

Chair Scott Harm:

There's no objections? Seeing none, I'll call to order the May 30th meeting of the Washington State Board of Architectural Registration. I'm going to call to order. It's now two o'clock in the afternoon and I will call the regular meeting of the Architect Board to order. The board will provide an opportunity for the public comment during this meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage all participants to mute their mics or phones when they're not actually speaking to reduce the background noise when others are indeed speaking. Please remember to unmute your mic or give us a giggle or phone when you are speaking. Also, for board members to help us capture the information correctly, please state your name when making any comments. Thank you very much, with a happy smiley face. Susan at this time, would you please do a roll call for the board members? Please respond if you are in attendance. Each of you.

Susan:

Chair Harm?

Chair Scott Harm:

Here.

Susan:

Vice Chair Cooley?

Vice Chair Cooley:

Here.

Susan:

Secretary Wu?

Secretary Paul Wu:

Here.

Susan:

Board Member Benner?

Board Member Rick Benner:

Here.

Susan:

Board Member Loynd?

Board Member Erica Loynd:

Here.

Susan:

This transcript was exported on Jul 26, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Board Member Manley said that he would not be attending. He has an excused absence. And then Board Member Roberts?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

I am here. Thank you.

Chair Scott Harm:

Great. Yeah, I remembered Board Member Manley saying that he couldn't make it. Let's see. We have an agenda before all of us. Do I have a motion to approve by anyone? Remember, state who you are first and then state if you're making a motion.

Bueller? Bueller?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

This is Board Member Roberts and I move that we accept the agenda of the meeting.

Chair Scott Harm:

Do I have a second?

Board Member Erica Loynd:

I second. And this is Erica, or Board Member Loynd.

Chair Scott Harm:

Thank you very much. Great. So we have a motion to approve the agenda. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor... I'm going to try... Is it okay if I do a... The other ones I do a hand wave because I think we're all on there. All those in favor of the motion to approve the agenda, please indicate by raising your hand. Is this okay? Oh, there you go. Do the computer hand. That's even better. Does the staff see any problem with us doing the computer hand?

Sydney:

If we could just follow up with a vote that would help us capture it in the transcription.

Chair Scott Harm:

So, still do the-

Sydney:

Yeah, the hand raise isn't caught by transcription.

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay, well then I'll sit corrected and we'll just stick with the yay and nays.

Sydney:

Perfect, thank you.

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay. Let it be documented that the motion passed unanimously with no nays for this specific meeting. Old business board priorities and goals. There's a note for me, Sydney, that this may be continued. Is that true?

Sydney:

Yeah, this is a continuation and the reason that this meeting was initially set was to go over the board goals. The board previously set some priorities that you would like to focus on for the coming year. And so this is just to drill down the specific action items that the board would like to pursue. And yes, if the board does not reach a consensus on these today, we can continue this item and we'll have it as kind of a standing item once these are set with the action item just for the board to refer back to regularly throughout the year.

So, I will go ahead and steal the screen from Susan.

Chair Scott Harm:

Oh, there we go.

Sydney:

[inaudible 00:04:00] Everybody back up so I can see. So, these are the priorities that the board previously set. Establishing a calendar of regular items to be reviewed on an annual basis every two years, every five years, whatever the case may be. Reviewing the board authorizations more regularly. When annual planning should occur, which I will let the board know our preference as staff would be the end of every year to at least touch base on these priorities, see if anything needs to shift. Be able to check the boxes on what goals have been accomplished or make adjustments as we're working through them and be able to adjust as we go.

Looking at the impact of diversity for licensure and how board criteria matches education currently being provided. Under outreach, looking at the benefits of licensure to grow the industry, increasing diversity, and working with partner groups and then demystifying licensure. So, I wanted to review these really quick, see if the board wanted any adjustments to these or if there were any glaring things that you wanted to have added. And if not, we'll pull this over to the goal setting so we can drill down and get some of the specific boxes to look at for this year. Was there anything anybody wanted added, adjusted?

