

Wonderful.

Roberts:

Thank you.

Scott Harm:

Hey, good morning.

Roch Manley:

So it looks like for the time, for the moment, we have a quorum. Am I correct?

Sydney:

Yes, we do.

Roch Manley:

Great. Has everyone had a chance to review the agenda? Take a look at the agenda and I think I'll start by saying, I know we've got Scott having to take off at what time do you think, Scott? Like maybe as soon as, oh, you're, you're

Sydney:

Muted, Scott.

Scott Harm:

Yeah. Yeah. I would do it as soon as possible, but hopefully no longer than a half hour.

Roch Manley:

Okay. We do have a few items that require vote, so put that in hands of you, Susan and Sydney as far as which items we would need to shuffle to the front of the agenda, if that's possible. And vote on, potentially vote on or change to the agenda for that.

Sydney:

Yeah, the only thing I would ask that the board consider is moving item 6.1 to the end of the meeting if we have time to go over it, the goal and priority setting, that's an ongoing discussion that we can move to a later date or even move to a special meeting if that were the board switches. But given the amount of business that the board has to get through today, that's not one that has to be completed today.

Roch Manley:

Okay. It looked like complete cases, election of officers and discussion of annual meeting issues were all items that we needed potentially to have a vote on. So that's 7.1, 7.2 and 8.0, which maybe we could

move forward in the agenda. As far as managing the agenda, Sydney and Susan are going to need your help on making the call of Windows. We'll slide into the order. So with that in mind, are there any other thoughts about the agenda?

Roberts:

I would also recommend that we move item 7.3 to the end of the agenda so that we can have Scott here for items eight under eight

Roch Manley:

Items, you mean 7.3 or do you mean eight?

Susan Cooley:

Move 7.3. Sorry, to the end of the agenda so that we may have Scott here for all items under eight.

Roch Manley:

Great. Sounds good. And maybe Sydney and Susan, you too can summarize that. If I get this wrong, it looks like we've got the agenda items six and 7.3 moving to the end of the agenda. We also have a potentially lengthy discussion on 6.3, 6.4. So, just move entire item six to the end of the agenda. And item 7.3 to the end of the agenda.

Sydney:

We can move those to after item eight. We can have those prior to the reports, but yeah.

Roch Manley:

Great. Do I have a motion for accepting the agenda with those changes?

Paul Wu:

Aye. So move.

Roch Manley:

Do I hear a second?

Roberts:

And this is Aye second. This is board member Roberts.

Roch Manley:

All right, if there are no other questions on the agenda, all in favor of approving the agenda as amended, which would be moving items six and items 7.3 to position after item eight. All in favor Aye.

Paul Wu:

Aye.

Roberts:

Aye.

Benner:

Aye.

Roch Manley:

All opposed? Okay, the agenda passes as revised. Next time is approval of minutes. Assuming you've had a chance to look at the minutes, are there any corrections or modifications suggested?

Benner:

No.

Roch Manley:

I seen shaking heads. I didn't see any myself. There's no further discussion on the minutes from the prior meeting, January 19. Do I have a move to approve?

Scott Harm:

This is board member Harm. I make a motion that we accept the meeting minutes as submitted by staff.

Paul Wu:

This is board member Wu. I second it

Roch Manley:

Right, we have a motion and a second and no other comments. It sounds like. Any other comments?

Hearing none. All in favor of approval of the January 19 minutes. Please say Aye.

Paul Wu:

Aye.

Scott Harm:

Aye.

Benner:

Aye.

Roch Manley:

Opposed say Nay.

No opposition. So the January 19 minutes are approved. The next item on the agenda is awards and recognition. And we do have a.

Going to turn this off because I can't see people. There we go.

We do have one item on the agenda and one of our colleagues, it has to do with one of our colleagues, Rick Benner, who is terming off the board. And this is a chance, I believe at this regional meeting there was a laboratory and I think Sydney, were you going to share that laboratory with us? And oh and Rick, there's the plaque. Excellent.

Sydney:

So this was submitted to NCAR through the regional summit by staff on behalf of the board member Benner served on the Washington State Architect's Board from 2011 until he will turn off in 2013, missing only one meeting in his entire service on the board. He was an active participant and served as chair of the Washington Board from 2014 to 2015. And again, from 2021 to 2022. Board member Benner served as the Western Washington University Campus Architect, and in that capacity provided architectural tours of the campus during several board meetings that were held on campus. He participated in numerous college campus visits, helping to represent the Washington Architectural Board into prospective candidates and students. While serving on the board, he participated in a law exam review task force and provided his insight and expertise in all decisions discussed by the board. Board member Benner's fellow board members describe him as generally very quiet, but someone that always provided thoughtful analysis. He always remained calm, never was agitated or heated up regardless of the subject discussed. He was an engaged board member who was committed to his profession and serving the residents of Washington State.

Roch Manley:

Excellent.

Sydney:

And with that, Board member Benner, we also have a plaque on behalf of the board that Susan is showing and we will be getting that in the mail to you next week.

Thank you for your years of service with us.

Roch Manley:

Nice, beautiful, beautiful plaque Susan. Rick, the option I guess is you can drive down to the Oregon coast and pick it up from Susan.

Benner:

Well I really appreciate that. And then the plaque from West Carb and just thank you all for 12 years. It's gone by faster than anyone would think. And I'm always encouraged, I've met a lot of friends along the way, both from through the board and also through the participation through NCARB on various groups. And I just encourage folks to get involved and get involved early because the years go by really quick and it's always the relationships that you meet along the way. And I have now numerous friends in the state but also across the country and beyond that I've met throughout these different task force and meeting groups and accreditation visits and those types of things. So, find what inspires you through the NCARB, be it working on A.R.E, whether it's working through accreditation for schools or just the regulatory processes, but get involved and stay involved and work your way up. And I just thank you all for all your

friendship and the good times and interesting things that we've done together and I will miss you all and hopefully stay in contact when I can. So thank you.

Scott Harm:

Thank you Rick. I think

Paul Wu:

Thank you for your service.

Scott Harm:

Yeah. This is a chance each of us board members, your colleagues on the board, have a moment here to thank you personally and your insight, your consistency, your dry sense of humor. You had an ability to give solid, calm, insightful input on some of the more difficult decisions and discussions that we've had as a board. And I've really appreciated that and learned from you, Rick, because I've kind of literally sort of followed in your footsteps as the next board member to come onto the board and to the point of, I just completed a, maybe my last but my first N.A.B. Accreditation review so that I remember you telling me. Yeah, it's a lot of work and a man of few words you are. Yes, it's a lot of work. But appreciate all the committee work and all the regular consistent contribution that you've made.

Benner:

Thank you. Thank you, your Honor.

Scott Harm:

Paul.

Roberts:

Is this an opportunity for all of us to jump in here, Rock?

Scott Harm:

Yes.

Roberts:

Okay.

Scott Harm:

As I said, it is, yes.

Roberts:

All right, great. Well I'll just add to, I'll speak about you in the present tense, Rick, because you are a great source of wisdom to this board and you will be missed and I do hope that we can remain connected. I do know a lot of previous board members have continued their volunteerism through NCARB and there are certainly opportunities for that and I certainly know hope, but know that our paths will cross against. So thank you Rick for really serving as a leader and a mentor on this board.

Speaker 1:

Thank you Sean.

Paul Wu:

Well this is board member Wu. I never got to really meet you in person, right? We're all virtual, so to me you are an image of leadership and wisdom. So I think we all miss you.

Benner:

Thanks.

Scott Harm:

I'll jump in. Oh this is board member Harm. Rick, you're like my big brother and in many ways. I have really enjoy our relationship. I loved what you brought to the board, you were as described in your plaque, a really calming influence to someone like myself who usually can get ramped up pretty quick. So it was an nice ying and yang and really appreciated the times we were able to come up to your campus. I always found those a very good experience in getting out of the normal place where we meet. But really appreciate all your hard work. I was amazed by your attendance. I know I'm nowhere near that. But yeah, keep up the good work and stay engaged in the NCARB. As someone said earlier, you do add a lot of value. Yeah, it's been a pleasure. Thank you.

Benner:

Thank you Scott.

Roch Manley:

Very good. Yeah, again, again,

Benner:

Thank you all.

Roch Manley:

Thanks so much Rick.

Paul Wu:

Thank you. Yeah.

Roch Manley:

Well, the clock ticks. So we do have to move ahead and I think this is the point at which we jumped from item five to item seven, new business pushing item six to the back of the agenda. So the first item on item six is election of officers. And this, I know in the past we've attempted to have a scheme that pushes people through those positions in a clear order and gives everyone an opportunity to be work on through all the positions and be chair near their time of terming out or a year before their time of terming out. Where it's a little bit different this time because I think Scott, who is vice chair right now

and is up for chair, is the only one on a board who's in his last term, aside from me at this point. Am I correct on that? I think y'all are first term. Presuming you'll go for two terms.

Roberts:

I'm in my second term.

Roch Manley:

You are in your second term?

Roberts:

Correct.

Roch Manley:

Okay, very good. And let's see. Thanks for that, Sean. Time flies so quickly. So Sean, you term off in June of 2027. So let's see.

Roberts:

Thanks for the reminder.

Roch Manley:

Yeah,

Roberts:

I'm reflecting on what you said, Rick, about how quickly this time flies.

Roch Manley:

Yeah, exactly. In my mind, Sean, you literally just joined the board with all your energy and quick mind and ability to vocalize it all just came on last year, which is wow. So we've looked in the past, we've done a slate of candidates and voted on a slate. If we were to do that this year, I would like to put forward a slate of candidates. That would be Scott as chair, Sean as vice chair and Paul as secretary. And I think, although it will not be my problem at that point, I think that allows Sean to make another rotation as chair in the next four years. I think maybe my math is wrong.

