

## Washington State Board for Architects meeting transcript

October 19, 2023

Vice Chair Cooley (00:00:03):

Thank you. It is now 10:02 and I call the 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 background noise when others are speaking. Please remember to unmute your mic or phone when you're speaking. Also, for board members to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thank you. Susan Nieves, at this time, would you please call roll call and board members, please respond if in attendance.

Susan Nieves (00:00:41):

Yes. The chair, Scott Harm, he has an excused absence today. So I'll start with you, Vice Chair Cooley.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:00:50):

Present.

Susan Nieves (00:00:51):

Secretary Wu.

Wu (00:00:53):

Present.

Susan Nieves (00:00:55):

Board Member Lloyd.

Lloyd (00:00:56):

Present.

Susan Nieves (00:00:58):

Board Member Manley.

Manley (00:01:00):

I'm here.

Susan Nieves (00:01:01):

And Board Member Roberts.

Roberts (00:01:03):

I'm here too.

Susan Nieves (00:01:04):

Wonderful.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:01:06):

Great. Thank you. So we have a quorum.

Susan Nieves (00:01:09):

We do.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:01:10):

All right. Moving to the approval of the agenda. I will need a motion for approval.

Wu (00:01:19):

So moved. I move to approve the agenda. This is Wu.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:01:24):

Thank you. And a second.

Lloyd (00:01:28):

This is Board Member Lloyd. I second the motion.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:01:32):

Excellent, thank you. Do we need to vote on that?

Susan Nieves (00:01:39):

Yes, please.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:01:41):

Okay. All in favor say "Aye."

Group (00:01:41):

Aye.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:01:45):

Thank you. Approved. All right, so moving on to the approval of minutes. The regular meeting minutes are from July 20th, 2023 and I will need approval and motion for approval of the minutes.

Roberts (00:02:05):

Board Member Roberts. I move that we approve the minutes for the July 20th, 2023 meeting.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:02:13):

Thank you. Second?

Wu (00:02:14):

Wu. Second.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:02:17):

Comments? I'll ask for a vote. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Group (00:02:25):

Aye.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:02:28):

All right. Thank you. Approved. All right, so moving on to the next, which is awards and recognition. I'm going to turn this over to Sydney. You would mind?

Sydney (00:02:42):

Absolutely. Thank you. Well, good morning board members. It is my pleasure to introduce Director Marcus Glasper to the board. Director Glasper joined the Department of Licensing this past spring and I will turn it over to him to introduce himself.

Marcus Glasper (00:02:56):

Thank you, Sydney. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for allowing me to pop into your meeting for a few minutes With the opportunity to introduce myself. I will say that I'm back-to-back meetings today, so I won't be able to stay with you the entire time. I'm supposed to be in a quarterly traffic safety commission meeting right now, but it was important for me to pop on in here and say hello. As Sydney said, my name is Marcus Glasper. I use he/him pronouns. I've been here at the department for six months now, so it's getting a little scary that I can't really claim that I'm new anymore, but I'm grateful for the opportunity to be at this great agency.

(00:03:44):

So a little bit about my background. I'm Southern grown, as the slide says, hailing from the state of Louisiana where I was reared and got my undergraduate degree in mechanical engineering. I've been attending several of the board and commission meetings to introduce myself and I told the landscape architects back in August, I think, that it was actually my original dream when I was in high school to be an architect. So it really is kind of special to be with you all today. But for some reason my guidance counselor talked me out of it, which is kind of what steered me in the engineering direction. She had this notion that it took a lot of effort to make a name for yourself in this industry, but it was my passion and I'm still drawn to design to this day, but nevertheless, it is what it is.

(00:04:50):

I did move to the Tri-Cities after I graduated shortly thereafter to work for the Department of Energy at the Hanford nuclear cleanup site. So while I wasn't in the military, I did sort of have a connection to a military site. So I did that for about 10 years before joining Washington State Government in 2003.

(00:05:15):

I moved around a bit over the last 20 years with licensing being my fourth agency. My 30-year career, I'd say, has taken me to some interesting places from nuclear waste to prisons to taxes, to gambling and now to licensing. But what I can say is that all of these experiences, however, have been grounded in public service, which I've always believed to be my calling. And I think licensing is truly a great fit as we touch the lives of almost every Washingtonian.

(00:05:52):

But as you can imagine, even though I've been here for a little over six months now, I consider myself still in the learning phase as the breadth of the mission of this agency is quite extensive as I have learned. But some of my focus areas that I believe that I want to prioritize over the next couple of years include taking a step back and evaluating the agency's strategic framework. I think it's important that we understand collectively about what guides our work and what guides our decision making, and then making sure that we find collaborative opportunities to make improvements for the residents that we serve.

(00:06:37):

Another key area is sort of preparing the agency for future stability. Even though this is not in your lane, everybody can appreciate this, that we also have a central role in collecting revenue for the transportation system here in Washington. And as the onslaught of new electric vehicles come into our lives, that really reduces the revenue that's needed to support the transportation network. So we need to partner with other agencies, the legislature and others, to figure out what is it going to replace that with so that we can continue to have safe roadways.

(00:07:21):

Also, supporting the Washington's traffic safety platform. We have a critical role also and establishing partnerships and advancing traffic safety on Washington roadways. I want to do a lot around supporting our businesses and professions. We want to make sure that we are improving our infrastructure to make it easier for our businesses and professions to obtain licensure.

(00:07:48):

And then evaluating the customer experience. As I said, we touch almost every resident here in the state of Washington. And so what I consider that to be that we really are the face of state government and so we must make sure that we are doing what we can to serve all of those residents with grace and dignity, ensuring a diverse, equitable and inclusive culture. Again, using an equity lens to continually evaluate our policies and practices. We have to work on ourselves inside the organization so that we can deliver great service outside of the organization.

(00:08:26):

And then finally, operational excellence. It's really, to me, all about public trust and what we must do to enhance organizational performance, so we maintain that trust and integrity of the people that we serve.

(00:08:40):

So that's a sort of a brief overview of me. I look forward to working with all of you in the future. I do, however, want to take the opportunity to thank you for your service to this board, your profession and the residents of Washington for the work you do to provide your advice and expertise to the department and for what you do to help our licensees as well as our consumers. So I hope you enjoy the rest of your meeting and I'm happy to take a few questions if you have them.

Wu (00:09:12):

I don't have much questions. This is Board Member woo. I feel a little kinship because my daughter went to Tulane and my [inaudible 00:09:23] went to LSU.

Marcus Glesper (00:09:24):

Oh my goodness.

Wu (00:09:26):

So I've been to Louisiana for the last eight-year period during their college days, so I know that place pretty well.

Marcus Glesper (00:09:35):

Very good. Well, I didn't graduate from LSU, but I did take a couple classes there.

Wu (00:09:41):

Good.

Marcus Glesper (00:09:46):

Anything else?

Roberts (00:09:50):

This is Board Member Roberts. I just will thank you for showing up and introducing yourself to us today. It's great to have a broader understanding of the Department of Licensing and kind of how we fit into the bigger picture. So I definitely appreciate you dropping in today and saying hello.

Marcus Glesper (00:10:08):

Well, thank you.

Manley (00:10:10):

This is Board Member Manley. You thanked all of us for our service on the board and, in turn, following on Sean, I'd like to thank you for your leadership of the department and looking forward to some good things to come.

Marcus Glesper (00:10:30):

Thank you very much. I appreciate that. All right, well, enjoy the rest of your meeting and thank you for the opportunity to pop in.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:10:42):

Thank you. Very nice to meet you.

Marcus Glasper (00:10:44):

Likewise. Bye.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:10:45):

Thank you. All right, moving on. Sydney, would you like to introduce Mr. Lenn?

Sydney (00:10:53):

Absolutely. Thank you again. We do have a lot of introductions to make today. It's my pleasure to introduce our new Military and Military Spouse Liaison, Jason Lenn. He joined our unit, the Board Commission and Outreach Unit, as a program specialist about a month ago, and I will let Jason tell you more about himself.