Chair Scott Harm:

This is Chair Harm for the record. I'm always interested in increasing the outreach as much as we possibly can feasibly wise, I don't know what budgets get involved, but going to the universities and even in the vo-tech schools or trade schools, especially trying to get a more diverse group.

I've got to take a three-minute break. I'm sorry. I guess my wife locked herself out of the house so I've got to go let her in.

Sydney:

So, I guess with Chair Harm stepping away, if there were any other items that anybody wanted to discuss with the priorities, we won't move on, but...

Board Member Erica Loynd:

I would just second that I agree with them. And as kind of a licensure advisor for the past many years, that's something that people were really looking for as well, getting the industry to grow and kind of different backgrounds of people coming. A lot of people who do different types of design wanting to become architects has been popular and good.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah, I'm back. I'm sorry for that interruption. I don't know what I missed.

Board Member Erica Loynd:

Just echoed you or kind of elaborate a little bit.

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay. Yeah, especially with the diversity goal, I think we just need more outreach to get people to apply, to get, excuse me, I know what's going on with my voice, to get more people to apply to be on the board or at least being interested in what we're doing. Maybe calling somebody out with Sian's input or maybe even Paul more outreach with the AIA to help [inaudible 00:07:27] because looking at this from my new board of directors level, there's this groundswell of how do we get more people on state boards to help fuel the diversity, equity, and inclusion. So, that's one thing I've always been interested in. Plus being an advocate for alternative pathways to licensure. I think it does ourselves a favor by getting out as much as we possibly can. So, that's myself only. Yes, I have a hand raise by Mr. Benner.

Board Member Rick Benner:

Thanks, Scott. The only one I would wonder about is it says benefits of licensure to grow industry and I'm not sure our responsibility as the board is to grow industry. I would agree with the benefits of licensure, but I'm not sure about the other part of that sentence.

Board Member Erica Loynd:

This is Board Member Loynd. I remember when we brought this up, part of it was there's a lack of, or sometimes there's people who feel like they get pushed out of our industry because it's complicated to get into. It doesn't have the benefits that they're looking at. And so we've been losing people growing in the architectural industry. And so it wasn't so much to grow industry in particular, it was to grow our architectural pool of people and get more people to find the path to licensure and architecture beneficial.

Chair Scott Harm:

Anyone else?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Well, could we say to grow candidate pool or to open candidate pool or something like that?

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

And I wonder if we could say increasing diversity of candidates and the board.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yes, I agree. I was trying to spot it.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

I'm trying to remember. I remember the discussion about the authorizations. So, we were talking about looking at those on an annual basis so we understand what we're responsible for and what staff is responsible for. So, I'm just going to echo my feeling that we should be more aware of that on an ongoing basis, the board.

Chair Scott Harm:

Absolutely agree. Then Sydney, you said staff on the annual planning prefers December timeframe, is that correct?

Sydney:

Yeah. What we're looking at is the last meeting of the year have this discussion. One, it's usually the lighter agenda for all of our boards at the end of the year. But then that also just sets the tone to start the new year out fresh.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah, I think that makes sense. Unless we ran into a situation where there's more than a couple of us that are out for whatever reason, holidays or whatever, vacations. But yeah, I think that that makes perfect sense. Okay, any other discussion? This doesn't require any kind of a motion if I remember correctly. Is that correct?

Sydney:

Nope. So, then what we will do, take those priorities over here. If I could stop hitting buttons on the keyboard. Pull these over here into the priority and drill those down into specific goals. We somehow lost Paul. So, understanding that those priorities are going to be a little bit more of the more overarching umbrella that the board wants to steer the ship in the direction of, this is to drill down understanding we only have two regular meetings left for the year. So, drilling down specifically things that the board would like to check the boxes of to move in that direction for the coming year, understanding two meetings from now, we'll be setting new goals for 2024.

So, if there are specific things you guys would like to see. For example with outreach, if you would like to look at hitting the universities or the colleges this fall, setting up outreach events there. If we wanted to work on the building officials again for their October meeting. If you guys are wanting to establish a calendar that we can bring back to the board, including the authorizations and just the standard things that the board looks at on a regular basis, we can make that a goal. So, just things like that. What are the goals you guys would like to see?