Scott Harm:

Rock, the only thing I think that we may have overlooked is I think I heard and I wasn't aware of. Who's our current secretary?

Roch Manley:

Yeah, that's a good point. That's a good point. That's you Paul, isn't it?

Paul Wu:

I'm not too sure what the secretary does.

Scott Harm:



So that's why I couldn't remember.

Roch Manley:

I couldn't remember too.

Susan Cooley:

I think it's me.

Paul Wu:

Which I'm happy to be that person.

Roch Manley:

Susan.

Susan Cooley:

I think it's me.

Sydney:

Oh, Susan is currently acting as the Secretary.

Roch Manley:

Good, good. Good point, Scott. That changes how we look at this, right?

Scott Harm:

And again, it's hopefully every, cause the newer members are out. Well, I mean we have a complete mix and so we hadn't talked about the fact that we were just every year rotating someone new and we don't get multiple years of being a chair and doing it. Kind of in the order that you joined. Right? So hopefully everybody's in tune with that.

Roch Manley:

And in the past we've had better opportunities to discuss this ahead of time and with virtual meetings and more limited attendance at conferences as it's turned out, we've not really had that chance. So

Sian Roberts:

I don't need two more terms as chair Rock. So why don't we bring, I would like to suggest that Susan, move into the vice chair and Paul move into the secretary and there will be time for me to elevate to chair before I'm done. I believe? 4, 5, 6. Maybe I need to come in ahead of Erica next year in order to make that happen.

Scott Harm:

Sweet.

Roch Manley:

Right, right. And just query for you Paul, this is your wrapping up your first term in.

Paul Wu:

I believe my turn ends in 2026.

Roch Manley:

Okay.

Susan Cooley:

27.

Roch Manley:

Yeah, the website says 27.

Paul Wu:

27. Okay.

Roch Manley:

Yeah. So that's in lockstep with Sean.

Paul Wu:

Yeah.

Roch Manley:

But it's your first term?

Paul Wu:

Yes.

Roch Manley:

Okay. Okay. So we have a slate of officers suggested that would be a adjusted. That would be Scott as chair, Susan as vice chair moving up from the secretary position and Paul joining it as secretary for the coming year. I think that's workable. I appreciate the adjustment, Sean.

Roberts:

Sure. And so I'm going to go ahead and move that we accept these slate of officers that rock just mentioned.

Scott Harm:

I second that.

Roch Manley:

Okay.

Benner:

Board member Benner.

Roch Manley:

Very good. We have a motion to second for the stated slate of officers. Any further comment on that?

Pretty tough duty being Secretary Paul.

Paul Wu:

That's perfectly fine. As long as I can help. Yes.

Roch Manley:

Okay. Okay. Well if there's no further discussion on the officer elections, all in favor of putting that, enacting that slate of officers, please indicate with an aye.

Paul Wu:

Aye.

Scott Harm:

Aye.

Sian Roberts:

Aye.

Benner:

Aye.

Paul Wu:

Opposed? Nay.

And hearing no opposition, we move the officer lineup in I think in our next meeting, correct? Or do I just step away from the chair right now? Sydney,

Sydney:

Next meeting.

Roch Manley:

Okay, so Scott is chair, Susan as vice chair and Paul as secretary?

Sydney:

Correct.

Roch Manley:

Okay, very good. Thank you. We have a couple more things to get through and then we can release Scott, the annual business meeting coming up in June in, is it Tampa? Tampa from Tampa for that, I think a little bit of discussion about who's going because that those attending will have an influence on the next question, which is who are our delegates?

Scott Harm:

I hate to do this, but I am getting really nervous about my time and I'm someone who's not on the state's time going to this. So, I'm not really germane in this conversation. So, I ask the board's indulgence and move to whatever we need, actually need me for or let me be excused real soon?

Roch Manley:

Yeah, absolutely. We could.

Sydney:

Do we have A quorum without Scott?

Susan Cooley:

Yes we do.

Scott Harm:

We do. We do. Yeah.

Roch Manley:

Okay. If it's allowed in the rules, I suppose we could move to complaint cases. Sydney. It's beyond my pay grade to make that call.

Sydney:

As long as there are no objections from the board, we can go ahead and move on to item eight with the complaint cases.

Scott Harm:

Very much appreciated.

Roch Manley:

Then we can get Scott on his way. So, Sydney?

Sydney:

So Sydney, if they could make that a little bit bigger. Phase 202207108800ARC. The respondent is a licensed architect in Washington State. The respondent self-reported disciplinary actions in other states, unlicensed practice in 2018 in South Carolina and 2019 in Minnesota as required by Washington RCW. These violations appear to stem from altering and ceiling plans using his architect license while the two state board require an engineer license to perform. In both cases, he believed he was operating within the scale and scope of the architect license and the alterations made to the plans were exempt from an

engineer requirement. He was fined in each of those cases. Subsequent violations in other states resulted from failing to list the previously mentioned violations and related sanctions at the time of applying for renewals in Missouri in 2019 and Colorado in 2021.

The respondent included in his self-report the paperwork associated with the various entities involved in the cases. Respondent provided a list of projects he worked on over the last couple of years in Washington State on November 9th of last year. Respondent maintains licenses in approximately 45 states in the US and is responsible for approximately 70% of architectural projects for Domino's Pizza and Dutch Brothers Coffee. The respondent's license is current with Washington State and expires in 2024. Since this case was self-reported with no actual complaint, acknowledgement letters were not sent and the recommendation is to close the case with no further action. We would need board's approval to accept that recommendation.

Roch Manley:

Great.

Scott Harm:

This is Board member Harm. I move to accept the case manager's recommendation.

Roch Manley:

Do we hear second?

Benner:

Board member Ben second the motion.

Roch Manley:

And any questions on the case for the case manager?

Roberts:

Yeah, I would like to ask questions. I'm sorry Scott, I know you have to run, but I need to ask a question about this one. I'm not sure exactly. There's no complaint against this individual. Is this individual asking to be re or upping their license or are they reporting just because they know they need to report?

Roberts:

... Or are they reporting just because they know they need to report?

PART 1 OF 5 ENDS [00:29:04]

Wu:

I think this is probably... This is Board Member Wu, I'm the case manager on this case. I think this is probably a preempt notification so that he won't get into the same trouble as he did in other states. His previous violations.

Roberts:

Because his previous violations are because he failed to report, so he's reporting.

Wu:

Right.

Roberts:

Elizabeth, has her hand... Sorry, what's up?

Manley:

Elizabeth has her hand up. Thank you, Sian.

Elizabeth:

Yeah, I was just going to say that I believe the statute requires that you are supposed to report previous board violations at other boards whenever they happen. So you don't wait until you're renewing, you just report right away. So he's seems to have learned that lesson.

Roberts:

Okay.

Manley:

And follow up on that question is that this is the appropriate, I think that's basically what your question is, that this is the appropriate venue for him to do that reporting. Just a yes.

Roberts:

Okay.

Manley:

Okay.

Roberts:

I have no further questions.

Manley:

Okay. And if there are no further questions, otherwise that was good question, Sian. All in favor of approving the case manager's recommendation, please say aye.

Board:

Aye.

Manley:

All opposed, nay. Great, case is accepted as proposed. And Scott, you have a case. I believe yours is the next one.

Harm:

Yep. Now Sydney, you're reading them is what we're doing now, right?

Sydney:

Yeah, unless you would like to read.

Harm:

No, no, no, no, no. This has been, in all honesty, the preferred format.

Sydney:

Okay.

Harm:

This works. This works fine.

Sydney:

Okay. This is case number 2022-11-16-13-00-ARC. The respondent is accused of not only unlicensed practice as an architect, but also delivering substandard deliverables for the defined scope of work for a single family residential structure. Facts are that there is no evidence either submitted in the complaint or during the investigatory phase of the department's research that supports the claim that the respondent identified themselves as an architect. In addition, there was no documentation that was submitted even upon request that supported and agreed upon definable scope of work. Each of the parties, the claimant and respondent, reported conflicting understanding of the scope of work and nothing was provided in written form for consideration and determination. And the recommendation is to close the case with no further action.

Manley:

Do you have any other comments on the case, Scott?

Harm:

Oh, this was... Got to laugh. This is one of the weirdest ones, including the client issuing a signed blank check to the designer with not having an idea of what they were doing. The designer thought they were just doing a simple graphic for a feasibility study within a jurisdiction and the client tried to submit those drawings for a building permit and they were rejected as not being sufficient enough. And when you look at the fee that the designer, again, got a signed blank check, you look at the fee that the designer plugged in for the work and it was nothing near what it would be to get any kind of a building permit. So it seemed like they were fair in what they were collecting, but there was nothing written and everybody admitted there was nothing written down on what it was all about, but the blank check thing is really weird.

Manley:

Yeah. Any questions for the case manager on this? If there are no questions on this, do we have a motion?

Wu:

Yeah, I move to approve the decision made on this case. This is member Wu.

Manley:

Thank you, Paul.

Roberts:

And Board Member Roberts, I second.

Manley:

Okay, hearing a motion and a second and it sounds like there's no further discussion. All in favor of accepting the case manager's recommendation, please say aye.

Board:

Aye.

Manley:

Oppose, nay. And hearing none opposed, the case manager's recommendation is accepted and the case is closed as recommended.

Harm:

Okay. I hate to interrupt one the last time for this session, but with that I'm going to sign off since we do have a quorum without me, if that's acceptable to the chair.

