

Scott Harm:

10:01 AM and I call this regular meeting of the Architect Board to order. The board will provide an opportunity for public comment during this meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage participants to mute their mics or phones when not speaking to reduce the background noise when others are speaking. Please remember to unmute your mic or your phone when you're speaking. As I did, also for the board members to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thanks.

Susan, at this time would you please do a roll call of board members?

Sydney:

Yes.

Scott Harm:

Please respond in the affirmative.

Sydney:

Chair Harm?

Scott Harm:

Present.

Sydney:

Vice Chair Cooley?

Susan Cooley:

Present.

Sydney:

Secretary Wu?

Paul Wu:

Present.

Sydney:

Board member Loynd?

Erica Loynd:

Present.

Sydney:

Board Member Manley?

Roch Manley:

This transcript was exported on Jul 31, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Present.

Sydney:

Board Member Roberts?

Sian Roberts:

Here.

Sydney:

Thank you.

Scott Harm:

Okay. Cool. First action item is we need a motion on approval of the agenda for today's conversation. Anyone?

Paul Wu:

I move-

Sian Roberts:

This is Board... Oh, go ahead, Paul.

Paul Wu:

Yeah, I move to approve the agenda.

Sian Roberts:

This is Board Member Roberts, I second.

Scott Harm:

Okay. We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor indicate by, let's see, what do we want to do, raise hands? Is raise hands good? Raise hands.

Sydney:

Or by aye through voices.

Scott Harm:

Or aye, okay. Oh, there we go. Oh, the electronic hand. Good move. Okay, the motion passes unanimously.

Next on the agenda is the approval for the minutes. We have two sets. We could probably, I think, capture this in one motion if we word it correctly. So do I have a motion to approve the minutes from the two meetings, April 20th and May 30th?

Susan Cooley:

This is Vice Chair Cooley, I make a motion to approve the minutes.

Erica Loynd:

I second. This is Board Member Erica Loynd.

Scott Harm:

Great, thank you. Okay, we have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion whatsoever? None. Hearing none, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor indicate by saying yea.

Board Members:

Yea.

Scott Harm:

I've got to figure out which is the best way to go with this. Okay, top of the order now is old business, starting with the discussion on the mutual recognition agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Sydney, I think you were going to field this one.

Sydney:

I was. So this is carry over from the last couple of meetings on the mutual recognition agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom. The board has considered the MRA a couple of different times now and at the last meeting wanted an additional answer from NCARB regarding the requirement for the AXP certification. We did reach out to NCARB, they did get back to us. They are still working on how to implement the rule and what this looks like behind the scenes.

In the packet that we did provide an answer for the board from Josh Batkin and it basically says that one way or another, whether it's the AXP or previously through the IDP or another previous version of that certification, but anyone wanting to be licensed under this MRA would have to have whichever version of that tied to their license here in the United States in order to be considered for the United Kingdom. I believe that was a stipulation from the UK, that was not one that NCARB could change.

So like I said, they are working on how that's going to look behind the scenes. They don't believe that that's going to impact a large number of licensees. But understanding that there is the possibility out there, they're looking at what that would mean. But that is the requirement.

So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions, or if the board is ready to make a final determination on whether or not to adopt the MRA.

Scott Harm:

I don't know that I have anything. Anyone else?

Paul Wu:

No.

Roch Manley:

This is Roch. I am one of those who, not that I would be interested in seeking registration in the UK, but I am one of those that would be impacted by this because of the time period during which I received my initial license there being no structured program for experience.

But that said, I am in favor of the mutual recognition agreement. I think it's an advancement. Hopefully in the language in the notes, I don't have the packet in front of me right now, but it sounded like they were working through a application evaluation process that would handle that and I'm willing to trust. So that's my comment.

Scott Harm:

Elizabeth, did you have something you wanted to add? I though I saw your hand go up. Okay. Recognizing Sian Roberts.