Jason Lenn (00:11:16):

Thank you, Sydney. Thank you everyone for letting me pop in here and introduce myself. Likewise, I was also born and raised in the South Florida and then ended up getting my bachelor's in finance from the University of Alabama. Shortly after, I ended up joining the Navy and spent 20 years working in the intelligence field as a linguist. I learned Arabic and Pashto and along the way I met my wife who is from this area. So we decided to settle back down here and call this home with us and our three children.

(00:11:55):

I just recently retired about a month ago and the opportunity to come onto the Department of Licensing in this role, which is the Military Spouse Liaison role, was something that I was really excited about and feel blessed to have this opportunity. I think the military spouse community is critical to so many different aspects of our military readiness. Their ability to gain employment is a big issue within the military community. So to see a lot of effort being done both at the federal but here in the State of Washington level to try and support that community and enable them to get their professional licenses and continue their careers when they come here from other areas is something that is going to be a lot of fun to work with. Hopefully, we see a lot of progress in that area.

(00:12:55):

One of the things that we are doing right now in getting this program implemented is having training for our board members on this military spouse culture and experience. We sent that out to all the board members on October 4th, so that should be in your inbox and that is a requirement from the legislation that they enacted in 2023 session. So if you have any questions about that, or concerns, please reach out to us. And if you need us to resend [inaudible 00:13:28] to that, it was put out by the Washington Department of Veterans Affairs. It's about half an hour into a little survey and then we can go ahead and track that progress for you. Anyway, if you have any questions just let me know, but I'm happy to be here. I've been here a month, but I'm getting settled in, so if you ever need anything just let me know. Thank you.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:13:57):

Hey, Jason, this is near and dear to my heart. I'm a military spouse and also a military mom, so this is important to me and I appreciate you being here and doing the work for advocating for them. So thank you.

Jason Lenn (00:14:13):

Absolutely. Thank you.

Wu (00:14:16):

Well, this is Board Member Wu. I want to thank both of you for your service of the country. Keep us safe and appreciate it.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:14:31):

Any other comments or questions for Jason?

Roberts (00:14:35):

I guess I just also pile on a little bit. We have two military spouses in our firm that we have supported through multiple moves across the country. Certainly, the ability to work remotely has helped us be able to support their continued employment a lot more easily. And some of the policies in place from a tax perspective have helped us as well, not have to deal with complexities of supporting employees working in different states, and that has been beneficial for us as well. So I applaud the work and I look forward to taking the training. I did see the email, but I still need to do it. Thank you.

Manley (00:15:18):

This is Rock Manley. Likewise, I still need to follow up with the training and I have a son in the military as well, so I really appreciate what you're doing and what you're offering to the state and the boards and the department. Thanks.

Jason Lenn (00:15:38):

Thank you.

Vice Chair Cooley (00:15:47):

So if we don't have anything else, we'll move on to old business. So the first order of business is discussion and consideration of the mutual recognition agreement, the MRA, between the US and the UK. Sydney, I will turn it over to you to present this.

Sydney (00:16:05):

All right. Thank you, Vice Chair Cooley. As the board is aware, this is an item that's come before you several times. At the last meeting, there were a few questions that were still remaining that the board wanted to have answered. So on the NCARB piece, I know that that was a rather large concern among several board members about whether or not architects who had been licensed prior to the creation of the AXP and the IDP before that, whether or not they would be able to qualify under the mutual recognition agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

(00:16:45):

So I worked with NCARB to get an answer on that and that was provided to you in the packet. But for members of the public who are present, any architect who got their NCARB certificate prior to 1976, they have met the experience requirement in place at that time. And the record can be transmitted to the UK. If they got an NCARB certificate after 1976, they have then completed the IDP or AXP requirements which were in place at the time to qualify and those documents can also be submitted.

(00:17:23):

So talking with NCARB, they basically told me that there is a path forward for every architect who would like to be licensed under the mutual recognition agreement. Some of the paths might take a little bit longer or might require additional documentation to be submitted for anyone who maybe does not have an NCARB certificate, but there is a pathway there, it just might take a little bit longer.

(00:17:53):

I see Elizabeth has her hand up as well.

Roberts (00:17:57):

Yes. When I went back and looked at the minutes from the last meeting, I noted that I had a couple of things to do as well. One was to see to what extent this MRA was in line with our laws and rules. And it's interesting, I don't know how much time people spent looking at all the documents associated with this MRA, and Sydney, you can correct me if I misunderstood, but from what I understand, there was an international organization that went in and compared the experience, the examinations and the education between the two, between UK and the US programs that we have in this country with NCARB, and they found equivalency. But UK's program is really based on education, so their licensure is very education oriented. They don't have an examination at the end of their education. They have examinations, I guess, throughout the education program. And they also don't have really an experience requirement.

(00:19:15):

But they did find that during the education program, the experience and the examinations had some equivalency. But our statute says you have to have an examination that's acceptable to the board and you have to have experience. So one of the things that this MRA does say is that states can have additional requirements.

(00:19:49):

So I think Washington State would be okay because they could have, for example, and it's up to the board and it's up to the staff to delineate this, but I think you could have the experience requirement where you ask the applicant to submit experience to show that they have the equivalent, it's either four years or five years if they have the education. They're not going to come in without the education because that's required for them. There's no other path for licensure. But whether or not they meet the examination requirement, the board can determine, yes, the series of exams that they took meets your examination requirement.

(00:20:39):



The experience requirement I think is a little trickier and you may want to decide that when people apply through the MRA that they have to show experience as well. But that's for the board to determine.

(00:20:54):

That's just my analysis of the way the MRA works and how it would apply to this board. Again, the board would need to decide that they were satisfied with the examination process. There is not an examination at the end of education, but could certainly determine that there's equivalency that's satisfactory to the board. I also suggest that if you decide you want to go forward with the MRA and sign on to the MRA that you have a policy that kind of explains what the MRA means to this board and how the process would work.

(00:21:45):

Does anybody have any questions?

Vice Chair Cooley (00:21:51):

I guess I don't have as much, well, I do have a question, but first of all, I guess just a little bit of perspective on this. I am currently on this competency task force at NCARB and the British system is one of the ones we've been looking at as how do the Brits determine competency compared to how we do it, and we've been looking at a couple of different countries. So everything you're saying is in line with kind of what our understanding is. They have put a much bigger emphasis on education and history and theory, those kinds of things that we tend to not focus on here as much. So I'd say that, from what I've seen, there's sort of, and I think that's one of the reasons why they weren't comfortable with having candidates who had not done a NAB-accredited degree because they do put an emphasis on that level of education.

(00:22:58):

I do think that the exams, I mean, I appreciate, Elizabeth, your review of this. I do think that the examination along the way doesn't, in my mind, make a difference whether you're doing it along the way or if you're doing it at the end, if you're passing exams along the way. But I would be interested in having this board discuss whether we should have some sort of experience requirement on top of the MRA, that, in my mind, would be the two-year experience level because they have done what I would consider to be the exam and the education fulfilled. So it wouldn't be the four- or five-year. Those are my thoughts.

(00:23:43):

The question would be, what would be the process for us to discuss this and determine how we would adopt it if we were going to adopt it in a way that had additional conditions to it?

Roberts (00:24:00):

Well, I can say, like I said, I think it might be worth a policy to say that you are approving, and I don't know what the right word is, Sydney, but the MRA, and applicants who wanted licensure in the state of Washington with the certificate from... So the first thing they do is they get a certificate from the UK's organization, which is the AR something. So that would be step one. Then step two would be that they

would have to apply. Step three would be that they also, in addition to that certificate, they would need to show the experience, if that's what you want. So I would say that it would be good to have some policy in place for if you have any extra requirements. But also, the board needs to decide if they want to actually recognize this MRA so that it's not required that you do that.

Sydney (00:25:14):

Yeah. Sorry, I'm trying to message with the team off to the side here. So anybody who's on the call, feel free to jump in and correct me if I'm wrong. I think probably the best way to go about doing it, if we're going to have additional requirements on top of the MRA would probably be to do a rule change within the Washington Administrative Code. That way, it's kind of there in black and white. Rule changes are much more defensible from the staff perspective, gives us a place to refer people rather than a set of minutes from 2023 when we're looking 10, 15 years in advance. So that would be my thinking is if the board wanted to sign on to the MRA with conditions, then staff would look at initiating the rule change process to go along with that to implement those additional requirements.