Manley:

Yes. Very well. Have an excellent and safe trip, Scott.

Harm:

Thank you. Rick, One more time. It's been a great pleasure and like Sian said, I know our paths will cross, so just don't look away from me when I come up to you.

Benner:

All right, thanks, Scott.

Wu:

Thanks everyone.

Benner:

Thank you. Safe trip.

Manley:

Thanks Scott.



Wu:

Yeah. All right.

Sydney:

All right, this is case number 2020-2-12-17-58-00-ARC. The complainant believes the respondent was utilizing the term "architect" and or "architectural design" without being licensed and in a manner that was misleading. The complainant included a photo of a title block, which was on a set of plans contained below this business name were the words "architectural design and drafting." The complainant also indicated there were references to the title and work of an architect on a Facebook page associated with the same business.

The facts are that the respondent was contacted and they had questions about the protected language and were provided the RTWs for architects. The respondent advised they would be removing all terminology from their drawings and would not use them in any further advertising. They advised that they do not advertise in any conventional ways. Further investigation of Facebook related to this complaint determined that the last entry was made in July of 2015 and the page does not appear to be actively used as an advertising platform. The respondent explained his intent to remove all references to the architectural profession from his design. They also stated that they do not advertise on Google or Facebook and that they could not control what any third party advertisers included in their site about their business. Recommendation is to close the case with no further actions.

Manley:

And are there any questions for the case manager on this case? It does look similar to many we have gotten in the past. I didn't know it was a problem excuse. If there are no questions and no discussion on this case, I have a motion to accept the case manager's recommendation.

Wu:

Board Member Wu, I move to approve the case manager's decision on this case.

Manley:

Thank you, Board Member Wu.

Roberts:

Board Member Roberts. I second that.

Manley:

Very good. Second from Board Member Roberts. And if there is no further discussion and no further questions on the case, all in favor of accepting the case manager's recommendation, please indicate with an aye.

Board:

Aye.

Manley:

All opposed, nay. And so it looks like this case manager's recommendation is accepted by the board, so thank you. Thank you, Rick. 8.4 is administratively closed cases, which I think this is a new topic, I believe.

Sydney:

This is a standard report that we do provide to some of our other boards. And in an effort to standardize and increase transparency, we're trying to standardize all of the reports to make sure everybody is getting the same information for each of their professions. So Grace kindly put together this administratively closed cases for us. The board has delegated board investigations to staff to administratively closed cases that are not within the board's jurisdiction. The investigation file is sent to a case manager to review and determine that the board does not have any jurisdiction. At this time, the investigation supervisor closes those cases. Since the last board meeting, there have only been two such cases that were administratively closed and Grace is on the call if you had any questions for her.

Manley:

Okay. I think I'm familiar with one of those, Grace. And so it's during this section of the agenda, administrative closed cases, do you generally describe the cases or what happens in the other boards where you do this?

Sydney:

So for the other boards it's simply a report. It's just something that we provide to the boards to show, again, for transparency that those cases have... That there are other cases out there, but if the board isn't seeing them, that's likely because they fall in that administratively closed cases category. For some of our boards, it is a very large category and for others, like with the architects, we have two. So it's not majorly impactful to the board's work, but to again, in an effort for transparency to let the board know that those cases do exist and we are just reporting to the board the number of them. And so normally no action is taken. It's just a report that we provide.

Manley:

Okay.

Roberts:

I have... Oh, sorry.

Manley:

Go ahead.

Roberts:

Well I have two questions about this. Now, first question is, a simple one. So a case manager does see this and agrees that the board does not have jurisdiction. Is that true on all of these cases?

Sydney:

This is, I believe so. Is that correct, Grace?

Grace:

Yes, it is correct. And I will also add that both of these cases were involved, they were civil matters and so that was the situation of why the board didn't have jurisdiction. But yes, it's always still reviewed by a case manager and they're the ones that determines that.

Roberts:

Okay. And so my second question, you almost answered, you've just about answered Grace, but so the type of case that would fall into this category would be things, you said civil or is it not about licensed architects? Or what are generally the types of cases that fall into these categories?

Grace:

So I would say mostly it is the ones that fall under a civil matter, contract dispute, something like that. Another one is when it's a third party title use. If it's like Yelp putting somebody into a category of being an architect or something like that, then it's closed administratively

Manley:

And this is [inaudible 00:42:02].

Thanks Sian. You were going down a similar trail to where my mind was going, in that I think staff makes these decisions we've delegated to staff to make decisions on cases that don't need to have a case manager. So you said, Sydney, I think that all these cases would get... Or Grace, that all these cases would get looked at by a Board Member and I'm not sure that that's entirely necessarily true. If it's something that's clearly not, doesn't rise to the level of having a board member look at it.

If that is the case, if our help is being asked on each of these and helping to make those determinations, I was thinking that there's probably value in a very, very brief recap so that all of the board members can understand why a decision like that was made and what the circumstances were and so forth. And I know in the case that I was shown, it basically was not even under the jurisdiction of an architectural board, it was someone claiming to be an engineer or something like that. I can't remember the details. Any comments on that, Sydney or others?

Sydney:

So if that is something that the board would like to see moving forward, I can work with Grace to see what we are able to do in producing that report. And if we're able to provide a little bit more context as to maybe a category that those cases fall into, if that would be helpful.

Manley:

I guess I'd ask, what do the other boards do? And I'm really hesitant about this because I don't want to be adding more time to an agenda that can sometimes be pretty false. So Rick has his hands up.

Benner:

Yeah, thanks Roch. I guess I would just say we've voted to allow the administrative resolution of these and I would be nervous to some degree where we should bring them back to the board and have a discussion about them as like we're second guessing the administration on the decisions they're making.

So while I appreciate knowing about these, I would just caution that we don't get to where we're bringing forward a list of, "Okay, well here's all the ones that we've determined administratively." If we've already delegated that authority to them. Just from a legal perspective, I'd be nervous about that situation, I guess.

Sydney:

Yeah, typically these are just provided just like it has been here, it's an aggregate report. We don't get into the details, we don't even list case numbers, it's just the number of cases. We do have a couple of boards that have a very high number of complaints that come in, but not necessarily the same high number that make its way all the way to the board. And so to answer the question of, "Okay, well where's that gap? Are the number of cases that come in reflective of the number that the board is actually seeing?" That this report was designed to close that gap for some of those boards. And anyway, we're talking boards that can have 50 cases a quarter.

Manley:

Sian, you have your hand up.

Roberts:

Yeah, sorry, I don't want to belabor this, honestly I don't. But one of the things that Rick said was, I just wanted to make it clear. If something is being administratively closed, are those cases that we fall under the categories that we have delegated? So is that a clear... Okay, so that, thank you. That makes sense to me then.

Manley:

My only question with that is then does staff really need to see them at all when... I'm sorry, do board members really need to see these cases at all if staff is given that right to that delegation to make that determination?

Sydney:

So from my perspective, the determination is still the boards to make. What you've delegated to us is just the ability to close them out without formal board action to say, "Yes, go ahead and close that out." But as far as it coming to a case manager, from my perspective, I see Grace's hand raised, so she can probably answer this far better than I can, but it would be a risk mitigation on behalf of the agency.

Manley:

Okay, and Grace?

Grace:

And I'll just add that prior, we had a timeframe where we used to have a supervisor, and we didn't for a period of time. And so that process of maybe where we started sending them to you guys to get that almost like an approval, just making sure you guys agreed, it developed during that time.

So before that, we didn't, when it was a contract dispute or a third party dispute, or a third party title use things like that, or where it was something where totally outside of the board's, like it's an engineer complaint, we would never bring it to you guys at all.

So that new newer process of having you guys look at it and just say, yeah, you agree started when we didn't have a supervisor. We do now. So if you guys are okay, if that's something you're wanting, we are comfortable with going back to that and just making it a report like this, just as like an FYI. This is how many that we closed, all those cases were within what you guys have delegated to us to close administratively. That's how it's done for the other boards when we have administratively closed cases.

Roberts:

The only reason I would hesitate on that, Grace, is that while I think the things like if it's an engineer or if it's clearly the board has no jurisdiction, that totally makes sense to me. If it's a contractual dispute, sometimes those are messier, they're a little bit more... And I'm not sure how it's determined that something is clearly not within the board's jurisdiction if it's a contractual complaint, because sometimes those can get into whether the architect has been acting according to the law, right? So I guess that would be my one question.

Manley:

I think Elizabeth, you had your hand up.

Elizabeth:

Yeah, I would agree with you, and I would also agree that if just because it's a civil matter doesn't mean that there's an element in there of unprofessional practice. So sometimes you will find that. And I know that in the past, boards have not gotten involved when there's a civil case ongoing because they want to wait and see what happens with the civil matter. But I think that is, it can also be a messy situation. You can go forward with cases even when there's a civil action depending on how egregious the unprofessional conduct might be. So those can be complicated questions. It sounds like things are going to case managers, but if they're not, some of those probably should go to case managers to look at.

Manley:

Thank you and thanks everybody for the comments. My thoughts are, I'm very comfortable with staff having the ability to use discretion on these and to decide when to approach board members with questions and don't feel like we need any further detail than X number of cases were administratively closed.

Any other positions on that out there? So very good. I didn't mean to turn this into a discussion point, but it is new and not what some of us are used to. And Grace's explanation was good. Appreciate that explanation of the change in how staff handles these terms. So, presumably we'll continue with this item as we did today, except it'll just be a report out on numbers in the future.

Sydney:

It'll just be that aggregate report the way that we do the license count report.