Elizabeth:

Sorry. I'm sorry. It's Elizabeth. I did have my hand up. I apologize. I just want to make sure that we're clear on the language. If you go forward with this, you are not adopting the MRA. I want to make sure. I don't think you're adopting the MRA, I think you are in support of the NCARB's agreement. Again, I'm not exactly sure what your intent is here. I don't know that you can adopt it at this point.

Sydney, maybe-

Sydney:

Yeah, Elizabeth, this is in line with some of the other mutual recognition agreements that we have with Canada and Mexico. There's one with Australia and New Zealand. I believe typically what the board has done is adopt as far as signing on that the Washington Board will accept the terms under the MRA agreements to allow for international licensing applicants.

Elizabeth:

Okay. This is a completed... I just want to make sure that so basically you're adopting an agreement that NCARB has already entered into between the UK and the US, is that right?

Sydney:

Yes. So as the examining authorities, NCARB, on behalf of the United States jurisdictions, and then their UK equivalent, came to this mutual recognition agreement to create a pathway for licensure for UK architects to become licensed here in the States and then for US architects to become licensed in the UK without having to go through the full education and experience and all of that in those nations.

Elizabeth:

Okay. So I guess my concern is we need to make sure then, if this group is actually adopting it, we have to make sure that it doesn't violate any of your WACs, and I apologize that this just came up in my mind, but make sure it doesn't violate any of your WACs or RCWs. Maybe-

Sydney:

Yeah, this is one that I sent you earlier this year and you were [inaudible 00:08:32].

Elizabeth:

Yeah. Yeah, I remember that. I think I didn't understand necessarily that we were going to... I thought maybe it was you were going to vote in favor of it rather than adopt it. So it's fine. I'm sorry, I misunderstood and it probably didn't violate any of the WACs. But I guess I just now realize that you're

going to be adopting it. So in a sense, it's going to be similar to a WAC, so we may need to consider all these. Do we have a WAC that allows the board to adopt these different mutual recognition agreements or do we have a WAC that says the other ones are adopted?

Sydney:

I would have to look and find it specifically, but yes, we do have active MRAs that Washington State has signed on to between the US, Canada, and Mexico, as well as Australia and New Zealand.

Elizabeth:

Yeah. No, my question was more about the WAC. So we can take this offline, I just want to make sure that we have something in the law that we can use to support this adoption process and what the outcome is.

Scott Harm:

Chair Scott Harm speaking. So we would need to go back and verify that we crossed the T's and dotted the I's for the Canadian, Mexican agreement I would imagine then as well then, right?

Elizabeth:

Yes.

Sydney:

That would be my assumption, yeah.

Scott Harm:

Yeah. Okay.

Elizabeth:

Yeah. But we can look at that. If you want to go ahead with this process, go ahead and then we can go back and look at the WACs and make sure that, yes, all the I's are dotted and T's are crossed.

Scott Harm:

Well, I personally, and hopefully somebody else will chime in. Again, this is Board Chair Scott Harm. I'd personally like to have had your sidebar conversation figured out and be more affirmative on what we're doing is indeed the right way so it doesn't come back and haunt us or some future board come back and haunt them because we didn't do something appropriate. That's a little harsh, but I'll stick with that one. So I would like to not make any move on this until we get that background stuff figured out. I don't know if anybody else has an opinion.

Sian Roberts:

Yeah, this is Board Member Roberts, I agree. I think we should wait till we figure out what the right way to do this is. Or make sure that this is the right way to do it before we go ahead and do it. I mean, I'm assuming we could do it in our next meeting, this has been around for quite some time now.

Scott Harm:

This transcript was exported on Jul 31, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Yep.

Sydney:

It has, so yeah, if somebody would like to make a motion to table, Elizabeth and I can dig into those WACs and verify everything and then provide all of that outlined to the board for the next meeting.

Roch Manley:

So this is Roch-

Sian Roberts:

But I... Oh, sorry.

Roch Manley:

This is Roch. I move that we table the consideration of the mutual recognition agreement until the legal aspects are confirmed.