Chair Scott Harm:

That's stuff to be worked on throughout this year. Is that right, Sydney?

Sydney:

Yeah, stuff that we'll work on for the rest of this calendar year. And then understanding setting new goals for 2024.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yep.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

I would suggest, I think we've been doing a pretty good job of continuing on our outreach without a plan or a specific goal because it's been a goal anyway. We've been kind of out and about and talking about what we do and I think we'll want to create a plan for next year obviously. But I think it would be good to get our organizational house in order. And so there's a couple of things here on the priorities. One is establishing a calendar for regular items to be reviewed and the other is when should annual planning occur? Authorizations reviewed regularly. So, I just wonder if we shouldn't really develop a good strong annual plan for what we do, when and if that could help. If we can do that by the end of this year, then we can start implementing it in future years. What does everybody else think about that?

Secretary Paul Wu:

It's good to me. Paul, [inaudible 00:14:10].

Chair Scott Harm:

Paul, we're losing your microphone.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Oh, we can't quite hear. You're awfully quiet.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Can you hear me now?

Chair Scott Harm:

No, just tiny.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

You're very quiet.

Secretary Paul Wu:

[Inaudible 00:14:22].

Chair Scott Harm:

So, we're answering yes, we can hear you. But it's like you're the whisperer.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Last time I did this...

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah, it's still not... Well, while Paul's working on it, I like the idea of very much as far as more detailed planning, especially since I'm wrapping my head around my board of directors obligations. I just got done infilling my calendar for the remainder of the year through June of next year. So, anything we can do to add even proximity of dates or allocation of dates and things like that would be great.

I continue to be a proponent of the building officials meeting. I don't need to keep going, but I think it's something that each of us that went this year found pretty rewarding and enjoyable and a good outreach opportunity. And then again, sticking with the regulars. I don't even know, does NOMA, National Organization of Minority Architects, NOMA, do they have chapter organization? Sian, I'm picking on you. Do you happen to know that? Is that something we could reach out? We could add to the reach out to kind of a thing?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Yeah, we've already reached out to them actually, Scott and we had, Paul and I had a meeting with the president. They're talking, there's a particular program that they're taking on right now, which is to try to develop scholarships for people taking their license and to help people, minority candidates be able to afford to take the exams. And so they're going to be pushing to create these scholarships and doing some fundraising and they're thinking that that would be a good opportunity to kind of dovetail one of our presentation from us. So, they're thinking about the right timing but it wasn't right now when we talked to them.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah. Okay great. So, Deborah, you had your hand up and then Paul will go to you. So, Deborah.

Deborah:

First off, good afternoon everyone. Thanks for this is really wonderful to be able to set these priorities. I just wanted to ask if you could include some contact information for NOMA and AIA to staff because one of this is our DOL internal priority that we're setting is to increase diversity on our boards. And as you know with Rick Benner leading, we are going to be needing to fill that position and we would really love to be able to reach out to some of these organizations. We're also working on, the governor has a task force for small businesses that we'll be reaching out to. So, we're trying to figure out as many possible ways to get the message out that we're recruiting for a board position as we possibly can. So, contact information that you have, please share that with Susan and Sydney so that we can reach out to those organizations.

Chair Scott Harm:

In my little soapbox so they get on in an annual basis as I would love to find representation for the east side of the state.

Deborah:

Absolutely.

Chair Scott Harm:

This transcript was exported on Jul 26, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

A double clicker that's one of them and then something else. So, all things being equal, I personally would lean towards the east state representing because we're just lowly lacking in that one. Paul, you're next up.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Yes, Board Member Wu. I did have a couple meetings capital [inaudible 00:18:15].

Chair Scott Harm:

We're all leaning in, Paul, because we still can't hear you that well.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Yeah, the last time I tried to adjust the microphone I was out.