Manley:

Okay, very good. So if we continue on the agenda as I believe we should be, item nine is next. Committee task force reports .

Sydney:

On the model law committee, unfortunately this group was not able to meet this quarter. We weren't able to find a date that worked for everyone. So Susan is continuing to work on scheduling that and hopefully we'll have a more detailed report for the next meeting.

Manley:

Okay.

Sydney:

And with the charter, staff is continuing to work toward completion of that charter to get it over to Elizabeth. Unfortunately, the more I've dug in, we've also been working on cleaning up our internal computer drives from our unit. It was broken apart and put in different places with the functional alignment. So trying to find all of the folders. And then with the changes that our unit has had in staffing, we've found that there were several copies of the charter that were more recent than the one we had been working on. And so trying to sort through and find all of the pieces of it to make sure that we are working on the most recent ones. So that did cause a little bit of a delay for the architect charter. We will be getting that put back together here in short order and pull together that committee to review that final document before it comes to the board. So I do apologize for the delay, but I want to make sure that we do it correctly and know we're working from the most recent version of the document.

Manley:

All right, thank you Sydney. Looks like 9.2 is up next and we'll look forward to seeing the work, the report on the model law committee in the charter. Staff reports, Sydney.

Sydney:

Right. So if you want to go to the next page. Our complaint status report as of March 13th, 2023. We have 17 closed cases, two that are currently in investigation, five that are in a management review and for a grand total of 24.

Manley:

Just curious, Sydney, do the administratively closed cases show up as a line item there?

Sydney:

That is excellent question. Grace, I don't know if you happen to know if those might be reflected in here or if not, I can research that with the team that puts those together and report back to the board next time.

Grace:

They should be included in that closed status.

Sydney:

Okay, cool.

Manley:

Yes. Okay, so that's just the balance of five?

Sydney:

Correct. Those are the ones that are currently in a review with a case manager.

Manley:

Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

Sydney:

Moving on to our licensee counts for, I believe I'm looking at instate, we have 6,947. And then Washington only, we have 3,945 licensees currently. And I will not go through reading these names individually, but for the board's awareness, those are our new licensees. And Susan, did you want to review the master action item list?

Susan:

Sure. Set up meeting to review architect law. That one is going to be a standing item and a committee report out. Set up meeting to review delegations, complete. Review website for visibility of the green book, that's currently on hold. Statistics for law exam next winter, working on a management analyst, still in progress.

Sydney:

And Susan, if I could get you to go back up to the cover sheet for us?

Susan:

Yes.

Sydney:

Okay. For our board executives report this go around, the item for reducing lead times on the permitting process. That was an item that came up at the last meeting that staff was asked to review. I did reach out to WABO, I heard back from them just a couple of days ago, sending me to a member of their board to have a more in-depth discussion on what's going on. And unfortunately, I just haven't been able to get that meeting scheduled just yet. So I will bring that back to the board once I have a report for that. With the ICOR members, I did speak with Josh from NCARB, and those board members, or those committee members I should say.

PART 2 OF 5 ENDS [00:58:04]

Sydney:

Members or those committee members I should say, were selected following the normal process for the president for that fiscal year, and it was made up of number of volunteers and staff members for the ICOR group. It is comprised of members from four different organizations, so not only NCARB but

[inaudible 00:58:27] for the landscape architects, NCEES and CIDQ. The folks from our community, from the architect community that are included on that ICOR committee are Wendy, I'm going to butcher the name, I apologize. Wendy Ornelas from Kansas is chairing the steering committee. Bob Calvani from New Mexico. Christina Harding from Alabama. Julie Hildenbrand from Texas. Judith Staley from Arizona, and Brett Foley from Nebraska. There's also a architecture subcommittee comprised of Bob Calvani, Paul Edmeades from Maryland, Mary Morrisette from Colorado, Brad Smith from South Carolina, and Katie Wilson from Wyoming. And I can provide that list to the board for any who would like to reach out to the ICOR committee. Regarding the...Oh...And I see [inaudible 00:59:38] has her hand raised.

Shawn:

Sorry, I thought this was a good time just to interject that I had had a conversation with Bob Calvani or this came up in a different committee meeting about what ICOR was up to. And I will say that I think we have been more focused on engineering discipline overlap and I will say that I think most of their conversations have been related to interior design, which is not as much of an issue in Washington state because we do not license interior designers. So I'm not sure how much we are going to get out of that particular effort. I'm just sort of sharing that as anecdotal information on what I've heard their focus appears to be.

Manley:

Thank you Sian.

Sydney:

So moving on to the distribution of invites for upcoming events. This is one that we are still trying to figure out even amongst staff regarding the NCARB emails that come out. What we think is happening is when NCARB staff members build distribution lists or send lists frequently through their Outlook that it's creating that cache and it's not updating regularly. So we're finding that even amongst staff, there's no regularity in who receives what when. So as I receive items or Susan receives items, we're going to be trying to forward them to all of our board members just to make sure that you see them. We apologize for the duplication if you are seeing those, but we would rather you see it two or three times rather than not at all. And so until we can figure out what the heck is going on with NCARB and their distribution lists, we would just as a precaution, like to continue sending those until we can get that sorted out through them.

And I actually just had that come up within staff members this morning. Somebody who hasn't been working with the architects group for quite a while is suddenly receiving emails again and we can't figure out why. So we're trying. We have had discussions about public [inaudible 01:01:54] reviewing complaint cases. That was an item that has been brought up in several discussions. I reached out to Elizabeth, as well as one of her cohorts in the attorney general's office, and received great feedback from Elizabeth. And so we're looking internally with staff members to continue having those discussions to see how we can bring our public members in as case managers as well. Only concerns so far being wanting to make sure that we have legally defensible expertise on those case by case basis's where we need to have a licensee doing the review just because of the intricacies involved in the case.

So we're looking for avenues on where we can put some definition around cases that can be reviewed by those public members. So as we make progress on that, I will bring back more detailed reports. And



then our hybrid meeting update. Unfortunately from the January meeting, the technology that the department had procured to test out, and try and get our hybrid meetings back, did not work. And we are still reviewing other options that the department can look at purchasing, but any interim staff has shifted our focus and we're looking for a space for the architects group, the fall meeting we would be able to do in a hybrid environment here in Olympia. So as those details become available, we will make sure we get them out to you. It will not be the next meeting in July, but hopefully the following meeting in October that we'll be able to do that hybrid environment. So we apologize for the delay. We were really, really hopeful with the technology that had been procured, but unfortunately when they tested it, it just was not functioning the way that we needed it to. So continuing to explore all of our options.

Manley:

Right. Thank you, Sydney. The staff report. At this point, I think we should go back to item 6 and run through items 6 and 7, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 before we conclude with public comments and our conclusion. Does that make sense? Sydney, perhaps you can jump in talking about our 2023 board priorities and goals.

Sydney:

So given the amount of business that the board still has in this, I can go through all of the presentation again, if the board wishes. However, given the amount that the board still has to get through, I would like to request if it is amenable to the board, that we look at setting a special meeting one hour maybe toward the middle to the end of May, just to have the discussion about the priorities and the goals.

Manley:

Yeah, I think the topic deserves a separate venue of some sort. Sian, you had your hand up.

Shawn:

I just wanted to make the observation that the numbers on the outline on the left for the items that we are looking at and the numbers on the actual document, differ. And so if we could please make sure we are referring to the actual name of the item and not just the number, I think it will help us be able to follow along better. Thank you.

Sydney:

You're muted [inaudible 01:06:04] .

Shawn:

Yes. I had not noticed that you're, you're very observant Sian.

Sydney:

Yeah, so Susan, if we could go to 5.1 on your taps on the left.

Manley:

Which is-

Speaker 2:

There we go.

Manley:

And what's the name of that item?

Sydney:

Okay, on your agenda Mr. Chair, this is going to be 6.1.

Manley:

Okay. So I think we are in agreement that we're going to hold 6.1 for more detailed discussion at a time yet to be decided. Is that what you were recommending, Sydney?

Sydney:

Yes. If the board is okay with that, we'll send out a meeting poll and find a date that works for the middle to the end of May, and have a special meeting, like I said, one hour just to have that priority and goal session. Just our meetings seem to be getting rather filled very quickly.

Manley:

Right. And I, for one, am very much in favor of that approach. Any other comments? Yes, nod your head. Okay. Okay, we'll move to item, I guess it would be 5.2 on the-

Sydney:

6.2 on the actual agenda. I apologize, our tabs on the side are just for us to quick access and when we updated our agenda with board member Benner's [inaudible 01:07:42], that side did not get updated.

Manley:

So first Sian's suggestion, the regional summit report. And I attended, I believe Deb attended, Scott attended and I think, who else attended? Someone else attended. Susan. So seeing, I guess Deb is...

Sydney:

Unfortunately, Deb is on vacation today.

Manley:

Okay, so Susan, it's you and me. And what we'll generally do here is just give a recap of what we heard and saw. And considering that we still have a lot to talk about, I'll try to make this as quick as possible. Overall, it was a good meeting. Despite the fact that it was in a beautiful setting, it was the usual windowless room event. See if I can make sense of my notes. Opening sessions, they did talk about the rolling clock, which I think is a topic that's yet on our agenda so I won't go into that.