Paul Wu:

This is Board Member Wu. I second the motion.

Scott Harm:

Thank you very much. So we have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion whatsoever on this?

Sian Roberts:

Yes, this is Board Member Roberts. I just wanted to confirm one thing about this since we're talking about it now. I think that Roch had talked about the experience prior to having an AXP. I believe that what I'm looking at in the notes says that if you have been licensed for five consecutive years in any jurisdiction then you do not need to have the AXP. Am I reading that correctly?

Scott Harm:

Yeah, I should have spoken. That's the way I remember it stating. I don't have it in front of me right now.

Sydney:

That is what it states and that is what NCARB is still looking at and how to implement that. So they don't know if it would be an additional experience verification or what that would be, but everything else within the agreement says that the AXP or IDP is required so that's what they're still trying to analyze. It's not a question that they caught during the process.

Sian Roberts:

It says, so this is not in the MRA right now? It says here, 2.4, Alternatives to the Experience Requirement, if you received your initial license from a US jurisdictional licensing board prior to January 1st, 2011, which must have been when AXV was adopted, you may provide documentation demonstrating you've been licensed in a US jurisdiction for at least five consecutive years in lieu of completing the standard experience requirement. Are you saying that's not in the MRA, that they're still discussing this?

Sydney:

They are discussing that there's a conflict between the language and the MRA. So there's a conflict between this language that they provided us from the certification guidelines on the MRA and the experience requirement in the MRA. So they are trying to figure out the conflict there.

Roch Manley:

Yeah. This is Roch. Yeah, I read the same thing, Sian, and I don't have it in front of me either, Scott, but what I also thought I was seeing was that there would be a review process that sounded similar to the review process that I underwent in my initial licensure with letters from architects that could vouch for you and so forth. So it sounds like it's a more-

Sian Roberts:

More onerous, yeah.

Roch Manley:

... onerous process than what you were referring to Sian. It also sounded like Josh was saying he's going to get back to us on it. So we probably don't want to try to vote on this anyway now.

Sydney:

Since it's been tabled, that gives us extra time to get with Josh and verify how they're going to implement that.

Sian Roberts:

Okay, great. Thanks for the clarification. I just was confused about it.

Scott Harm:

Elizabeth, you have your hand raised.

Elizabeth:

Yeah, I was just going to agree with you. If this is still up in the air, again, I apologize for the first one, but I think that you shouldn't vote on something that hasn't been resolved.

Scott Harm:

Great. Okay, any more discussion? Hearing none, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor of the motion to bench table the conversation for now, please indicate your approval by saying yea.

Board Members:

Yay.

Scott Harm:

Those opposed? Hearing none, it sounds like the motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Good, good, good, good, good discussion, and Roch, your voice sounds extra baritone-ish today. I hope you're doing okay.

Roch Manley:

Yeah, I think I picked up a bug from my grandson. He's four and a half.

Scott Harm:

Oh, there you go. Yeah.

Roch Manley:

So he's crawling with them.

Scott Harm:

He's a walking Petri dish as well. Or crawling Petri dish.

Roch Manley:

Right.

Scott Harm:

Okay, next item on the agenda is it looks like 5.2, a report out on NCARB's annual business meeting, or ABM, to use their acronyms. I'm geared up to go but I want to give Roch, or who else, Sian, do you want to give a report or should I just have what I have ready to go and then you can add on?

Sian Roberts:

Go for it, Scott.

Scott Harm:

Okay. So there were a series of elections. There were two contested elections, which I was really glad to see. I honestly think we need to have more contested elections so that you actually have a choice. The contested elections were for secretary and treasurer. Both contested elections were very close in the voting. I think it was around four votes separated the two candidates, which I thought was also interesting and great. Then the rest of the slate was voted in by, is it called affirmation, I think, or proclamation?

Sian Roberts:

Acclimation. Acclimation.