Wu (00:26:20):

Board member Wu. I do agree with Sean on the experience portion of it. Without working experience, we cannot expect competency out of the schools. What they teach and what we do, a lot of times they don't really mesh together very well. The working experience is very important in providing the services that we think the industry requires. So I do agree with further discussions in that.

Roberts (00:26:55):

I also think that, I agree with Sydney about doing a...

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:27:04]

Roberts (00:27:01):

I also think that, I agree with Sydney about doing a rule change if you're going to have... possibly, if you're going to have additional requirements, but I do think it's worth stating in a policy that the board finds the examination, the education and examination requirements equivalent to the Washington examination and educational requirements because the education, I mean, the examination is different, so I think the board needs to recognize that it's equivalent, different but equivalent.

Speaker 1 (00:27:31):

Quick question. You said the examination, they've done a crosswalk where they have looked at the examinations they've currently taken, this is fairly equivalent to what NCARB's examination is?

Roberts (00:27:53):

What I understand is this international organization that did the evaluation, what they say is all of the elements and the examination are covered. All of the elements that we have or that you have in your NCARB examination are covered in the process during their educational period. So they do have examinations and they cover the same topics, but they don't have a final examination like Washington does. So again, it's different, but this international organization finds it to be equivalent.

Speaker 2 (00:28:31):

So I would say that the IP, what's the acronym for the program where you are in school and you're taking exams while you're in school and you're working while you're in school. And when you're finished you are done.

Manley (00:28:31):

IPAL.

Speaker 2 (00:28:50):

IPAL. Thank you pal. IPAL. Geez. The IPAL process, I think is basically the same. For instance, you take your structural course and then you're able to take the structural exam right after you're done with that course.

Manley (00:29:12):

I think this is right. I think the only difference in my memory is that you're still required to do an AXP, but you're able to do your AXP hours while you're in school, starting virtually before you start school if you can get it. Is that your recollection as well? Yeah,

Speaker 2 (00:29:38):

Yeah. I mean, that's what the IPAL is.

Manley (00:29:40):

Yeah. So would that differentiate it a little bit from the British System, but I see what you're saying, they're very similar in that way. What Elizabeth, you added to our packet some sections from the law and I've been looking to find them again, but unsuccessfully. I know they're in the packet somewhere and in reading those and I should be more familiar, but I haven't pinpointed and spotlighted those sections for a few years. It looks like the board really has quite a bit of leeway in accepting degree or non-accredited degree or experience. And in the law, I suppose, in the partner regulations, it may be that's what the regs do is, the rules do is, specified, make it more specific. But it looks like we already have quite a bit of leeway. So I'm trying to put together in my head, well what would our specific analysis of an experience requirement be versus any analysis of a non-accredited degree, for example, we might have, which I don't think we do have as a board. Am I making sense?

Roberts (00:31:29):

I mean, so you are. The language is as acceptable to the board or something like that in the statutes. So you do have a lot of leeway and there are cases where at least I would assume there are cases where the staff can't make that determination. The board should be, or somebody from the board should be deciding whether it's equivalent or not. And I don't know if the staff does that, goes to the board for those kinds of decisions. But I think in this case, I would imagine that most of the people that come to seek licensure, and they, in Washington state, have some experience. They're not just coming directly out of school in the UK. They're coming here with having a little bit of work under their belt, at least, probably two years. And I think as long as it just shows that they have experience, however, it's defined in the whack, I can't remember, but it should be fairly straightforward.

Manley (00:32:34):

And then one more comment and yield to Erica who's got her hand up. If I don't expect that we're going to get a flood of applicants to Washington state from the UK, is it possible within our laws and regs to consider these applications on a case by case basis and leave it a little bit looser versus creating a procedure for experience? So I throw that out there and yield to Erica.

Erica (00:33:19):

Hi, board members. I'm Erica. I'm just trying to remind myself, I do exactly what you were saying. I think there is a time that they're supposed to be working actively in the UK before they can come over. It's not fresh out. I just don't have that in front of me. I was trying to look and see if it was easily handy, but I do agree with you too about one of the thoughts of if there's a case by case, but also then it could start to set different criteria of just when they get evaluated and in response to what you're saying, if we evaluate them one by one, then it becomes at that moment what is the context that we see that person in instead of having some standards that say everybody needs to be equitably looked at for that. I'd be concerned if somebody came at a later, like the board has turned over and there are new people here and how they evaluate that similar criteria could be a little inconsistent.

Sydney (00:34:22):

We have run into that issue with other professions that do not have it clearly outlined and what one board member perceives as equivalent, the next board member may not. And even on the same board I could show a resume to three different industry members and they're all three going to tell me a different level of adequacy. So that is something to keep in mind on the case by case. But I also see that Deb has her hand raised.

Deb (00:34:55):

I do and board member, Lloyd, I entirely concur with you. One of the difficulties is if you're looking at things on a case by case basis, instead of having it defined clearly in whack, what we're looking at and what criteria we're utilizing, it opens us up to subjectivity and we want to move away from that for the purposes of making sure that we're transparent and that we're equitable and that we're looking at each application through the same lens. So that's really important. The other thing that I just wanted to throw out there is that with these MRAs in the past, we really have just either determined that we're going to accept it entirely or we're going to reject it. So just putting it out there that that's sort of been the precedent for this board in the past. We will, of course, do whatever you feel. If you feel like we need to do a rule change to support this, we can. But typically, it has been either accepted or choose not to accept it. We see board member, Roberts has her hand up. Sean, you're muted.

Speaker 2 (00:36:23):

Sorry, A couple of things. One is the NCARB did determine that there was equivalency for all of their programs. So I do feel like after hearing this from Elizabeth, I hate to say this, but I do feel like we should go back and really understand whether they have a similar kind of internship program or something in their educational process that hits that to some degree. But also I would say that I think it would be relatively straightforward to add a two years of experience to this because this is exactly what we do for folks without an NAAB-accredited degree, right? The DOL looks for evidence that they've got that much experience working under a licensed architect and it's pretty straightforward. It's just here's the licensed architect that signs off and said, "I worked for you for two years." So I would think that we could add

something like that if we determine that it's necessary. We could add something like that and not have it be a case by case basis or anything that could be subject to differing opinions about what somebody's experience might mean.

(00:37:43):

I think it's really basically just exactly what we do with all of our candidates that do not have NAAB-accredited degrees. And I guess I would say two, I don't know what we're hoping to accomplish today, but I think it would be good. I think the first question that Elizabeth asked is are we even going to do this? And it might be worth before we go down the rabbit hole of understanding if everybody is in support of this in one way or another. And I would start off by saying that I am in support of us adopting this MRA, whether or not we determine that there's an additional component for equivalency.

Board Member Wu (00:38:31):

Board member, Wu. Yeah, I do think that we could adopt this with the condition that additional requirements for our state that stated that the working experience is important in what we do. So I will put that condition out there if we do adopt this. I'm done.

Sydney (00:39:07):

I see board member, Manley has his hand up.

Board Member Wu (00:39:15):

You're muted.

Manley (00:39:17):

Yes. I was trying to find my mic. So I'm in favor of adoption of the MRA. My feelings are that if we do any gymnastics to make that happen, we should try to keep it very, very simple. And I like the direction that Sean was going with her suggestion of a single statement on the experience level that we would accept and just keep it simple.

Board Member Wu (00:40:08):

Question, board member Wu, did this mutual agreement, do they accept experience in lieu of formal education on the other side?

Sydney (00:40:23):

I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

Board Member Wu (00:40:27):

Yeah, my question is that whether this agreement is agreed upon... our state allowed experience, the new or formal education, did they accept our standards?

Sydney (00:40:44):

Yes, they do.

Board Member Wu (00:40:44):

They did?