Among the highlights was noting that with the addition of the practice exams, they're seeing a 12 to 17% increase in pass rates for groups that they identify as DEI or underrepresented minorities. There's a task force that's analyzed in the meaning of competency for exams because...Oh thumb, got it. There's a task force that's analyzing the meaning of competency for exams. And those of us who have been doing this long enough can recall that the catchphrase used to be, "minimum competency." So I think it's good that

there's a group taking a look at that. And I'm just hitting some highlights here. There was a video presentation on the governance issue. And that's an issue that the board and the governance committee seem to be...They're struggling to communicate as effectively as they can on that. So, they did provide a video for us to watch at the conference. And I quoting John Baker's line in the video, he says, "we are changing the culture of this organization." I know this is also a discussion for later on the agenda when we talk about items, hopefully, we have a chance to talk about this and we're talking about items we're voting on at the ABM.

I mean I've got four pages of notes, hard to recap. A lot of good discussion, a lot of interesting interactions and interchanges. The biggest issue of course was the governance and there was a lot of heated discussion over the proposal to eliminate two of the regions and consolidate them with other regions. There was a lot of discussion over whether the approach was actually going to satisfy DEI issues. There was one point when a young woman, can't remember what state she was from, who was in attendance, a young board member in that state raised her hand, stood up and said, it was in a larger session. She said, "I'm a young mother, a single mother, I can't afford to have an NCARB certificate, so that precludes me," she said, "from looking forward to a board position, unless that changes," and that was telling, I could go on. But Susan, did you have any thoughts about the regional meeting? Things that stuck out in your head?

Speaker 2:

Yes and there was a lot of good discussion that happened mainly primarily about that governance because we know that's a big hot topic and I know they'll be some discussion. And it was eye-opening seeing things that happening in person. So if you haven't been able to attend one of the regional meetings, there's a lot of stuff that's going on at one time, and trying to keep track of all of that was interesting to see and watch that. So, it was nice to be able to go and experience that in person. I know it was a horrible place to have to visit but I mean we survived that.

Looks like Sydney has her hand up.

Sydney:

Mr. Chair, you're muted.

Manley:

I've been trying to start using the mute button so I don't create background noise but you have your hand up, Sydney.

Sydney:

I did. Just to add to what has already been said. I was able to attend virtually and, I don't know what the experience was like in person, but I know there was a lot of great discussion that happened with the virtual attendees. There were a number of states that were not able to send anyone in person. So a lot of those, but a lot of those members took advantage of the virtual attendance and there were a lot of great discussions around both community engagement as well as strategic board management, taking boards through strategic planning, prioritizing setting goals. And so that is a big trend among a lot of the boards just to help bring some of that focus, understanding that the terms are constantly shifting. One that I found very interesting and we were very excited about among staff, was a discussion came up

about board training and the need for more training. And so we were in a position where we could share the trainings that we provided to all of you recently, as well as some of the other ones that we've been working on. And so a lot of those have now been taken and are being reworked and re-implemented for several states that were struggling in that area. So it was nice to be able to share that information and that knowledge from a practice that we're implementing here.

Manley:

Yeah, I know one of the things that came up that could help us in the near future is onboarding and trying to create a more consistent onboarding. I know we've talked about that. Excuse me. Any other thoughts? I wish Deb was here. Deb, and I see both Susan and Sydney nodding their heads. I think Deb really got a chance to see the value of these sessions and how animated the conversation can get and how much information flows. And she was pretty excited about it all by the end of the meeting, and I think she came away with some interesting ideas, not the least of which is questions on the law change that is coming our way because of the rolling five year clock change, and how we might capitalize on that. So sure we'll have some discussions on that down the road. So that's all I had right off bat on the regional summit. Sian?

Shawn:

Yeah, just a quick question. We are going to discuss the proposed, what do you call them, things we're going to vote on later on in this meeting, is that right?

Sydney:

Yes [inaudible 01:17:13]

Shawn:

This is not the time for that. Great, thank you.

Manley:

Very good. So if we can, let's move to 6.3 which is discussion of the Mutual Recognition Agreement and Sydney, I think you're up to bat for this.

Sydney:

I am. As the board will remember at our last meeting there was a discussion about the Mutual Recognition Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom. That agreement has now been fully passed by both NCARB as well as the governing body in the United Kingdom. So that is moving forward for implementation and is ready for the boards to consider approval of. The board did have a number of questions about the MRA, particularly around DEI and a feeling of a lack of inclusivity of the MRA. I did raise those questions with NCARB and I provided the direct response that we received from Josh Batkin with NCARB. But essentially with those DEI concerns, that is a concern for NCARB as well. They are continuing to have those discussions and the indication that I got was, especially as a member board, if that is the will of the board, then it is really important for us to continue being that voice with the NCARB board of directors and making sure that that remains a high priority for them, not just with the UK MRA, but with all of them to make them a little bit more inclusive beyond just the NAV accreditation and the ARB and the NCARB certificate.

As our chair just indicated, it's causing a lot of concerns among licensees across the US, so I don't see that discussion going away anytime soon. I think that will be a continuing discussion for the NCARB board. And so at this time I would just be looking for if the board has any additional questions or if the board would like to look at moving forward with approval we have agenda'd it so that can happen at this meeting if the board wishes.

Manley:

Sian, you had your hand up.

Shawn:

Yeah, sorry, I seem to be monopolizing here today. Apologies. But I did have a question about one of our questions. I think our major question of course is about alternative pathways. I think there's another question in there that was embedded that was maybe a little bit different, which is those who got their licenses before AXP and IDP programs. So does the experience program that those who were licensed prior to those programs being implemented still acceptable to the UK for accreditation?

Sydney:

So I did include that question to NCARB. I didn't receive a direct response on that. I imagine it could be addressed on a case by case basis, but I can raise that concern again as well.

Shawn:

I think it would be good to get a direct answer to that question because there have been a number of experience programs. So there was an experience program prior to IDP that was just didn't have a name, and then there was IDP and now there's AXP. So the fact that they have written AXP would suggest that all others are excluded, which I don't believe is the intent. So I would like to hear a direct response to that question. But that said, my take on this honestly is that I don't see why we would prevent whoever can take advantage of this from taking advantage of it in Washington state and I would urge us all to continue to work towards making this more inclusive as we go forward. But I don't have any problem in approving it personally. That would be my opinion. Are we approving this today, Susan? Or is this just FYI and with there will be it voted on in a different meeting.

Sydney:

No, if the board would like to approve today, you can certainly do so we've a agenda it to allow for that.

Shawn:

Okay.

Sydney:

And I can continue on working on getting that answer and provide it to the board as soon as I have it.

Shawn:

Thank you.

Manley:

Sian, I appreciate your bringing up the AXP question again being one of those who...I don't have a memory of any program that assessed my experience other than letters from former employers and I know some of us are in that category where we were licensed long enough ago. But yes, that's a very good question and I, for one, would like a more definitive response from NCARB on that. Although for me personally, it's not going to impact me either way. And the agreement is already signed. I think the agreement could probably be amended if there was an issue that needed to be expanded or corrected. So I would've no problem voting on this today. Rick, you have your hand up.

Speaker 3:

Yeah, thanks Chairman Manley. I guess the question for me is that it seems like this happens frequently and I'm just somewhat concerned that since we're such a minority of states that have alternative pathways, whether or not there's a real seriousness to pursuing this further or whether it's just one of those of lip service to the state and we're kind of like, "okay," in a situation where if we approve it, we're basically kind of downplaying the importance of alternative pathways? I guess that's just my gut feeling of, how far do we want to go with this? Because in a way I agree with Sian of, "okay, well let's make it affordable for those that can," but it also then just becomes an item that never gets back to it and you just end up with, "this is the way it is."

Manley:

Personally, I'm a little torn on that point. That's a good point Rick. But we have seen NCARB and other jurisdictions change or soften their stances on the requirement for accredited degree and opening up pathways to licensure. So from the standpoint of what is the overall trend? The overall trend seems to be to make licensure more accessible. Maybe the UK and Germany, the EU, maybe they're not feeling it the way we are, and I don't know what to say about that as the two ideologies kind of continue to bump heads. To Sian's point was, as a board we continue to promote and push for broadening pathways to licensure. And is that enough, to your point, is that enough? I'm not sure that's enough, but maybe it's all we've got at this point. Thoughts? Sian?

Speaker 3:

You're mute.

Manley:

Yep, mute Sian.

Shawn:

Sorry, I thought I unmuted, the last time we talked about this, I did mention the fact and I am currently in the UK right now and I am a homeowner in the UK and I'm wondering if I need to recuse myself from this discussion. Although my intent is not to actually get licensed in the UK, I do have close connections. So I guess I'd look to Elizabeth on should I recuse myself from discussion and vote on this particular topic?

Speaker 2:

Well, that's a good question.

PART 3 OF 5 ENDS [01:27:04]

Speaker 4:

Well, that's a good question. I don't think so. I don't see that you're going to gain personally from either way from this. So I think it's worth representing, especially with somebody with that kind of experience. I think it's worth representing your opinion. So I don't see a conflict.

Shawn:

Okay, thank you. So I would offer then one more point and, I guess two more thoughts, one is that we have already approved other MRAs that do have a similar constraint on them. And so I just make it clear that we've already done this so there is precedent. And then also recognize that we have two board members missing today and it feels like this has been enough of a topic of conversation among our board and enough concern expressed. And I appreciate Rick's concerns raised again today that I would also be okay with deferring this until we have a larger number of board members present to discuss. It doesn't feel like we need to do this right away, but I'm ready to vote if anybody wants to go forward right away.

Manley:

Okay. Having heard what everybody has said, I don't think that we're going to bring anything crashing down around us if we don't vote on this today. And I agree that being able to have a fuller discussion with the full board is a good idea. So I'd be in favor of pushing this to the next board meeting. An informal vote maybe? Paul you had-

Speaker 5:

Yeah, member Wu here. My position right now is pretty neutral on this, but I think we can discuss this further. I'll do some more research and talk to people and probably be able to participate in this discussion next week, next meeting. So...