Chair Scott Harm:

Well I just turned my volume way up so now I'm good.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Can you hear me now?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

As long as you don't talk, Scott. Or me.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Okay. Can you hear me now?

Chair Scott Harm:

Yes sir.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Okay. Is that coming over okay?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Yep.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Okay. Yeah, I was saying that I had a couple meetings with the student chapter of the NOMA and they are coming up with a new board election for them and their main concern is whatever they're dealing with the architectural school at University of Washington. But I do have all the context which I will be gladly to send over. That's it. Hello?

Chair Scott Harm:

Yep Paul, thank you very much. We got it.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Okay. I lose my [inaudible 00:19:36].

Chair Scott Harm:

Anyone else before we move on? I think we've got some pretty good input, Sydney.

Sydney:

All right, so if the board is good with these goals, we'll take that and run for the remainder of the year and then look at establishing for 2024 at the last meeting of the year.

Chair Scott Harm:

Great. Yep. Appreciate it. Okay, going to my copy of the agenda. I think the next one is, let's see the review of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards known as NCARB proposed 2023 resolutions. I think if I remember correctly, Sydney's going to lead this discussion. Once again...

Sydney:

I will lead this discussion but this is going to really rely on the six of you more than it will staff. So, as the board will recall, we have five resolutions that are up for consideration at the annual business meeting here in a couple of weeks. The first one is a proposal from the state of Mississippi to align NCARB's model law more closely with Mississippi state law. And then resolutions B, C, and D are all cleanup language in the NCARB rules that are just things that were either antiquated because they were passed 50 years ago and just time for an update, or just a minor cleanup to adjust to current business model, things like that. And then the big topic of discussion, not only for our board but I think for every board across the country right now is resolution E, which is the updated governance structure for NCARB.

This one has had some, to me, seemingly rather large changes since we last met, including doing away with all of the discussion on changing the regional structure, eliminating positions, things like that. So, that has all now been eliminated from the most current version of the resolution, which was included in your packets. And I believe they're looking at combining a couple of positions on the executive board. I believe the treasurer and secretary position are being combined to make space and going that route to increase the amount of diversity available on the board. So, with that, I will turn it over to all of you for you to discuss the resolutions and how you would like to see your votes cast in two weeks.

Chair Scott Harm:

So, I begged your forgiveness that I had to depart last time, what was I, at the airport I think, or somewhere. And so I understand I am the voting delegate you missed, you get called on, so shame on me will be-

Board Member Sian Roberts:

That happened to me last year, Scott.

Chair Scott Harm:

I know that's right. So, it's payback. So, yeah, any discussion would be helpful. I've made one of the three Teams, I think they're Teams that you're using, I can't remember. The calls that they did as an overview. Don't know how many of us made those. They found it pretty informative and it did go fairly

quick. I did notice one discrepancy and not to pick on anything, but we're labeling them 2023 dash A, B, C, D and E. The stuff they produced refers to them as one through five.

Sydney:

Oh, we apologize for that [inaudible 00:23:40].

Chair Scott Harm:

That's all right. Yeah. So, going back between my notes and that, do any of our board members have a need to talk through using what's on the screen? Anything for A, B, C or D? I think E is the governance, which is... I'll just shut up right here. Does anybody have anything that they would like to talk about? Any of those four?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

I guess I'll jump in if that's okay. I think AA is interesting because it's really a reaction to the change to model law last year to redefine responsible control and it's an attempt to try to really be very specific about responsible control language. Last year they tried to pass it as it changed in the definition of responsible control, but there were some issues associated with that. And so now they're looking at a different area of the model law that they would like to change in order to tighten the definition of responsible control.

I think my perspective on this is that they're free to do what they want with their law. This is model law. There have been a number of reasons why it's been put together the way it's been put together. And I don't see a need for us to change model law because Mississippi feels they want it to be like this. I did also hear that the board of directors is also recommending a "no" on this vote, which I did not understand until I listened to the webinar. So, I would propose that we as a state do not approve this one. Vote "no" on this resolution. And then just quickly B through D I don't see any reason why we would not vote "yes". So, I would say "no" on the first one and yes on the second, third and fourth.