Sydney (00:40:48):

Yes, to the best of my knowledge. That's what the NCARB certificate, that was the experience piece, and yeah, that was why the NCARB certificate was tied to the licensure for the-

Roberts (00:41:02):

I thought the NCARB, you couldn't get the NCARB certificate unless you had a degree through the NCARB process. They aren't accepting degrees from other places other than the NCARB-approved degree program. So you have to have education, you can't have experience in lieu of education. That was my understanding of the NCARB certificate. So in order to apply in the UK, if I'm understanding correctly, in order to apply in the UK, you have to get this NCARB certificate, and the NCARB certificate, in order to get that, you have to show that you have graduated from an NCARB associated school and also you've passed the test, their test.

Sydney (00:41:49):

Yeah, that's actually not correct. You can get an NCARB certificate without having a NAAB-accredited degree, but the UK, in the MRA, the UK will not accept candidates who do not have a NAAB-accredited degree. So you can have an NCARB certificate, but it wouldn't get you the mutual recognition.

Roberts (00:42:14):

That's fair. Yeah, that's what I read was you have to have the degree for the MRA.

Sydney (00:42:14):

Correct.

Board Member Wu (00:42:21):

If that's the case, I think our licensure standards is outlier in that sense that if they don't accept our standard, which doesn't require a formal degree, then why should we accept theirs?

Speaker 2 (00:42:39):

So we've had this conversation for two years now and talked to NCARB about it. They are very optimistic that they will get the UK to change that. So they're working on it, actively working on it. And so my opinion of that is that they are trying to get that changed. I don't see why we should prevent our candidates who do have a NAAB-accredited degrees from being able to take advantage of the mutual recognition just because there might be a few that can't. We did talk about whether we should not accept this because of that. So certainly that's open for discussion again. But yeah, this has been ongoing, but we along with California have voiced our opinion about this to NCARB and they understand it and they're trying to get that changed.

Board Member Wu (00:43:48):

Board member, Wu, again, I think before that is resolved, we shouldn't just agree on buying offer agreement without the final approval of their reciprocity. I think once we approve that, we lost our

opportunity to get that experience into their acceptance. So I wouldn't go for agreeing on the agreement right now until that's resolved.

Speaker 2 (00:44:19):

My understanding is that our other MRAs with other countries currently are the same. Is that true?

Sydney (00:44:26):

Yes, that is correct. And we have signed. We, meaning, Washington State have signed on to all of those other mutual recognition agreements with NCARB as well. So it is something that NCARB is working to make some headway on. Part of the problem being that NCARB doesn't have as much of strong of a platform as they would like to have for that broader acceptance because those standards are not uniform across all of the NCARB jurisdictions.

(00:45:04):

Some still have very strict requirements where all the way varying to ours and California where we have accepted alternate pathways and have different levels and different ways to meet the licensure requirements. That's not the same across all 55 NCARB jurisdictions. So that makes it a lot harder for NCARB to then go to the UK and say, "Well, you have to accept this when they're going, not all of your people accept this." So they're working on it, but they're also having to fight that battle here in the United States as well. And I have been messaging with the licensing team off to the side, and so our belief is that under the Mutual Recognition Agreement, this would qualify it as board member Roberts had indicated as a non NAAB- accredited degree. And so then would have to meet that additional experience requirement that we already have in place in statute and in rule.

Speaker 2 (00:46:12):

You're on mute.

Erica (00:46:16):

A non NAAB-accredited degree?

Sydney (00:46:19):

Yeah.

Erica (00:46:20):

I would consider it equivalent to having a NAAB-accredited degree.

Sydney (00:46:24):

Okay.

Erica (00:46:25):

Because I think the education is actually, the education requirement is, I would say, at a higher level than ours is. So you are getting the education and you're getting the exam?

Speaker 3 (00:46:25):

Yeah, it's only education.

Erica (00:46:41):

Yeah, it would be the experience that you would require if you had a NAAB-accredited degree. It's just that it wouldn't have to be AXP for us. We would be able to accept whatever we typically accept for non NAAB-accredited degree folks to document their additional experience, if that makes sense.

Sydney (00:47:01):

And we can do that. Yep, absolutely, we can do that. So I guess from staff's perspective, we're at the point that we would like to have a vote from the board whether or not you guys would like to continue down the path with the MRA. Because this has been so long, we just need an indication whether or not to keep bringing this back or whether this is a dead subject for the board. I think if the board does want to sign on to it, then we have some pathways forward that we can provide that additional clarification probably surrounding all of our MRAs as well. And we can look at what all of those indicate. But that would be from the staff perspective, what we need as a next step. And I know Elizabeth has her hand up.

Roberts (00:47:58):

So I just also wanted to point out, and Sydney, I don't know if you were aware of this, but the governor recently had a meeting with the UK, not the ambassador, but the representative in the state of Washington and made an announcement and signed an agreement and I haven't seen the agreement or heard the announcement, but that there's some kind of agreement between the UK and the state of Washington with respect to different professions. And he specifically named architecture as being one of the licenses that would, and again, I haven't seen it and I'm not clear on it, but he I think stated that architecture is one of the licenses or one of the professions that the UK and Washington can exchange. So Sydney, are you aware of that?

Sydney (00:48:57):

No, we hadn't. I hadn't heard of anything about that. I don't know.

Roberts (00:49:00):

It just happened last... It just happened last week. It was a big announcement and the reason I know is he also named engineering, but he said they were working on the engineering but the architecture was agreed to and so I don't know what he was talking about and I wanted to find out more. I just wanted to put that.

Sydney (00:49:25):

To the best of my knowledge, that didn't come from anybody here at the agency, but I don't speak on behalf of the agency. So I will say, our unit didn't hear anything about it to the best of my knowledge.

Roberts (00:49:37):

I just want to throw that out. The governor basically is trying to, in all areas of licensure, he's trying to open up licensure and make it more accepting, lower the bar, that's not the right word, but trying to encourage licensure. So I think he would be in support of signing this for whatever that's worth.



Sydney (00:50:03):

I can't say where that would've come from, but I will say we have had a ton of interest from UK residents wanting to pursue licensure here in Washington state. Probably more so than what I've heard in discussions with NCARB for the other jurisdiction. So Washington is a popular place that UK architects do want to come to. So I don't know about the other direction, but I know coming this way we've had a lot of interest.

Erica (00:50:37):

This is board member Erica, and I'm going to put a proposal out there and you can tell me if this is appropriate, but I moved to ask the staff to prepare additional information on the options that would move this forward to find an agreement for the MRA. Does that make sense? Is that clear?

Sydney (00:51:00):

Yes. I would just ask what specific information the board is looking for.

Erica (00:51:06):

Okay. I would propose that the staff prepare a document that identifies the comparison of the education and work experience to create a specific agreement that we may be able to approve at the next meeting. Is that more clear?

Sydney (00:51:06):

Yes.

Erica (00:51:06):

Okay.

Roberts (00:51:29):

So we did receive the MRA in full in a packet. I just dug it out in our, which packet is it? In our April, that might've been before, Erica, you were on the board. In our April meeting, we did have the full MRA, is that correct, Sydney? I think that's what I'm looking at.

Sydney (00:51:52):

I think we got one on January 19th, even.

Roberts (00:51:58):

Yeah, we probably got it both times.

Sydney (00:52:00):

We have a lot of information about it. So we have the MRA, we have an explanation of the MRA. The one thing I was looking for was the actual data on the comparisons, but it's been done by the... I'm sure we could access it. It's been done by that international organization that has the equivalencies. Yeah, there's a lot of information already prepared out there. It's just a matter of, I took a lot of time to read

through it all and try to make the comparisons, but I'm not sure what more we can give you beyond what the information other than the very specifics about the education and the examination.

Erica (00:52:48):

This is board member Erica, does that mean for what you're requesting then would it be more appropriate that we just need to prepare the actual verbiage or measure that we would be requesting on? If all that information is there and then it is just culminated into the state would accept it with these bump, bump, bump conditions and it's just the actual formal notice? It sounds like we're ready to have that. We could be very clear and say this is why we put these agreements in there.

Board Member Wu (00:53:27):

Board member, Wu is this simple enough to add a write up to that agreement that we are requiring working experience. They want the license in the state. It'll be simple enough. And in most cases these applications will reflect that. Nobody's come out of college and want to get a license here.