Manley:

Very good. If we're all in, and of course it's not a formal vote, not requiring a quorum or anything to decide to move it to the next meeting, but if we're all in favor of that, let's move onto the next agenda item. But let me ask before we move on, do we need to take a break? Is everybody good with at least maybe pushing through and finishing six. And then if we need to take a break before we jump into seven, which could be a longer item. Okay, let's push forward and at least finish whatever number it is. What number is it, 6.4?

Sydney:

Item 6.4.

Manley:

The rolling NCARB five-year rolling clock policy, this update. Sydney, the floor is yours.

Sydney:

So I apologize to the board, I know I've sent this to you in writing, but I apologize. When we had reached out to NCARB regarding the five-year rolling clock, we didn't realize it was a closely guarded secret even within NCARB itself and most of their staff members didn't know. So two, three weeks after we had our board meeting, I said, "nope, everything we've heard is just a rumor at this point." And they contacted us and said, "hey, the board has voted to terminate the five-year part of the rolling clock policy and Washington has some issues that we'd like to discuss." And we said, "what?" So I do apologize that for whatever reason that information was not relayed to us. We did express some frustrations with the NCARB staff that contacted us and said, "well, for how closely the secret was guarded, it apparently was not guarded closely enough."

So, Washington is one of two jurisdictions that codified the five-year portion of the rolling clock in our RCWs, meaning we have to take legislative action in order for that rolling clock policy to change. We are working with NCARB, and NCARB is working with AIA as well on making those changes. Our [inaudible: 01:31:53] and Illinois are the two that had it codified, but there are a number of other jurisdictions, I think 14 in total, who are not going to be able to implement the five-year rolling clock or the changes to the five-year clock immediately. Some are hoping for later this fall, others it will wait until next year.

So NCARB has made adjustments to how they're providing those notifications to applicants to take the ARE, as well as how they're communicating that in line with each jurisdiction's rules as they are in the moment and as they change and update. Right now, staff's plan and seeking a consensus today from the board on whether or not there's support for this, but staff's plan is to submit legislation next year as an agency sponsor bill to make this change. We feel that it's a very simple change to remove the five-year rolling clock and we can address the policy then in a WAIK update, but we can't do that until the RCW has been changed.

NCARB is moving, for those who have not seen the communications, they are moving from the rolling clock to an exam validity policy. And so it will be the two most recent versions of the ARE in which they will be considered acceptable. And that'll extend that from a five-year rolling policy to anywhere from seven to 12 years, depending on the versions and the changes and how quickly those come up. Right now, nobody is anticipating any changes until 2027 at the earliest I believe. So we are with ARE 5.0 for quite a long time. And so if the board is in support of making that change, and we will continue to have these discussions as we move forward. Unfortunately, by the time we received contact, it was already too far into the legislative session to even try and get anything put through this year. So we do have to wait until next legislative session at the earliest to make this change. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Manley:

Shawn, you have your hand up?

Shawn:

I do, thank you. My only question, I think we should push this forward as quickly as we possibly can, my only question is about if there is a possibility, if there is a need, if we feel like there are other changes that should be made through the legislative committee that we are, has been unable to find the time to meet, whether it would slow the process down or not. It would be nice to put things together in one package, but I understand how important this particular change is to make and I would not want to



jeopardize this change by confusing it with others. So, I guess I'm looking for your opinion on that, Susan.

Sydney:

So from the agency's perspective, running this bill on a single item is much more likely to be put through quickly, easily, with minimal resistance or encountering as few hurdles as possible. If we do keep it focused on this one item, the more in depth we can get, the more changes we're looking to make to the RCW, the more likely those hurdles are to become. Next year is also a short session for our legislature. I believe it's a 60-day session. And so the number of bills that they put through tend to be much more condensed, addressing those single items. If the board would like to discuss any other changes and the committee is able to pull together some of those changes and they're more cleanup oriented, I think we could probably make the argument that while we're doing it, let's clean up whatever needs to be. We just have to make sure that we're strategic in how we put those forward so that we can get the necessary momentum behind them.

Manley:

Sydney, can I ask, can staff put together some sort of timeline for us? Because I'm understanding that this would be, because of the nature of the change, it can be a department initiated change versus it having to come from an outside organization like the AIA or another [inaudible: 01:36:37]. Is that true?

Sydney:

Yes. So the agency is limited on the types of bills that we are able to put forward. Really restricted to what we call cleanup bills, where they're items that are either outdated, antiquated, just didn't make sense when original legislation was passed. For example, we have another commission where the number of board members that are able to be appointed each year don't ever allow for the commission to be full. So cleaning that up where something got eliminated and never put back in, that's the sort of cleanup we'd be looking at. And that's the category that this would fall into. That it's a policy change on a national level and that we're just bringing it in line, bring our statutes in line with the national practice. The more into the weeds we get on the RCWs, the harder it is to make that argument that this is a cleanup bill and we're getting into more territory where AIA would have to run that legislation for us.

Manley:

It sounds like that ends up being kind of a judgment call if you do decide to add items. And that's kind of why I'm asking about a timeline, because if the board or staff was to consider trying to introduce any more housekeeping items or cleanup items, it seems like a really good idea because these opportunities don't come up that often. But b, it would really have to be done timely. It would have to be, project would have to be started immediately.

Sydney:

It would have to be started immediately. I can put together a timeline and email that out to the board, that way it's not waiting until June, because we would have to have that committee moving as quickly as possible. I think realistically we would have to have any recommendations wrapped up probably by October to move forward with agency sponsored legislation.

Manley:

So I guess there's another one for the to-do list.

Sydney:

Yes.

Manley:

Okay. Anything else on 6.4, 5-year rolling clock? Elizabeth, you have your hand up.

Elizabeth:

Yes, so just a quick question for Sydney. I have another meeting, I apologize, is there something else that you think would involve legal advice?

Sydney:

I don't believe so.

Elizabeth:

Okay. Well, I apologize everybody, I have two meetings happening at the exact same time today, so I'm going to try to go give some input on the other meeting. But thanks everybody. Have a great day.

Manley:

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you Elizabeth. Great I think that wraps us up on all of item six, unless anyone else has something to add at this point.

Shawn:

I'd just say that I do know a lot of people who've been caught by this five-year rolling clock and it is a barrier, so I recognize it as such.

Manley:

Yeah, I agree that it's moving the right direction on NCARB's part. It's just unfortunate we're caught up in the difference in our laws. So let's see, navigating the revised agenda, looks like we're jumping to item seven, an election of officers. Wait, we already did that.

Sydney:

You should be on 7.2.

Manley:

7.2, yes. Item 7.2. So I think Sydney you're taking the floor on this one

Sydney:

Just to leave this discussion, but really I'm going to be relying on the board for a lot of input. I did provide the slate of officers that is up for election this year. We will need some direction as there are two candidates for both treasurer and secretary, on the way that the board would like to vote on those.

And then there are a number of resolutions that we can run through at that time. But the more immediate issue that we need to address is confirming attendance at the annual meeting, so that we can then figure out delegate and alternate.

Manley:

Okay, great. Very good. Well, I think the first question in my mind is attendance and who is able to, willing, and plans to be there. I know Scott has said he will be there. [Inaudible: 01:41:49]

Speaker 5:

Again, what date is that, June...?

Sydney:

June 15th through the 17th, so traveling the 14th through the 18th.

Speaker 6:

No.

Shawn:

I am planning to attend. I believe that NCAR will fund me because of my committee chair position. I'm required to be there for a workshop.

Manley:

I, for one, get a lot out of these meetings. I would go if it makes sense in the larger picture for me to go, but I wouldn't want my going to that meeting to preclude someone else's going who either hasn't been to a meeting, to one of these meetings, or has a longer future out ahead of them on the board than I do. So where do you stand, Paul?

Paul:

I can't get away.

Manley:

[Inaudible: 01:43:06] Okay.

Paul:

I'm sorry, yeah.

Manley:

Yeah. And Susan...?

Susan:

I think I'm going to just attend this one virtually. I've got some stuff I'm doing in June that I'm not sure I can make this, so I don't want to commit to it and then not be able to go.

Manley:

Right. And we have Erica not present.

Sydney:

And we have been in contact with Erica and she's trying to confirm with her work schedule whether or not she'll be able to attend.

Manley:

Okay, okay. So right now the only certainties are Shawn and Scott. So as far as-

Shawn:

And I think we're both funded alternatively, so it sounds like we probably have enough room for everybody who wants to and is able to attend. Is that right, Susan?

Sydney:

Yes, we do.

Manley:

Yeah, I'm just hesitant to do we vote on, I think we vote... Yes, we take action. It's an action item on declaring the delegate and an alternate. And we have to know that that person will be there presumably in order to make that vote. So at this point we know for sure that you, Shawn, and Scott will be present. So it's starting to shape up that way as terms of an alternate, a delegate. I probably will be there, but I don't myself, I don't need to be a delegate or an alternate. So Sydney, do you think it would be appropriate to have that vote at this point?

Sydney:

Yeah, absolutely. And that is something that we do need to submit ahead of time with the registration is who the delegate and alternate will be. So yeah, I think we can go ahead and do that.

Manley:

Okay. And Shawn, you're comfortable with either position?

Shawn:

I am, I would suggest that maybe Rick you be the delegate, as the chair of our board, and I would be happy to serve as the alternate.

Manley:

But I think Scott is the chair. Is that true?