Scott Harm:

Acclimation, okay. Acclimation. One of them being myself, who was voted in as the Region Six regional director. I've since already filled up my calendar for the entire year with all the travel that's expected. So I can only imagine what someone like the first VP and the president have to go through, because I think I have five three or four day trips already booked.

There were five resolutions on the table from responsible control to sun-setting education policy and sun-setting some resolutions in conflict with current council, I can't remember exactly what that one was, and then an ethics update, and lastly, the hot topic was redoing the governance in the organization of NCARB as a body.

My opinion is I thought it was a very spirited debate on the governance. Went a lot smoother and faster than I had anticipated. It came to I think a fairly good agreement. I can't remember much of the specifics, so maybe Sian or Roch could fill that in.

I found the venue nice. The city, in my opinion, was a little bit of an odd choice for the ABM because usually that's the larger cities, like next year is Chicago. I thought this was a little more small in size or whatever, or not as urban feeling as what we've had in the past.

I think that's about all I've got.

Sian Roberts:

Yeah, I would just add it's funny, I can't really remember the details either on the governance structure. That was the one that we got into the amendment to the amendment discussion. But it all ultimately went through I think with a lot of support and I think it was a big win for everybody to pass that. So we're looking forward to seeing what impact that might have to the makeup of the board in the coming years.

Roch Manley:

I agree wholeheartedly on spirited discussion. It was as we have come to expect from the floor and the leadership there at the ABMs, but it went really quickly, which shocked me. I thought we'd be there for hours.

Sian Roberts:

Well, we did go through lunch.

Roch Manley:

Yeah, that's true. But congratulations to you, Scott. I think that two things we're seeing the results of the governance in some respects as far as the affirmation of the regional directors and being part of the board and really wonderful to see someone from our Washington jurisdiction move in to that position. So thanks for doing this, Scott, and congratulations.

Scott Harm:

Oh, thank you very much. Yeah.

One thing I did want to mention, because I will admit, again, this is Board Chair Harm, found it almost moderately annoying was the amendment on sexually responsible control, which was an attempt to make an alignment with I think Mississippi. I thought it was interesting in the final vote I think there was only one or two votes in the affirmative, which told me that even in their own region they didn't have support for that because their own fellow members of the region didn't vote in favor of it. So it's like, well why did it make it this far, it didn't even have support that much support at the ground level? So it was an interesting little dynamic that I observed.

Sian Roberts:

Well, any jurisdiction can put forward something, right? So if we wanted to put forward something, even if we had zero support, we can do it.

Scott Harm:

That used to be Oregon's forte.

Sian Roberts:

What do you guys want to do next year?

Scott Harm:

That used to be Oregon's forte. They would always-

Sian Roberts:

Yeah. That's right, Oregon used to do that pretty often.

Scott Harm:

It almost became annoying.

I think we had a couple members of the board or the staff that participated partially virtually. Was there any report out from any of you that did it? I'm not sure. I don't want to name names because I don't know who did it.

Sydney:

It was myself and Susan and it was very educational for both of us to get to see the behind the scenes. It was all of the same breakouts that all the in-person attendees participated in, they just had dedicated ones for the online to attend. Very educational, very informative. It was really helpful for us to see how NCARB functions as an organization. It is very different from what our other national organizations that we interact with, how their business operates. So very, very insightful for us. Very early mornings with it being in Miami and logging in from here in Washington State, but yeah, we got a lot out of it and brought a lot home.

Scott Harm:

Great. Yeah, I think that was a pretty good report out. It was a very interesting meeting, and as Roch said, I really thought we were going to go into the night on the governance thing so I was delighted in some way that it went as fast and as smooth as it did with still a lot of debate.

Okay, we'll move on to the next agenda item. According to my Cliff Notes, it's the Model Law Committee discussion, possible changes to the current Model Law Committee. Sydney, you want to deal with this one?

Sydney:

So this is a request from staff that was then supported by some of the additional requests. With the Model Law Committee we have been struggling to reach Colin, we are very appreciative of him agreeing to stay on and to assist with the Model Law Committee, but we also understand that shifting his focus away from the board that this committee is not his primary focus. We've been having really hard time reaching him, getting on a schedule when we can reach him, and so it has just made the work of the Model Law Committee much, much slower and much more difficult.