Roberts (00:53:56):

Correct.

Board Member Wu (00:54:01):

That would be my-

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [00:54:04]

Wu (00:54:01):

That would be my condition that I would...

Roberts (00:54:07):

I guess the question is do we feel ready to make... And I hate to drag this out anymore, Sydney, I appreciate your suggesting that we've... The problem is it's dragged out so far that I think that some people... It's been a long time since we've dug into it in depth. I guess the question is, do we feel ready to be able to make a vote on this today? Do we feel that we need to review the documents that we've already received in order to feel comfortable to make that vote? Do we really want to even continue having the conversation?

(00:54:46):

I would say yes. And then just before I pass it on, one more thing that we should all be aware of is that NCARB is actively working on getting many more MRAs. They are kind of trotting around Europe and looking at other places to do MRA. This is going to be something this board is going to continue to be considering over the next few years.

Wu (00:55:09):

Board member Wu, again. I think this MRA will set the precedent for our state. I think it might be good for us to think about it and prepare to vote during the next meeting while there are more board members present than just the four of us.

Roberts (00:55:30):

Thank you, board member. Okay. And board member Manley has his hand up.

Manley (00:55:43):

Yeah, I agree with Board member Paul Wu, that I think we need to have some closure on this. I think it's come to us fairly well vetted. I think the question of experience is a good question, but I also think that it's unlikely anyone would leave school and immediately come to Washington State, it could happen, and apply for a license. But what I'm wondering is, as far as the order of things here, can we agree on accepting the MRA as a board and have that be followed by further analysis of experience requirements or would that be too much of a risk that there may be a backlog of people who are wanting to apply and they may want to be applying to Washington State and when we vote to accept that, then we're faced with applications that we have to look at, but with no policy concerning experience that we've agreed on.

Roberts (00:57:06):

Elizabeth?

Roberts (00:57:09):

Yeah, I think you could vote to accept the MRA because the MRA does say clearly that individual states, by accepting the MRA, you're accepting the equivalency together with any extra requirements that states may have. It's not saying we accept the MRA just as is. I think you could, in this case, say we agree to the MRA, and our additional requirements would be that an applicant show two years of experience as already described in the wax, for example, for the non-degree, non-accepted degrees, whatever that is. Or just use the exact same language in the acceptance.

(00:58:07):

The purpose of that is just so that the staff knows in the future that whenever they get somebody who's applying through the MRA equivalency, that they also need to just make sure that there's experience there. The acceptance would be we accept the MRA with the understanding that they also have to show the experience equivalent to what other experience requirements are in the state of Washington.

(00:58:36):

I think that would work, but again, it's up to staff and up to the board. That would be my... I don't know that you need to do a rule for that.

Roberts (00:58:44):

We would defer to legal counsel on that. If the attorneys give their blessing, we're usually pretty happy.

Speaker 4 (00:58:58):

It sounds like we could, at this time, have a motion on the floor if somebody would like to do that.

Roberts (00:59:05):

You do have a motion on the floor right now.

Speaker 4 (00:59:05):

We do?

Roberts (00:59:05):

Yes.

Speaker 4 (00:59:08):

We do have a motion on the floor. You're correct. Thank you. Does it need to be altered or do we want to move forward with seconding and voting on that motion that Board Member Erica-

Roberts (00:59:24):

Can you... There were a few things discussed. I'd like for somebody to reread the motion, please.

Speaker 4 (00:59:29):

Susan, do you have that documented?

Roberts (00:59:34):

I do not. Susan, do you?

Susan (00:59:36):

I believe Erica Loin said that a motion... She did say a motion to approve it with the policy change outlining the extra requirements and the education. So I don't know if you want to continue to have that.

Roberts (00:59:36):

Yeah, I think it was a motion to request that staff prepared documents...

Speaker 4 (00:59:36):

A document, sorry.

Roberts (01:00:10):

... to return to the board outlining the education and the work experience. Board Member Loin, I don't know if you would like to still pursue that motion or if the board would like to withdraw that and put something else forward.

Erica (01:00:19):

I would... Yes. I think that that is still where we were at the end of that conversation. For Board Member, Loin. Correct?

Roberts (01:00:29):

So that's the motion on the floor. The motion on the floor right now is that the staff prepare additional information before an MRA gets approved to present at the next meeting. If somebody wants to amend

that, it would be a friendly amendment, if you agree, Erica, if you agree to this amendment. Otherwise, you can vote against this if there's not a friendly amendment, or you can vote for it.

Speaker 4 (01:01:04):

Before we get to the vote. Do any board members want to second that motion?

Wu (01:01:10):

I would make a friendly amendment to add the two years working experience in the MRA.

Roberts (01:01:21):

Do you still want all the information prepared by the staff? Because that's kind of a critical piece.

Erica (01:01:29):

This is Board Member Loin. I can make a friendly amendment to my own statement, but that information has already been provided in previous documentation. I agree with Board member Wu's for the amendment to just have that clarification made and then we can have something prepared that we can vote on at the next meeting to approve the MRA, is my revised proposal, or motion.

Wu (01:02:00):

I second that motion.

Speaker 4 (01:02:02):

You second that? Okay. Then we'll take a vote. All in favor of that.

Roberts (01:02:08):

Can we have discussion about it please?

Speaker 4 (01:02:12):

Oh.

Roberts (01:02:12):

I'm a little confused. I don't know if staff is confused about what they're supposed to do. I'm a little confused about what we're asking for.

Roberts (01:02:22):

I think, and Board Member Loin can correct me if I'm wrong, but bring back just the full MRA to the board again, for you all to be able to review, as well as outlining whatever would be required to implement the two year experience requirement with anyone applying through the MRA. And bring that back outlined for the board just so that you guys have a clear, fresh idea of why you would be voting to approve.

Roberts (01:02:58):

The language... We're creating the language for what that equivalency of experience would be for us?

Roberts (01:03:07):

Correct.

Roberts (01:03:08):

Okay. So something that we could cleanly vote on next time.

Roberts (01:03:12):

Yeah. That is what I think is helpful is because I think we've gone back and forth and I'm not sure if the vote is just we accept it, but I think if we had the text and it was very clear, this is what we're accepting with all the background information already been completed. It would be prepared in the next session.

Roberts (01:03:32):

That sounds good. Thank you for the clarification.

Speaker 4 (01:03:40):

Do we need to restate the motion then again? Are everybody clear on that?

Sydney (01:03:47):

Staff is clear. I don't know. Staff is clear.

Speaker 4 (01:03:49):

Board members clear? No, it is been going around and around so thank you for that. Okay, then I guess it's time to vote on that. All in favor say aye.

Sydney (01:03:59):

Aye.

Wu (01:03:59):

Aye.

Speaker 4 (01:04:03):

All right. Sounds like it's approved. Thank you. So we'll keep that on as old business and have a vote for next meeting.

Roberts (01:04:11):

Would you mind just saying all opposed?

Speaker 4 (01:04:14):

Oh, all opposed?

Roberts (01:04:16):

All right, so the voting is unanimous. It's just for the meeting minutes. It's good to have those things established.

(01:04:22):

And also I just want to make sure that when there's a motion on the floor, somebody is writing down what the motion is and hopefully... This was very convoluted. So hopefully staff has... I don't mean you, I mean staff, hopefully staff has been able to write down what this motion was, who seconded it and that it was approved unanimously. I know that's complicated.

Sydney (01:04:48):

Yes, we do have that captured by three different people in the background.

Roberts (01:04:52):

Great. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 4 (01:04:55):

Thank you.

Roberts (01:04:57):

We're making your lives difficult today.

Sydney (01:05:00):

That's okay. That's okay. Sometimes progress is painful and that's okay.

Speaker 4 (01:05:07):

All right, moving on to 6.2 for old business is discussion of creating an overlapping incident practice reference document. I'm going to turn this over to again Sydney with assistance from Assistant Attorney General Elizabeth.

Sydney (01:05:25):

So I'm just going to present this and then I'll turn it over to Elizabeth. This has been a long standing request from the board for some sort of document outlining overlapping in install and practice with the other design professions. This was previously referred to as the Green Book.