Chair Scott Harm:

Looks like we have an enthusiastic thumbs up from Mr. Benner and Erica. Yep.

Yeah, it's interesting the subtleties that they're trying to change through A or one. It's review and correct I think is one of the languages, like well what if you review it and the great staff that put together the documents originally got it all right, there's not anything to correct. So I thought that was a little odd that they were pushing for that one. But no, I concur with-

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Well, I guess one important thing to point out that relates to that, Scott, is that we did in our committee when we did the definition of responsible control, we worked with NCARB's attorneys in crafting that language. They reviewed it multiple times to make sure that it was appropriate legal language and their attorneys have reviewed the Mississippi proposal and are not recommending it. So, I would also suggest that it hasn't been vetted thoroughly for us to want to make it into model law for the country.

Chair Scott Harm:

No, but I would second what you said also. They're free to do with their law, whatever they [inaudible 00:27:01] well want to do. The model law is just that. It's just a model from which you can refer. So, yeah, I agree. I don't think there's a reason for us to react. And also I have flashbacks to my two or three-

year tenure on the model. I don't think the future's task force or collaborative with Rick Storvick and that was a big topic of the conversation.

But I would agree with what Board Member Ryan said and vote "no" for alpha and then incur with BC and D after that. So, that's my 2 cents. And as the voting member, unless I get pulled aside or somebody wants to speak up now, that might be the way we would be leaning unless somebody offers an amendment that changes it and then we'll have a discussion while we're at the event. And I guess we won't be suffering from while we're at the event having a quorum, will we?

Sydney:

Nope.

Chair Scott Harm:

Which has been the concern in the past. I know I've been asked to step into the aisle while other people were talking in years past, but I don't think we were going to have that problem because I think it's, is it Board Member Ryan, myself and-

Sydney:

You, Board Member-

Chair Scott Harm:

And Mr. Manley.

Sydney:

Manley and Board Member Roberts.

Chair Scott Harm:

Oh, Roberts. What did I say? Yeah, good correction. Sorry about that, Sian.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

That's all right, Scott.

Chair Scott Harm:

Who's Sian Ryan? Any other need for further discussion for the first few of these? Is everybody okay? Hearing no objections and seeing no hands? I guess the final one is just the governance discussion. If we get into that, I've been on enough calls again through my new board of directors orientation and everything that I do expect that there will be not a heated debate, but there are more than a few people who have opinions on this. I do kind of expect that what we are reading now may not end up being the final version unless the discussions keep it back on course. But I think it's gotten a little bit closer to what most people are comfortable with. But I do know there's a moderate number of jurisdictions out there who still quite aren't happy. So, I do expect there to be a very interesting dialogue. So, if you can do a remote tie in, that might be just one thing to listen to hear what is being said because I do expect there won't be an easy-peasy motion seconded vote and it all passes. I think there will be a discussion on this one.

Anyone else? As it is written, I don't know that we can actually say which way we're going, but is there anyone that has a major concern with what the way it's written now, if you've had a chance to read through it?

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Well, I don't want to monopolize, but I was really, really pleased with the changes that were made. I think I almost felt like they took my survey responses and I'm sure mine were the same. It's just about everybody and they-

Chair Scott Harm:

All on you.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

And they crafted into new legislation. So, I think the major changes that they've made that I think are really key. But really all they're doing and I'm going to say, I'll start off by saying I'm in support of this. All they're doing is collapsing the executive board. Removing two positions from the executive board, the first vice president and the treasurer or saying combining treasurer and secretary. So, that's freed up to board seats and then those board seats, they're making it at large board seats. And so that could be anyone. That could be a really, really passionate committee member.

But that committee member cannot then... And it was misleading by the way, and our president did a very, very poor job of describing this in the webinar, at least the one that I attended. But that board member would not be eligible to be on the executive team because you have to be serving or have served as a member board member in order to be in that position.