On top of that, one of the members is Chair Harm, and as he's already discussed, his calendar has now become exceedingly full for the remainder of the year and he has asked if he can step away from the Model Law Committee. So with that, that just leaves Board Member Roberts, and this is far too big for-

Sian Roberts:

I'll do it.

Sydney:

... her to [inaudible 00:24:32] off on her own. So we wanted to bring this back to the board and let you know the issues that we've been having with this committee in getting a meeting scheduled and then see if there were any additional volunteers who would like to come forward to participate on this committee or how the board would like to proceed.

Scott Harm:

This is a Board Chair Harm. For those of you new to the game, we'll call it that, it's really a look at the NCARB model law and comparing it to our state regulations I think in pointing out where they're in alliance and where there's some potential conflict. As an overview, is that fair enough to say, Sian?

Sian Roberts:

I'd say more than that given that there is a new NCARB model law, does that suggest to us that we should make any changes or consider the fact that changes could be made to our law?

So for instance, one of the biggest issues right now is the rolling clock. We know that that needs to change, right? That's not actually model law, but that's just the way our law is written. I know that another issue that's come up is the length of time that someone needs to be licensed before they can get on the board that is in conflict with what NCARB recommends and also can increase maybe the diversity, age diversity of our board if we want to consider changing that.

So there's some things that we might want to, I know we can't change the law, so I get that, but we thought we should look and see if there are any areas where we might want to recommend working with AIA or others to see if we can, I don't know, encourage or support changes.

Scott Harm:

Great, thanks. So don't need to do it today, but if any of the committee members would like or be interested in pitching in, I guess, please let Sydney know and we can give you some time to consider it. It is pretty valuable work.

I apologize to everyone. I just am recognizing that my bandwidth has been stretched. I, up until recently, was also a planning commissioner for my local municipality. I had to resign that too because I've over-committed. I didn't want to just phone it in as my part of the Model Law Task Force. So hopefully we can get a couple more volunteers to join Sian, but we needn't do it today unless you're so inclined to throw your name out there. That would be great.

Sydney:

Board Member Loynd has her hand up.

Scott Harm:

Oh, good catch. Sorry.

Erica Loynd:

Yeah. Board Member Loynd. What is the commitment? How often does it typically meet or try to meet?

Sydney:

So we try to get a meeting together once a month, but it really depends on the committee and where they're at in individual work and research. I think after the last meeting, we were hoping to meet at the four to six week timeframe, and then just haven't been able to find a common time on everybody's schedules to do it. So it's been several months since they've met, but hopefully once a month to every other month, just depending on the need. But we always discuss that in the committee meetings and we the staff stay in touch with the committee throughout and if more time is needed then we adjust from there.

Sian Roberts:

It's a short term responsibility, so I think there's a task that we have that we need to do that we should complete relatively quickly. So there's a little bit of homework involved because I think last meeting we talked about dividing and conquering and looking at different areas of the WAC and the model law and each individual person doing a little bit of work and then coming together and talking about it. So it could actually be done in a matter of three or four meetings, I think. Is that fair?

Sydney:

Yeah, I would agree.

Scott Harm:

Yeah, I think so.

Erica Loynd:

Yeah, I'm happy to jump in. I'm going to need more kind of background and a little bit more handholding because I'm just getting familiar, but I'm happy to dive in because I haven't been able to participate in any committees thus far. So as long as I get a little bit of extra handholding, then yes, I'm happy to participate.

Scott Harm:

Thank you very much.

Sydney:

Absolutely. We will get you up to speed.

Scott Harm:

Great. Anyone else? No pressure. Anyone else? Okay, I think with that we'll table it for right now and see if we come up with one more. I think it would be nice to have three people again, so if we could get one more person to make eye contact, that would be great. But we'll table this for right now and not declare a new team. But we can certainly do the coach up of our new volunteer.