(01:05:46):

However, board member Wu pointed out to us at the last meeting that that terminology was problematic and we did our research and agreed that was entirely problematic. So we apologize for that terminology and not knowing any better on that previously.

(01:06:04):

But with regard to the overlapping and incident on practice document, this is something that's been on the action item list for quite some time and Staff trying to move through that list and get it cleaned up

and get some progress for the board. We asked Elizabeth to take a look at what that would look like and to present to the board. So I'll turn it over to her.

Roberts (01:06:30):

Yes, thank you. So my advice to this board, as well as the engineers board, is that there is no incidental practice because incidental practice implies that you are allowing, say engineers or landscape architects, or whoever, to practice architecture, the practice of architecture. And that is not legal. There's no legal authority to allow that. There is overlapping.

(01:07:03):

There tends to be what the architects would consider some overlapping work between engineers and architects or between other professions. However, I advise against putting anything in writing about that because there's no statutory authority or whack authority that allows you to create that document or that gives you specific enough information within the practice of architecture or the practice of engineering to even from a legal perspective to even define what that would be.

(01:07:43):

So my advice is that you guys are architects. Your authority is to regulate and enforce the practice of architecture. If you find a complaint that says somebody has been practicing architecture without a license, at that point you have the authority to look at what that person was doing and determine what their work was and whether it was unlicensed practice. So whether they were practicing architecture engineers, practicing architecture, but it's up to engineers, it's up to architects to determine for themselves what their practice involves.

(01:08:27):

So if an engineer feels like he's doing engineering work, that's a determination for him to make. If somebody makes a complaint about that, then yes, you guys can look at that and say that is clearly architecture and you aren't licensed and you aren't qualified. So my advice, from a legal perspective, is don't create or use this document because you don't have the authority to do it and there's no purpose for it in the board's day-to-day practice of being a regulatory board. I don't know. Sydney, do you have anything to add to that?

Sydney (01:09:15):

No, really the Staff concern with this is the legal risk involved and that is why we asked Elizabeth to address this with the board, particularly based on the attorney general's opinions that have come out regarding this topic. We really felt like there was a considerable risk there, but know that it has been an interest to the board. So wanted to give you all the opportunity to have that discussion and make a definitive determination.

Roberts (01:09:45):

And the engineers have removed any type of document like this from their website. So they don't have anything that talks about overlapping or incidental practice. They just don't speak to that issue.

Sydney (01:10:00):



And I believe what they had actually tied back to the Department of Licensing website and that page no longer exists. I do see Board Member Roberts has her hand up.

Roberts (01:10:13):

Yeah, I don't have any problem with that. I guess I agree that it could be, yeah, that it could be confusing, if not illegal.

(01:10:26):

But I guess my question is that I do know, for instance, that the AIA is interested in trying to consider changes to our law that would clarify maybe architecture versus engineering or whatever, how architecture... Where we draw that line. I don't know what that is going to look like, but I'm assuming that that would be the path that would make sense, right?

(01:11:00):

Because there'd be something then in our law that we would then be able to regulate because it would be kind of written down as part of the law should it end up passing. And I mean this would be years and years down the line, but am I right on that understanding of how this might work?

Roberts (01:11:22):

Absolutely. If you had more guidance in the statutes, more definition in the statutes, yes you would have much easier, much more authority to go forward with that. And I do know that I spend a lot of time researching this and I do know that they are working on trying to make those definitions clearer, but we just don't have anything yet.

Sydney (01:11:43):

Board member Manley has his hand up.

Manley (01:11:52):

Yes. So one of the reasons this has come up in the past is because of our local building jurisdictions having questions directed at us regarding whether someone who has submitted documents for review needs to be an architect or needs to be an engineer or where the lines are drawn. So if those questions come up in the future, and you've been clear on this in the past, you've been clear on this and consistent on this all along, Elizabeth, that it's problematic.

(01:12:40):

Should, say, a board member get a question from a building official, should we... I suppose question answers itself, but should we demure on that and tell them that they just need to look at the law and make their own decision? I think that's what's been discussed in the past.

(01:13:08):

Other than that... And also, we have a five year rolling clock legislation issue at hand. There's probably no way to... If we're going to add to the law, in terms of further defining architect versus engineer in the architect law, probably impossible to piggyback the one on the other and maybe not well advised either.

Sydney (01:13:47):

So I can address that as it relates to the overlapping and incidental practice. I do know that, like board member Roberts indicated, AIA is looking at outlining that further in the future. We talked to them about the rolling clock legislation. They told us their initial thought was to include some of that initial definition change, but because this is a short session for 2024 and they didn't want the rolling clock piece to get held up because of the pursuit of further outlining the practice and anticipating there could be some disagreement between architects and engineers on what those definitions are and where those lines are drawn. They didn't want to risk the rolling clock piece with the additional things that they would like to pursue.

(01:14:46):

So this is something that they're looking at pursuing, at the earliest 2025 and they're looking at what that would entail,

Roberts (01:14:58):

Which is the right way to go, I think. We're excited that they're going to jump on the rolling clock thing. Keeping it clean, I think we'll give it a better chance of getting through and I think that's a huge priority for us right now is to try to get that rolling clock thing resolved.

Sydney (01:15:15):

Absolutely.

Speaker 4 (01:15:23):

I don't think we need any action item on this. Are we good to move on if there's no more discussion?

Sydney (01:15:28):

I think the only thing staff would like is just, it's not something we necessarily need a motion on, but if we could get a definitive direction from the board on removing this from the action item list, if this is no longer something you would like to pursue. It's always something that we can revisit once the laws and rules are changed. But at this point there's just a risk to continuing to keep this on the books.

Rock (01:16:04):

This is rock. I would be fine personally as a board member dropping this from our ongoing concerns in favor of watching it for future action with AIA creating some kind of law change.

Roberts (01:16:30):

I agree too. I'm good with dropping it.

Speaker 4 (01:16:33):

I think we keep losing Erica, but any other comments? Discussion?

Sydney (01:16:48):

That was what we needed. Thank you.

Speaker 4 (01:16:52):

All right, perfect. All right, moving on to new business. We have a discussion about continuing education requirement for Washington State. This was brought up last meeting by board member Lloyd and we wanted to open it up for board member discussion. Not sure she's on, she keeps dropping on and off the meeting. She might be having technical difficulties.

Lloyd (01:17:23):

This is Board Member Lloyd. I apologize.

Speaker 4 (01:17:24):

Oh, there you are.

Lloyd (01:17:25):

My internet keeps dropping at the office. I don't know why, so I'm on my phone. I'll try to put this together. So I saw that this just came up. Do you want me to share some of my discussion points on it?

Speaker 4 (01:17:39):

Yes, please.

Lloyd (01:17:40):

Okay. So this is board member Lloyd. It was brought to my attention that [inaudible 01:17:47] that there are some specific requirements for education coming in from certain topics. In particular, maybe creating a minimum requirement for seismic classes or things that would be tied into our continuing education. And they've seen that starting to occur in other states or jurisdictions.

(01:18:13):

And we're curious about the view from the board on what it would mean to have these kind of specific requirements added to our list for continuing education that's documented to the state. I was not given specifics of which states had exactly how many credits or what the information was, but it was more in context of is that something that the board would be wanting to address?

Roberts (01:18:49):

I got my hand raised. I'll just go ahead and talk though since no one else is talking.

(01:18:54):

Yeah, our continuing education requirements are probably some of the most minimum of any other state. They're very, very low bar for us. And I do think it's worth looking at this. Most states have at least a HSW requirement. We don't have an HSW requirement and most states also... And the states that I'm licensed in that do have these additional requirements you're talking about, Erica, is California and they now require five hours of accessibility and they require five hours of... They're now requiring net zero energy, a certain number, I can't remember how many hours, of net zero energy. And then I know in BC, I'm also licensed there, they now have indigenous people, they have a requirement for, I think it might only be one or two hours.

(01:19:53):

So there are definitely states that have more specific requirements. I don't actually know one that has seismic, but there are states that have specific requirements am actually wondering if we should maybe form a committee to review this and understand what the AIA requires, which is significantly more than what we do, what other states are requiring. And then maybe come to the board with a proposal about whether we should consider asking more of our licensees in terms of continuing education.