So, the other thing I think that is really important... So it opens up diversity in terms of there will be a couple of seats... And I think it's important to have representatives on the board that are stakeholders in NCARB that may not necessarily be member board members. It does reserve the executive team for current or previous member board members. It also opens up leadership positions to people in states who have term limits and short term limits. There's some states that you know, get two two-year terms and then you're out. So, in this scenario, if you are on your member board, you serve, you time out, you continue to volunteer for NCARB, you can still then be in national leadership for the organization. So, I think it's a really solid proposal.

Chair Scott Harm:

Erica has a hand up. Erica and then Mr. Benner, I think Rick, I see you after that. So, we'll go to you. [inaudible 00:32:54]

Board Member Erica Loynd:

I did attend the session. I think the first one too. And the one question that came up that I don't know if I really understood the answer was, and it has that you do not need to be an architect to be an at large director or a person on the board. And so there was concern by some of the Q&A at the end [inaudible 00:33:13] then does that mean that people who are running NCARB were running the groups to make these decisions would not be a licensed architect? And I don't know, I am in support of this, so I don't know if it deters me in any way. It kind of brought up another little tangent on the side that I wasn't sure if that had an impact or if that was, I didn't quite follow if that was the case or what that would... is that kind of side situation an issue or not? I don't know.

Chair Scott Harm:

So, Sian, you can back me up if I get this wrong. The way I understand is in keeping with what Sian described earlier, you can't make it all the way to the top of Mount Everest if you haven't served on the board for at least two years. But can, if you're not an architect, if you have served on the board-

Board Member Sian Roberts:

I believe, and I'm not going to say this definitively because I'd have to reread that, but I believe that is sure, Erica. You could be one of the two at large positions, but only the two at large positions. So, you could get somebody, let's say there's a passionate NCARB volunteer who is deeply invested in the organization and has some significant challenges in getting licensed as an architect and has some really good perspective on NCARB and has a great deal of knowledge. Would that be a valuable voice to have at the table? Right.

I'm just making that up. But I'm saying that I think there might... Right now we have a public member on our board and that comes from the public members from all of the different jurisdictions. So, that's one not licensed architect on the board. I think in reality it's highly unlikely that there would be an unlicensed person in that seat. But I think the idea of having at large seats means that you're open to more perspectives and they still have to get voted in.

Board Member Erica Loynd:

And it was not a deterrent to me, it was just a confusion. And I agree, there's many people who run very large firms who are not licensed, but they're running architectural practices. So...

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah. Gary Ey are still, I think until we have election, he still our active public member, he had shown an interest in running for the office and was a big proponent for a lot of people who were again pointing out that were architectural registration boards, were not architects. And so being a member of the board, whether you're a licensed architect or not, he thought was being consistent. So, I know he was a big advocate for it. And then Stephanie, I'm going blank on Stephanie's last name, who's running, I think unopposed for the public members' position this year is running unopposed. I know she shares that same concern, but I do think that their having served on the board, I think is being seen as most important that we want to be as an organization and NCARB wants to be representative of architectural registration boards, not necessarily solely focused on being architects. Rick, did we address your concern or...

Board Member Rick Benner:

Yeah, it was the same discussion. And again, I'm okay with it because it's... again, they won't have a majority vote of the board, anyway. So, even if it was five to three or whatever the vote is... Obviously if it affects architects, the architects will probably vote consistently. So, I don't see whether it would matter. And as you say, it would give it more of a rounded participation and ideas.

Chair Scott Harm:

So, a little inside peek, and I am going to say this with a caveat of I'm seeking guidance from NCARB staff on whether I need to have a gag order put on myself as I learn what I'm doing on the board of directors, I requested and they sent me an itemized list of the meetings that I will be expected to attend. And Sian, it would scare the heck out of you like it did me. It's a lot. And so where I'm going with this is my fear

and concern is while we needed to update the governance and I leaned towards liking what they did, I don't know in reality it's going to get the goal that I think we're after because I think, well, I mean there's still severe limitation of someone having to be in, I'll use myself as an example, very well advanced in their career where they have freedom of schedule and movement.