Next on the agenda is new business, the discussion on the RCW 1808. This is me. I was in my position probably, because I am now the chair, I was interestingly enough contacted by a plans examiner for one of our major cities in the state. I won't share the name because I don't want to ruffle any feathers, but a licensed civil and structural engineer who had worked for the municipality for I believe it was close to 20 years and had himself been reviewing and approving plans and specifications for building projects within

their area of responsibility, and was interested in, I think as a hobby that came and went pretty quick, about becoming an architect and what it would require given their education and years of experience what they felt was almost managing architectural work.

I pointed out that I didn't agree with that delineation, but it started me looking at what were the requirements, the education, the three Es, and I told this individual that I didn't think there was any way around them having to work under the direct supervision of an architect. So unless their supervisor, in this case, let's say a city manager, was not a licensed architect that they did not come close to that requirement and there was probably no way to really get that waived, at least in our jurisdiction.

But then I started noodling into, well, what's the definition of work, assuming it's for time, but was that 22 hours a week, it had to be 40 hours a week? So Sydney and I were talking about this off and on, it has been going on for a while, and what we came, and correct me if I get this wrong, Sydney, what we came to recognize was that the NCARB process defines the number of hours that needed to be recorded and that's what the state would need to lean on.

I reported back to this individual who showed the interest that there was that requirement and the person has since gone quiet. I thought about having this item removed from the agenda, but it had already been published so didn't want to not do it. But it was pretty interesting someone who was really excited that about the idea of becoming an architect, obviously very bright, and then in my quick purview of our regulations and NCARB really came down to the fact that no matter how much experience we check this individual off over the years, there was no way to get around having to work under the direct supervision of an architect.

So it was a fun little exercise. It was four or five or six conversations between either this individual and/or Sydney. So that was it. I don't know that we need to have any more discussion. If anybody has any questions or comments, feel free to have at it.

Sian Roberts:

Yeah, I have a question, Scott. I thought I heard you say they had to have AXP.

Scott Harm:

I if I did, I didn't mean to say that.

Sian Roberts:

Okay.

Scott Harm:

Yeah, it was because of our state being one of the more generous on alternative pathways. I said we could give them potentially a lot of credit for their experiences, but that direct supervision thing was the one last. But if I did say AXO, I didn't mean to.

Sian Roberts:

Okay. All right. It's a structured program or whatever. But no, I appreciate that. So yeah, that's helpful. I mean, that's how I've understood it too. You have to work under direct supervision of an architect.

Scott Harm:

Yeah. I pointed out to this individual while you may feel that you know the practice of architecture because you've corrected their work, you never did a program and planning exercise, you don't know how to generate a piece of art that could be the building, and that's one thing that you were severely lacking as far as experience. So I think that got their attention as well. They didn't appreciate that fact. It was fun. It was nice to see somebody who was really interested in our profession.

The next agenda item under new business still is 6.2, the timeline for the five-year rule [inaudible 00:34:32] legislation change and possible bill cleanup. Sydney, I think this is once again something you're fielding.

Sydney:

This is, and unfortunately I do have a little bit of bad news to bring with it. We did submit the request for agency sponsored legislation to be considered on this. All the indications that we had received were, oh yeah, this seems nice and easy, shouldn't be a problem, and then when it got into the mix of everything that the agency has to look at for the coming legislative session, being that it will be a short session, they elected not to take it up for this year. So not an end to this, just a shift. So we are going to be reaching out to NCARB and AIA for them to look at running the legislation with our understood support once it comes through and running it that way through their advocacy.

So the timeline will be a little bit easier running through them. The legislative session is set to kick off on Monday, January 8th, 2024, with the deadline for bills to be submitted relatively shortly. Mid-February is the deadline approximately. The legislature will set that later this year, but approximately mid-February, and then it will run for 60 days being an even-numbered year and is expected to adjourn [inaudible 00:36:04] on Friday, March 8th.