Erica (01:20:31):

This is board member Loin. I agree. I think that it does warrant that, especially to ensure that people are putting their time to appropriate hours. I think frequently there are people who may check the boxes that they have hours, but not really use quality things that are really benefiting the advancement of our profession. And those topics that you mentioned, I have heard those too. And I have some of the states I'm in equally do that in provinces. So I agree. I would-

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:21:04]

Board Member Erica Loynd (01:21:00):

... provinces. So I agree to expedite this because we don't have a lot of information. I would move to have a committee started and I'd be willing to be a part of that committee. Or I don't know if it needs a chair, how that is, if there would be something that needs to get spearheaded by somebody.

Speaker 5 (01:21:27):

You just need another couple of volunteers, Erica.

Susan Nieves (01:21:30):

I think it would be good to have a motion on that to set to establish a task force. Is that what you're talking about or committee?

Speaker 5 (01:21:39):

Yeah. Yeah, maybe task force is the right word. I don't know.

Speaker 6 (01:21:42):

Yeah.

Board Member Erica Loynd (01:21:42):

That sounds better. I would make a friendly amendment to myself again. I propose that we create a task force and I would volunteer to be a part of that task force.

Speaker 6 (01:21:53):

We have a motion on the floor to create a task force to review the-

Speaker 5 (01:22:00):

I second it.

Speaker 6 (01:22:03):

Okay.

Sydney (01:22:04):

And Board Member Wu has his hand up.

Speaker 6 (01:22:07):

Yes, we'll have a discussion. Board Member Wu, you're on mute. If you want to come off mute. It looks like you're still on mute.

Board Member Wu (01:22:28):

Sorry about that.

Speaker 6 (01:22:29):

There you go.

Board Member Wu (01:22:30):

I will be glad to join that task force.

Speaker 6 (01:22:35):

A volunteer. Thank you.

Board Member Wu (01:22:37):

Yes.

Speaker 6 (01:22:38):

Any other volunteers or discussion? All right. So we have a motion on the floor to create a task force to look at the requirements for continuing education and then come to the board with a recommendation. And that's been seconded by Board Member... I don't know the last names on here. Sean?

Susan Nieves (01:22:38):

Traverse.

Speaker 6 (01:23:07):

Traverse? Thank you. Now we'll take a vote. All those in motions say aye.

Audience (01:23:13):

Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

Speaker 6 (01:23:16):

Any opposed? No. Motion unanimously passed. Thank you. All right. Moving on to 7.2, the meeting schedule. We're looking at the dates for meetings for next year and I'll turn this over to Susan Nieves.

Susan Nieves (01:23:39):

So this is the last meeting of the year. So up on the screen are the proposed meeting dates. We have January 25th, April 25th, July 25th, and October 24th. And we have the meeting scheduled at 10:00 AM. If the board's in agreement with that, we will send out meeting invites once we have all of the boards and commissions meetings set.

Speaker 6 (01:24:08):

Board Member Loynd?

Board Member Erica Loynd (01:24:13):

This is Board Member Loynd. We briefly discussed are these meetings anticipated in the year 2024 to start being back in person? I think that had been briefly discussed that it was a goal for meetings to be in person again, but I don't know if because of the new format and the way this has created efficiency that might stay this way.

Sydney (01:24:34):

I can address that. So our goal is to have one of our meetings a year be an in-person hybrid meeting. Part of the reason for that being coordinating travel across the state, granted, I know most of you are on the western side. But looking at it holistically for all of our boards, with a lot of people trying to travel over the past during the fall, winter and spring months, it creates a whole lot of logistical problems. So what we're looking at is for the summer quarter meetings to be our in-person hybrid meetings. We will rent a meeting space and have that available. Part of the challenge is that the law requires that we now provide a virtual option not only for all board members to be able to attend, but for public participants as well. And so that's been part of the challenge is getting that technology. The technology really hasn't caught up to the post-COVID world quite yet.

(01:25:34):

So we did have one in-person meeting for a different board this year just to test it out and it was the funeral and cemetery board. They weren't picked for any particular reason. Other than the meeting space that was available, we looked at the dates that it was available. And they were the winner that got picked to be the Guinea pig this year. And we've learned a lot of lessons out of it in particular that the technology just hasn't caught quite up yet. And so we're trying to figure out how to address some of the issues that we found coming out of that. In particular, a lot of the delays that were caused from the technology bouncing mode. When we're all virtual, we don't have that delay because we are all on the exact same delay. Whereas when we're in the room with other people, that delay gets really pronounced really quick.

(01:26:27):

So just some different things like that. Also, just some audio issues, different things that just weren't necessarily an issue pre-COVID and that we're trying to work out. So we're hoping to have all of that set

up by the summer quarter for next year and then that will look at being our in-person hybrid meeting every year moving forward.

Speaker 6 (01:26:54):

Any other comments or questions? I'm going to ask for a motion for approval of these dates.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:27:04):

This is Roch. I move that we approve the proposed meeting schedule for 2024.

Speaker 6 (01:27:12):

And a second?

Board Member Erica Loynd (01:27:16):

Board Member Loynd. I second the motion.

Speaker 6 (01:27:19):

Any discussions or comments? All right. Ask for a vote. All those in favor say aye.

Audience (01:27:26):

Aye.

(01:27:27):

Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

Speaker 6 (01:27:29):

Any opposed? [inaudible 01:27:33]. Thank you. All right, so moving on to 7.3. Board member discussion. And I'm going to turn this over to Sydney to present this.

Sydney (01:27:48):

Before we go too far, I see Board Member Manley have his hand up?

Speaker 6 (01:27:51):

Oh.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:27:53):

Yes. Yes I do. And I have to apologize. I've been watching the clock and concerned about our ability to have a quorum because I see we have a complaint case coming up. And the experience committee meeting that I thought started at noon, our time actually started at 11:00.

Sydney (01:28:23):

Oh, no.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:28:24):

My poor organization skills. So I'm wondering if it would be possible at this point in the meeting to revise the agenda so that the complete case, because I don't think we're going to vote on the goals discussion, am I correct?

Sydney (01:28:47):

This would just be voting on whether or not these goals and priorities are still what the board wants to pursue.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:28:54):

Oh, so it is a voting issue?

Sydney (01:28:56):

Yeah. And we can move this to the first meeting of next year if that is the board's preference.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:29:02):

It does sound like it's usually a long discussion. So that concerns me a little bit since we're seem to be running a little bit longer with this meeting. So I would ask that, do I need to make a motion then?

Speaker 6 (01:29:25):

Go ahead.

Sydney (01:29:27):

Yeah. If the board is in agreement, we can do a motion to table this item to the next meeting.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:29:33):

And move to complaint case?

Sydney (01:29:36):

Yeah. Then we'd be moving right to the complaint case. That's the next item.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:29:40):

Okay. I would move that we table board goals discussion until next meeting and move to complaint cases the next agenda item.

Speaker 6 (01:29:55):

Do we have a second for that motion?

Board Member Roberts (01:30:00):

Board Member Roberts. I second.

Speaker 6 (01:30:02):



Any discussion? Those in favor say aye.

Audience (01:30:07):

Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

Speaker 6 (01:30:10):

Any opposed? All right, we'll have this as business to discuss and review for next meeting. Thank you. Moving on to complaint case for review and I'll turn this over to Board Member Wu?

Board Member Wu (01:30:28):

Yes. Board Member Wu here. Complaint case number 2022-05-0816-00ARC. The complaint summary is on the meeting notes there. I'm going to read it. A complaint was filed against Architect Greg Brant, license number 5177 by Alan Heckler on May 9th.

Sydney (01:31:01):

Board Member Wu, we don't provide the names of the complainant or who the complaint was about during the open meeting.

Board Member Wu (01:31:08):

Okay. But anyway, the complaint was for non-performance of services paid. Greg Brant was a licensed architect in Washington state. The complaint accused Mr. Brant of not producing required drawings for surface paid already and failure to respond to multiple attempts for contact. And the facts of this complaint are the record shows that Mr. Greg Brant passed away on January 2nd, 2023. Any further claims, monetary or otherwise are beyond the jurisdiction of this board. The complainant was advised to pursue other civil actions it deemed necessary to recover his loss. So the complaint is closed with no further action from the board. That's the result of this complaint and the decision.