But off the top of my head, I haven't counted them up. I think I'm going to be out of the office for eight weeks for four and five days at a whack. And my firm is supportive of it because of my role. But if you are recently licensed architect or someone in their mid-career, the higher percentage billable, my fear is... I hope it's successful, but my fear is the reality of moving up that fast and the obligations change so tremendously much that I think the board will have to do a better job of at least presenting that as "this will be your reality if you make it to one of the at large members or anything like that.

And if you make a jump of just being first or second year on a board or coming in as someone who's not on a board and makes the jump, this is what's going to be expected and can you garner the support from your own company? Can they take that time away from a principle affirm of firm to be gone that much? And then if you're also counted on for being billable, can your firm take that hit?" So, my fear is you might not ultimately change that much, but it's possible still.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Well that's an improvement.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yes, absolutely.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

It's an improvement to our... We need to clear the impediments, right? And so this is one impediment. And then Scott, you're raising another impediment, which may be another thing for NCARB to work on, but...

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah, and as I'm filling out my Outlook calendar and went, holy moly, Batman. It's just like if I had to be 75% billable, I ain't going to make it this year. Kind of a kind of a thing. Anyways. But that's a [inaudible 00:40:12].

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Well, and I also think that I was kind of baffled by their last attempt, the first shot over the bow from them. And it was this mean I'm all for being as inclusive as we can be and opening up opportunities and getting diverse perspectives on the board. But the first pass where it was technically possible for the entire board, nobody on the board to be a member board member definitely seemed like it wasn't a wise way to go just because of what we do, what we all do, and the knowledge that you really need to have about what it means to be a member board member to be in that role in the organization.

Chair Scott Harm:

I almost looked at the first one as a negotiation ploy. We'll throw something, some kind of a sinking fast pitch that nobody will swing at and then we'll show what we really wanted.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Yeah.

Chair Scott Harm:

So, any other questions, concerns, comments? Especially for those of us that can't make the meeting?
Not to put anybody on spot.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Yeah, I mean I guess the question would be is there anything that you... Because I think Scott's right. This is one of those ones that might have some last minute changes. So, is there anything that is particularly concerning to anybody else that board member Chair Harm should know going in?

Chair Scott Harm:

No?

Sydney:

Yes, I would add are there any concerns that if they pop up as a last minute amendment that would be breakers for you to be like, "Nope, we're not doing this"?

Board Member Erica Loynd:

I think maybe - this is member Erica Loynd - potentially one deal breaker for me would be if they try to over-define what those two board positions that are being opened up. If it's that they need to be meeting a certain thing, like "this person has to have a certain years of experience or from a certain region or something" then it may over structure it and take away the ability to bring in people from different backgrounds or different locations and stuff. Right now it seems like the objective is to make those at large positions be available to a wider group of people. And if it becomes "they must be this demographic or they must be this age" then it would maybe hinder that.

Chair Scott Harm:

And speaking of that, I might even ask them the question. I've always been intrigued if you get a... I'll call the person a super go-getter, someone who's finished to make it a little bit easier to articulate it, someone who's done an accredited degree program and still is in the licensure process, who decides they want to throw their name in for something like this? I don't know that there's anything that would preclude that. And it might be a really good way to get a more diverse group. If you could get someone who's like president of the AIA students in a major city who's working on getting a license and has the wherewithal of maneuvering through organizations. It could be a breath of fresh air kind of a thing.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Exactly.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

I mean I think all of us have had, well, at least most of us have had the experience of meeting with the think tank and the rethink tank folks, and there's definitely some solid people in there who are passionate about this whole process and making it better. And it would be good to have that kind of voice, the board as well.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah,

Board Member Sian Roberts:

It could mean some very interesting elections as well. [inaudible 00:44:41] Scott, I know that's something you're interested in happening. I think we could have some very interesting competitions for those positions.

Chair Scott Harm:

So, Sydney, on my annotated agenda, I think it does say that... Do we need to take action on this resolution and do a vote as it sits to make it official the way I should vote?