Shawn:

[Inaudible: 01:45:56]

Manley:

In June?

Shawn:

Oh, Scott will be the chair. Oh, that's right. Okay.

Manley:

So I'm still thinking Scott delegate and Shawn alternate if that makes sense to everyone.

Shawn:

I'm good with that as well.

Manley:

All right, all right. Well if there are no other comments on the delegate and the alternate to the 2023 NCARB ABM, all in favor of a slate of Scott as delegate and Shawn as alternate, please indicate by saying aye.

Shawn:

Aye.

Manley:

Aye. And opposed, nay. Okay, very good. So congratulations, Shawn, you are the alternate and Scott will be, I'm sure you won't be too surprised, but great. So is this, Sydney, do you think this would be a good time for discussion on the big item, the big voting item at, I know we have no other time other than this meeting if we're going to have any further discussion on the governance changes at all. Would you see that fitting into the agenda now?

Sydney:

Yes, that is the intent. Understanding that the way NCARB's resolutions process works, those resolutions can change up to the moment that they are voted on. So with that whatever position the board decides to take, declaring an intent one way or the other as far as the direction you would like to see the vote go in, just to provide that direction to the delegates in case those changes happen. And I can go through each of the resolutions. Three of them, I don't think anybody is going to have an issue on, they're basically cleanup resolutions that have been submitted by NCARB, getting rid of very old or antiquated or confusing, conflicting language within the NCARB bylaws. We did include those in case anybody had any questions on them, but I don't think anybody would have too much heartburn over them.

Resolution 2023 A is a resolution that's been submitted by the Mississippi State Board of Architecture to align NCARB's model law more closely with their state law.

I do understand that from a meeting that I was able to sit in earlier this week for region six, that that resolution is undergoing some minor changes. It doesn't sound like it'll change too much from the current, but still would be nice if the board indicated affirmatively one way or the other, which way you would like to vote. The big one will be, as Chairman Lee has indicated, the governance package that is still going through changes.

We don't know what that final resolution is going to look like. And I know that makes it very hard for the board to indicate one way or another on a vote at this moment. An option that we could have is with

that goal setting session, I can bring an item back to specifically look at the governance resolution in that snapshot of a moment at the end of May. Hopefully we'll be closer to what that final resolution is going to look like at that point, and then allow the board to make that determination with the most up-to-date information we'll have at that point. I think that's the closest we'd be able to get.

Manley:

Okay. Rick, you had your hand up for a bit.

Rick:

Well, thanks. I was going to mention the May special meeting too. So...

Manley:

Yeah.

Rick:

You've already hit it, thank you.

Manley:

Great. And I agree, especially if we're able to put out any updates and keep it present on our mind or point to any items that it would serve the board to look at more closely that between now and then, that would be a good idea. It will be nice for us as a board to have a more uniform outlook on this thing. And I kind of think that we do. I know we're all interested in the DEI benefits that they're proposing come with this proposed change. I kind of have questions on how that's going to actually work. I'm sure we all have some questions like that or other similar questions.

Sydney:

[Inaudible: 01:51:17].

Rick:

Go ahead.

Sydney:

Oh, I apologize. I was just going to mention, I believe the NCARB board is meeting at this very moment. So hopefully, I know they're supposed to be reviewing the survey results from the survey that went out to everybody on this issue, so I imagine any changes that they want to make based on those will be forthcoming in the next couple of weeks.

Rick:

Yeah, and I just wanted to remind folks that haven't gone through this before that if you don't vote or make a decision at one of these meetings, then you can't do a forum discussion when you get to the meeting or prior to that about how you want the committee or the delegation to vote. It really has to be done in a public meeting process. So...

Shawn:

Yeah, if we [inaudible: 01:52:15]

Paul:

If we don't decide today, we have to decide the next meeting.

Shawn:

Yeah, I'm very much in favor of a special meeting. This is a complicated issue and one that has had a lot of discussion. And if there are, I'm almost certain there will be changes to it and I feel like our board really should have the opportunity to discuss it together and hopefully with our missing board members here as well.

Manley:

Absolutely, absolutely. So as for, I think Sydney, you had the other items that you wanted to give us a chance to get our feedback on, which in my mind I've read them, it's all clean up, housekeeping items, pretty pet and dried. And then the Mississippi is basically as you, to paraphrase what you just said, it's Mississippi wanting the rest of NCARB to conform to its state law, which is interesting.

Sydney:

It is interesting. And with that one, one thing NCARB has been very clear about is because Mississippi is a member board member, any resolution that they propose automatically moves forward for vote regardless of any feelings, thoughts, anything, the board doesn't get to review it just goes forward. So yeah, I would ask that the board approve a slate of officers that the delegate gets to vote on, particularly the treasurer and secretaries. Those are the only two that are being challenged this year, the rest are all single candidates. And then if we could confirm one way or another on each of the first four resolutions, we'll bring back the governance resolution at that special meeting in May.

Manley:

I guess kick off the conversation on the treasurer and secretary positions. It's interesting to see treasurer. We've got two very familiar names and they're all somewhat familiar. But we know a second runaround for both Richard McNeel and John Rademacher, and I think they're both successful in their earlier terms. As for secretary, I haven't read the bio, I should have read the bios, but I know Sylvia has gone through region six, but I don't know that she's gone through before in the NCARB board. Anybody have a better understanding of that than I do right now? Do you recall, Rick, at all?

Rick:

I-

Manley:

Probably reading [inaudible: 01:55:41].

Rick:

I don't recall whether she's done national, but I would recommend Richard and Sylvia, but I leave that to other board members.

Sydney:

I'm in agreement on Sylvia.

PART 4 OF 5 ENDS [01:56:04]

Shawn:

I'm in agreement on Sylvia. I'm honestly, probably don't know enough about Richard and John, but would trust my fellow board members' recommendation there.

Manley:

And I wish I knew more about the initiatives and the direction they implemented during their previous terms. But unfortunately, mostly it's a personality familiarity I have with Richard and John. And I would characterize Richard as more personable, outgoing. John maybe is more of a in-the-weeds personality, and that may not be accurate. I'm fine with either. This may be Richard's last run at this, and so I'm fine with looking at Richard for secretary. I don't know Lenora. I don't know much about her, and I should have read the packet on this, but I'm afraid I did not. Sylvia, I think it would be fine. That's where the board wants to be going. I wish I knew a little bit more about Lenora, though, as Rick said. Rick.

Rick:

Well, I did have a question in a way on Lenora, she's a candidate for both treasurer and for Region 5 director?

Sydney:

That is correct.

Rick:

Is that normal, where they hold both? Or can hold both positions?

Sydney:

I am going to defer to the board. Unfortunately, I don't have the historical knowledge on that.

Manley:

And I don't know, Rick. That's a good question. It seems, and from what I've seen and heard, when you take on that board position, especially the executive committee on the NCARB board, that pretty much becomes your life. So I couldn't see anyone doing both roles.

Rick:

Yeah, I find that odd. That's, for me, it's just...

Manley:

Paul, do you have any thoughts?

Paul:



No, I'm an outsider in this case with the NCARB and still trying to get into it, learn more as I go along, so. I will try to find out more before I can make any statements.

Manley:

And Susan, I know you're new to the personalities and their backgrounds as well.

Susan:

We did get the pitch, I guess you can say, at the regional meeting. And I do agree with your assessment of Richard and John. Richard is based from Mississippi, so you can imagine the good personality, laid back. But it is hard to just look at them or hear a short spiel and try to make a decision without knowing their background and some of the things that their mission that they're doing. So it's a tough decision. And though I would say you probably can't go wrong with either choice there.

And I, also, Paul, kind of in the same way, I'm not quite sure how the board members work, to be secretary and a region director. I don't know how that would play out. I was thinking that the directors could run for an office and then hold both in my head, so I'm not quite sure how that worked. But again, they both had really good messages, so it's hard to determine.

Shawn:

And can I ask those who attended? And so I guess that would be Susan and Rock, who were at Regional, because we didn't get to hear the pitch, and unfortunately when I'm attending remotely I always get pulled in a million directions, so I was unable to listen as well. So I guess were there any sort of things that these candidates expressed about what they hoped to accomplish in their terms that was differentiating or might suggest that one might be able to accomplish more than another or be committed to something that we believe is important in our state?

Manley:

I did jot down some notes to your point, John, and I'll just pass along their impressions. And I don't think in that short time any of the candidates were able to offer specific ideas on initiatives that they wanted to move forward or anything like that, but it was more about characterizing their approach. And let's see, starting from the top, my note on Richard was that his comments were tied to the position of his treasury duties. So his comments were appropriate in that they were about the position he was running for, which, treasurer. What do I have for...? I don't have anything down for... Oh, I do have something down for John. I'm sorry.

I have in John that there was substance in what he said about advocacy and that his spiel wasn't as much focused on him as it was on others and ideas and leadership were. I liked what Richard had to say, but I also liked what John had to say. And as far as Sylvia and Lenora, I only had that Lenora was on the enforcement committee. I'll have to look that up. I didn't know we had an enforcement committee. And for Sylvia I have that her talk was all about Sylvia, so it was more... I didn't really get any impression of what she would be introducing, interjecting into the leadership, but it sounded like she has a lot of very good things that she has done in her career, and it was about Sylvia.

So those are my impressions. And leaving those sessions, those visits from the candidates, I have to say I'm comfortable. I was comfortable with Richard. John spoke a much more... What were the words?

Advocacy-based, outward-looking presentation. And Lenora's seemed... I didn't get much out of Lenora's. And Sylvia did seem to be all about Sylvia. Those were my impressions.