Board Member Roberts (01:32:24):

So this is Board Member Roberts. I move that we accept the case manager's recommendation to close this complaint.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:32:32):

And seconded by Board Member Manley.

Speaker 6 (01:32:38):

Do we have any discussion or comments?

Board Member Roch Manley (01:32:45):

I have one comment. Is there a question as much? Is there a process we had to watch for deceased license holders and purge them from our lists? That's all.

Sydney (01:33:07):

That I would have to check with the licensing team on, but I can certainly ask and report back to the board at the next meeting. We'll do that.

Speaker 6 (01:33:20):

Any other comments or questions? Call for a vote. All those in favor say aye.

Audience (01:33:27):

Aye.

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye

[NEW\_PARAGRAPH]Aye.

Speaker 6 (01:33:30):

Any opposed? Motion passed. Thank you for that.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:33:37):

Okay. With my apologies, I'll leave the meeting.

Speaker 6 (01:33:46):

Thank you.

Speaker 5 (01:33:46):

Thank you.

Sydney (01:33:48):

Thanks, Roch.

Board Member Roch Manley (01:33:49):

Bye-Bye.

Speaker 6 (01:33:52):

Moving on to... Oh.

Sydney (01:33:55):

I was going to say we do still have our quorum so we're good.

Speaker 6 (01:33:56):

Quorum? Okay. All right, perfect. So moving on to nine reports and I'm turning this over to Sydney to talk about the committee task force reports.

Sydney (01:34:09):

So the only committee report that we have or the only active committee that we had prior to today is the Model Law review committee who did meet week or so ago, and are going to be meeting again in November to finalize their review and bring back their comments to the board at a later date. With the complaint status report, we currently have eight that are in case close status. One that is an investigation, two that are in management review for a grand total of 11 as of August. And Susan, we can go to the next one. This is just a quick snapshot.

(01:34:57):

So the previous chart that was provided is from our central services group. They've take a much more holistic look. This is provided specifically from our investigators and the wonderful team over there. And that was just a quick second quarter snapshot, so I won't go into detail on it. It was provided in your packets, but just so that you all could see the data from a different angle. For our licensee counts, we have a grand total in-state of 4, 073 and then out of state of 7,219.

(01:35:43):

And again, just trying to provide the data in different ways, just showing what those licensing trends are and have been. So this is just how those numbers look throughout the year, but architect stays relatively pretty steady compared to some of our other professions. And I will turn it over to Susan Nieves to go over the master action item was.

Susan Nieves (01:36:14):

So Sydney just gave a little report out for the Model Law so that we'll be continuing on our action item list. Statistics for the law exam next winter about getting assistance with a management analyst, that's still in progress. Today, Elizabeth Lagerberg discussed the MRA and we're going to bring that back for the next meeting to discuss on old business. And the discussion for the reference manual was resolved today and will be removed from the list.

(01:36:52):

We have the NCARB & AIA assistance with the five-year rolling clock. We have had some communications recently with AIA to get assistance to get that legislation upfront for the next session. And Sydney is currently working on some legislation with the Sunset Bill 1101. So hopefully something will be coming out in regards to that legislation. And on the NCARB university visits, there was a meeting back in August. And NCARB addressed what they're going to be doing for outreach and they're going to be visiting community colleges rather than universities.

(01:37:38):

So whichever direction the board would like to go in, whether they would like to visit the community colleges with NCARB or go to the universities, it's completely up to the board and board staff will assist in coordinating those events for attendance. And then in regards to the newsletter for NCARB to send out our recruitment, we didn't think that that was something that we could do. So we're exploring other options. Recently, I reached out to the governor's office to see if there was any applicants for the architect vacancy that we currently have. And unfortunately, there hasn't been any applicants turned

into the governor's office. And I recently sent out a listserv again in regards to the recruitment. So we have one vacancy currently for a licensed architect eight years experience. So we'll continue to explore avenues for different places that we can reach and send out our recruitment information.

Sydney (01:38:56):

The only thing I'll add to that is on the legislative update, that is something we've been working on putting together, but there's been a lot of behind the scenes happening that I wanted to be able to include with that. So a lot of that information I actually just got yesterday and some more this morning. So I will be finishing that legislative update and getting it out to all of you this afternoon, but I didn't want to send it without giving you guys that full picture that was happening in the background on a couple of these.

Susan Nieves (01:39:20):

And if you have any questions or if you have some direction that you'd like Sydney and I to move forward with for the outreach, we'd be happy to facilitate that.

Speaker 5 (01:39:37):

I wonder if actually, AIA Washington Council in particular, because I know there's always been a desire to have at least some geographic diversity, which we're struggling to get people from the other side of the mountains. AIA Washington Council wouldn't be a good avenue to get the word out about the vacancy.

Sydney (01:40:02):

I believe we've reached out to Tammy.

Susan Nieves (01:40:04):

I believe Tammy has... She's aware of it and she sees the listservs that come out. And I believe back in July I connected with her and she says that she's putting the word out. And I know that's something that Scott Harm has really stressed too, that he would like to see something from the other side of the mountains in regards to applicants for the vacant position.

Sydney (01:40:34):

We will keep pursuing that and keep hammering, particularly at Eastern Washington, but also understanding that unique to architects that isn't for some of our other professions is that the bulk of our licensees are from Western Washington and fewer on the east side. So it's just a smaller pool to get from over there. But we will continue to work on that. And would just ask if any Board members know of anybody that they would like to apply even from Western Washington. We would prefer Eastern Washington, but if not, because of the challenges with this particular licensee base, we would just love to have any applicants at this point. So if you know of anybody, please ask them to apply. And with that, we can move on to public comments.

Speaker 6 (01:41:26):

So do I need to read this or just...

Sydney (01:41:36):

Sorry, I muted myself too fast. If you want to or I am happy to. I know we had a couple members of the public on, I don't know if we still do. I'm not seeing anybody, but we'll still open the public comment period because it is a requirement.

Speaker 6 (01:41:52):

Yes. Oh, absolutely. The public may address the board on matters within the board jurisdiction, either verbally during the meeting, which is now, or by submitting written comments in advance. The verbal comments are limited to one to three minutes. Written comments are limited to no more than 500 words and must be emailed to [DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov](mailto:DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov), no less than two business days prior to the meeting with the subject line public comment board architect board.

(01:42:24):

In response to public comments, the board is limited to request that the matter be added to a future agenda for discussion or directing staff to study the matter further. Inflammatory comments and language will not be permitted. I'm going to pause and see if anybody comes off mute to add a comment. Hearing nothing. We'll move on to conclusion number 11. Do any Board members have any announcements or additional reports that they would like to make at this time? Can we progress this slide, please?

(01:43:03):

Oh, thank you. Thank you. Any announcements? Reports? Are there any requests for additional future agenda items have not been discussed yet that any Board members like to request for the next meeting? Efficient pause. Okay. And then Susan, would you mind reviewing the action items from today's meeting?

Susan Nieves (01:43:39):

I don't believe we technically captured an action item, but we do have a new task force. And so I'll reach out to the new members with the task force to see if they'd like to schedule a meeting to get working on their research with the education requirements and the potential document to present to the board. And then I did capture one agenda item and that's the MRA and staff will work on a document that outlines identifies the education and experience so the board can make an educated vote in regards to the MRA at the next meeting.

Sydney (01:44:15):

And we did have one other item that staff will bring back information on whether or not we monitor for deceased licensees and what that process looks like. So we'll bring that report back at the next meeting.

Susan Nieves (01:44:28):

Thank you, Sydney.

Speaker 6 (01:44:33):

Thank you. All right. It looks like we are complete, so we'll move on to adjournment. The time is now 11:46 and the meeting is adjourned.

Sydney (01:44:47):

Thank you all.

Susan Nieves (01:44:48):

Thank you.

Board Member Roberts (01:44:48):

Thanks everyone. Bye.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:44:52]