Sydney:

Yeah, and I think the easiest way to do... We already have the board's determinations on what's on the screen A through D, but one through four. And then if we can just wrap something up for E and just for the board to vote to provide that direction to you as the delegate and Sian as the alternate, I think that would be helpful.

But just so that we have an actual record of the way the board is directing you guys to go. And the other thing I'll say before we move into that, there is another question and answer session on the resolutions this Thursday. I will be joining in. I think Susan will be joining in as well, just to see if any more changes have been made. And if so, we will send those out. But if you want to join those, please let me know. I think I forwarded it, but if you didn't get it, let me know and I'll send it again. If something comes out of that that you're like, "Oh, red flag," if you want to send those comments to Susan and I, we can then forward them to Scott and Sian to take with them to the annual business meeting. And just to avoid OPMA violations, feel free to use us as the go-between.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah, I plan on listening in on Thursday's call as well, just again to hear if there's any been any further discussion. So, then I guess I'm going to call for a motion? Is that correct, Sydney?

Sydney:

Yes.

Chair Scott Harm:

Can we do agree to do the resolutions as a group?

Sydney:

Yeah.

This transcript was exported on Jul 26, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay. Someone want to step up to the plate and take a swing at a motion regarding the five resolutions at hand?

Oh-

Board Member Sian Roberts:

[inaudible 00:46:56] Paul's raised his hand.

Chair Scott Harm:

Yeah, thank you, Sian. Paul, you have had something you want to say?

Sydney:

Oh, you're muted.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

You're muted.

Chair Scott Harm:

You're muted. Still muted.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Oh, you're muted.

Chair Scott Harm:

Hopefully I can unmute him. Nope.

Sydney:

No, it won't let us.

Chair Scott Harm:

Paul, you're still muted.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Okay.

Chair Scott Harm:

There we go.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

There we go.

Chair Scott Harm:

There we go.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Okay. Board Member Wu, I would like to make a motion as amended by Member Roberts on the resolution. Five parts of the resolution with the comments of voting against resolution 2023-1, number, and the balance will be as recommended.

Board Member Erica Loynd:

I second the motion. This is council, this is number loin.

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay. We have a motion for the board and that is to vote against resolution 23-A or 23-1, vote in the negative and vote in the affirmative for 23-B or two through 23-E or five. Sorry for being confused, but it's just annotated two different ways. Is there any discussion whatsoever on that? Okay. Hearing no one raise and seeing no one raising hand, may we have a vote? I guess again, verbally. All those in favor indicate by saying, "yay".

Board Member Erica Loynd:

Yay.

Board Member Sian Roberts:

Yay.

Secretary Paul Wu:

Yay.

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay, all those opposed "nay". Hearing no nays. We have passed this motion unanimously. So, we'll go ahead and direct the voting member who might look a lot like me to vote in accordance until we have some meaningful discussion. And then I think it's just left to the delegates that are there to kind of make a motion on the fly. I would say, I don't know if this is legitimate or not, but I'm free to share my cell phone number. So, if you do want to get an opinion in there, if we're going into discussions, feel free to go ahead and use my cell number. We can issue that again Sydney if we need to. I don't know if that's appropriate or not, but it seems like the quickest way to allow someone else to have a voice in what's going on.

Sydney:

Please, just no full board conference calls.

Chair Scott Harm:

Right? Yep. Yeah, yeah. No interim Teams meetings all of a sudden, please.

Sydney:

I do not want that call from Elizabeth.

This transcript was exported on Jul 26, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Chair Scott Harm:

Okay. Let's see. We had a motion and it's been approved. I think that's the end of our board business. And right now we have the opportunity for a public member to speak to the board. I don't know that. Is there anyone in the public on the call? I don't see a name. I don't know.

Sydney:

[inaudible 00:50:30] think so.

Chair Scott Harm:

I don't think we have any individuals. So, having said that, I think Paul, I think we're making it easily on time for you. So, if it's okay with everyone, I'm going to go ahead and adjourn the meeting at 2:51 PM on May 30th.

Thanks everybody.