Shawn:

Well, I would just say that in support of Sylvia, it is always nice to have someone from your region represented on the executive committee. And I know that our region has particular way of looking at things that I believe that our state is aligned with.

Manley:

And I could support Sylvia based on that and based on the issue of running for two offices at once with Lenora. And based on, I just didn't get much out of what Lenora presented. I should have read her bio. I didn't have time to read the bios. So I suppose I would favor, especially if that's what others on the board are looking at, I would favor Richard and Sylvia for those two contested positions. He's nodding.

Shawn:

I would agree. Understanding that of course it will ultimately be up to the delegate. And who knows what might happen in the meeting that might change somebody's mind.

Manley:

Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. So I think we've met our goal there. I don't think we do any voting on this. Sydney, am I correct?

Sydney:

Correct. We would just the indication on which way you want the delegate to vote is enough.

Manley:

Okay. And then, moving on the housekeeping issues. Yeah, they all seem necessary. They seem like most of them had to do with some very old changes to how NCARB operates that were reflected in the bylaws. It was. And then as far as the Mississippi proposals, I don't think there's any reason to let that tail wag that dog. I didn't see anything substantive in what they were offering to put it in a more substantial way.

Speaker 7:

Agreed.

Manley:

Oh, our alternate delegate. You feel like you have a good idea of where the board's headed?

Shawn:

Yes, I do. And I agree.

Manley:

Okay. So I think, we've... Sydney, have we satisfactorily completed item 7.2 on the agenda?

Sydney:

I believe so. And I took notes to pass to Mr. Harm.

Manley:

Alright. Okay. Let's see. The outreach. I have next on my agenda, the 7.3 report from AIA outreach event?

Sydney:

Correct.

Manley:

All right. That is-

Sydney:

I've been talking a lot, so I'm going to ask Paul to give the...

Paul:

Yes. The board member, Wu, Sean and I attended their meeting on March the 15th. Is informal gathering of young candidates for architecture, and there's some pretty interesting discussions. And of course the rolling clock became one of the topics, and subsequently I got the information from NCARB and forward it to their group. Hopefully, that will help answer some of their questions. So other than that, it was a good meeting, good representation from the board.

Shawn:

And Sydney was present virtually? Sydney, any words of wisdom from that encounter?

Sydney:

Note same. That board member we just indicated the big topic of conversation was the five-year rolling clock. I don't think anybody in the room was up against that clock but wanting to make sure that they didn't come close to it. So they definitely indicated that was a big concern for them. Another interesting concern was licensing across different jurisdictions. And so board members, Roberts and Wu, were able to give some really great information on how to approach that from the professional standpoint. And also gave us, the staff members, some really great insight on some literature to put together and especially as we're working on gearing up our outreach and engagement pieces for the agency where a lot of those concerns are. So it was really enlightening.

Paul:

While we're on the topic of outreach, I want to let the board know that I'm in touch with the NOMA, the UDub chapter, student chapter of the Minority Architects Group. These are the group of students. I happen to be working on a very interesting project in Kirkland as for the IMAN Center master plan and for their addition and renovation. So I invited the group of architectural students. These are mainly from their NOMA group students. Try to mentor them through this project, so this may become part of their curriculum as part of their school projects. So there are 10 of them that's in this group, and I still haven't

figured out how to deal with the academic's portion of this, but I did offer as a mentor to some of them if they want to follow through the project. And tomorrow is a big day, the celebration of EID, that all these students will be there attending a service, which I think, I don't think any of them have that kind of experience before. So I'm looking forward to that.

Manley:

Nice.

Shawn:

I'll also, actually, mention that Paul and I did speak with the president of NOMA here Northwest. And they gearing up for an ARE support group. They're trying to pull together some funding to be able to help support NOMA members through the ARE. And at any rate, they're thinking that might be a good engagement point for the board when that gets up and running, which they're hoping to get up and running sometime in the next few to six months, somewhere in that arena. So we're in touch, but right now there's no appropriate venue, but one should be coming along pretty soon.

Manley:

You've brought up the outreach question. And the traditional method of outreach for us has been going to the two credited universities, and I'm hoping that there's some way that we can engage with... Washington State always seems to be more open to it versus University of Washington, but if there's some way that we could reconnect with those universities and have even a virtual session where they're either invited to, and the school sets up a room where they can be a part of our meeting as a guest participants, guests in the background, something just to make that connection.

During this NAB visit, it came up that I think it was 25% of the master's students in the program were in AXP. And I'm recalling a visit to WSU, probably, maybe eight, 10 years ago where there were only one or two of out of 50 students who are even aware of AXP and were familiar with the path to licensure. So there's a lot of work to do there. I don't know if WSU or UDub have AXP advisors both on staff and the student AXP advisor, but.

Shawn:

I don't know if that's a thing. But they certainly have professional practice professors who help students understand what they need to be doing. And of course, NCARB goes out and sees these schools, if not every year, every other year. And I think it's been problematic that they haven't alerted us to their visits in the past in a regular way so that we can join them and to show unified front. We've done that once or twice, but they seem to keep forgetting that they should be inviting us as well. So maybe that's something we can do better in the future is make sure that we are joined at the hip with them when they go and talk to the students at both of those universities.

Manley:

It would be good to show a unified front, and it would be good for their awareness that the board exists at the universities. And maybe that's something we bring up in conversations in the hallways with Mike and Josh and others. We can bring that up in June. June?

Sydney:

And we can also add this as an item to the next meeting for the board to get a little bit more of an in-depth discussion on how you want to look at tackling that. And I think over the summer will be the perfect opportunity for that because it'll be in-between sessions for those universities. And then we can look at launching something in the fall.

Manley:

And I think what I learned was the university is supposed to have an AXP supervisor. And I was told, although I haven't verified this, that there's also supposed to be a student position, AXP coordinator or super, I'm not sure what the term is that they use, coordinator, but there's supposed to be a student position as well. And I don't know if that's the case at every school. It'd be nice to find that out about our two state schools.

Shawn:

Yeah, that would be a good question for NCARB, too if exactly, if that's a required thing. Or because when I think of an AXP supervisor, I think of somebody who's approving ours.

Manley:

Right.

Shawn:

That's what a supervisor is in my experience so far.

Manley:

Yeah, There's mentor, supervisor, coordinator, and I'm not sure which label gets used here. Good. How have we done on item 7.3? Any further?

Sydney:

We are done.

Manley:

All right, very good. We've completed items 8 and 9, and we're moving on to item 10, public comment. And Sydney, do you introduce the idea of public comment or is that something I'm supposed to be doing?

Sydney:

Whichever you prefer.

Manley:

Okay. Why don't you field this one?

Sydney:

Okay. For public comment, the public may address the board on matters within the board's jurisdiction, either verbally at the meeting or by submitting written comments. The board is limited to directing staff

to study the matter further or requesting that the matter be rescheduled for discussion and consideration at a later date. Members of the public who address the board verbally are limited in time to one three-minute comment. In lieu of a verbal comment, individuals may submit their comment in writing at least two days prior to the meeting by emailing DOL boards at [dol.wa.gov](mailto:dol.wa.gov). Written comments are limited to no more than 500 words and will be read by staff during this portion of the meeting. We have not received any written comments at this time,

Manley:

And as Sydney has stated, if there are any members of the public in attendance who wish to comment, this would be the time to step forward.

Okay, I hear none, which takes us to item 11, which is the concluding points of the meeting. 11.1 is announcements, and this is a chance for new items that the board or board members may wish to bring up or any announcements of activities that we board members have been doing. I think, for my part, I've mentioned the NAB engagement when it's come up earlier in the meeting, and I know Rick was active with NAB.

I responded to an email that came out just before the regional summit, and I got back an almost immediate response that saying that I was on a NAB-visiting team. So that was interesting, and it all went very quickly and very fast, and it was very intense, and the actual team visit was last week. And except for the pace and the work level, it was of quite a wonderful experience working with the team and getting to know a school's entire program from stem to stern quite intimately. As you'll remember, Rick. That was my announcement. Anyone else have an announcement?

Paul:

I suppose I have jumped the gun on my announcement, which is the involvement with the NOMA chapter, UDub chapter, student chapter on prospective mentorship and encouragement of young architects and especially the minority architects, so. That was my announcement.

Manley:

And it's pretty cool, Paul, that you're getting engaged in potentially in that your project becoming part of a curriculum activity for those students. That that's-

Paul:

Thank you.

Manley:

... good. If there are no other announcements or additional reports. Are there any requests for future agenda items? Anything we haven't discussed yet that someone would like to request for the next meeting? And if there are none, 11.3 is action items and items for the next meeting that Susan, that's you're up to bat on that?

Susan:

Yes, I am. So it looks like I will be scheduling a meeting at the end of May to discuss the goals and make a decision on the governance resolutions for the NCARB business meeting. Staff will reach out to NCARB

for a more direct answer about the APX and the IDB question with the MRA. Staff will put together a timeline for the five-year rolling clock or possible cleanup bill, and Sydney will email out to the board. And then there were two agenda items. The MRA, the vote for the MRA was deferred to the next meeting, and we will be adding the outreach discussion with the universities. If there was something I missed, I'd be happy to add it, but I believe that's it.

Manley:

Can't think of anything you missed just now, so that's good, complete. If there's anything else from anyone, if not, we move on to item 12, which was adjournment of the meeting. The time is now 12:27, and the meeting is adjourned.

Sydney:

Okay. Thank you everyone.

Paul:

Thank you. Thank you everyone.

Susan:

Thank you.

PART 5 OF 5 ENDS [02:24:38]