So the earlier we can get AIA and NCARB on board to look at proposing that legislation the earlier they can begin doing the legwork on getting a bill sponsor and getting it pushed forward. Again, we don't expect that it will be a big lift for anybody to necessarily do, it was just one the agency couldn't take on in the scope of everything else that we have for this year. So hopefully AIA will have the capacity and be able to run that through relatively quickly.

So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Scott Harm:

So the initial outreach to the AIA, as an example, was that something that anyone on the board could do or staff?

Sydney:

If a member of the board would like to participate in those discussions with us, but otherwise that was something that myself and Susan were going to spearhead. Just reaching out to them and just kind of letting them know all of the work that we've been doing behind the scenes, specifically what we're looking for, and that we're not looking at if there's anything else that they would like to change in the architect laws that we have a Model Law Committee looking at those things, that this is just specifically for the rolling clock and see if they would be willing to take that up for us.

Scott Harm:

Great.

Sian Roberts:

So we wouldn't, or they wouldn't, I guess they're going to do whatever they want, try to bundle this with other things. They, I know, have been concerned about cleaning up incidental practice language, but I don't know what that might even look like.

Sydney:

I don't know what that would entail. We can have those discussions with them and start doing the research and the prep work on the backside on any of that, but let them know that as far as removing the rolling clock from the code, that the agency has already researched that we'll wholeheartedly support that, and then any other provisions that they would like, we can take a look at those and see what the impact on the licensee side would be.

Sian Roberts:

It'd be a bummer if it gets bundled with something else to not have it fail, I guess.

Scott Harm:

Right.

Sian Roberts:

Anyway. Okay.

Scott Harm:

Thank you. Okay, next agenda item is the outreach discussion for the universities.

Sydney:

I can take the lead on this one, but really more facilitating a discussion. This was a request from the board at the last meeting to discuss outreach at the universities for the coming school year. I can say just from the contacts that we've already had at the universities and colleges around the state, we've been told that they're not even looking at setting those schedules and to give us potential dates and times until August and September while they're working on setting their curriculum for the year.

We'll be reaching out to them about mid-August and we can certainly add this board to the list and just reach out to all of the different departments that we need to and start getting on those calendars and then communicate that time or those availabilities back to the board.

The board also wanted to discuss potentially collaborating with NCARB on these outreach events as well and we can coordinate that also.

Scott Harm:

Yeah. This is Board Chair Harm. It seems to me, and Roch, you might remember this far back, but there were instances where not blindsided, just under informed by NCARB that they were coming into the state and visiting campuses. So yeah, if we could pester them to keep us engaged I think that would be great. Something tells me they probably get a fairly healthier turnout than we as a board get, so I think piggybacking on their visits would be great.

Sian Roberts:

Yeah, I think I would say that they do not really think about including us in those visits and I think it would be great if they would. So any movement we can make on that, we certainly, even if we can get one or two board members there with NCARB, I think that would be helpful.

Roch Manley:

Yeah, this is Roch. I think reaching out to NCARB now to find out what their visitation schedule might be in the coming year and then putting that on, I know we've discussed in the past a calendar of things we need to do, a checklist. That would be a good checklist item to coordinate those dates within NCARB so that we have the opportunity to join in those visits and we're not just passed over on that.

Scott Harm:

Anyone else? I would say I have enjoyed the visits we have made, even to the technical schools. That was a very interesting one I think. For me, it has only been one time for one of the vocational technical schools, but the Washington State University trips have always been very enjoyable and an interesting array of student types show up. Various stages of being fully engaged in what's ahead of them and some who are just trying to make it through their next test and not making eye contact with anybody.

But yeah, I've found it to be pretty valuable. I know we have a hard time I think getting into the University of Washington. Hopefully we can crack that egg and get in there a little bit, especially if it does include NCARB. That again might be helpful.

Okay, next agenda item is-

Sydney:

Before we move on, Board Member Wu has his hand up.

Scott Harm:

Oh, I'm sorry. Missed it. Sorry, Paul.

Paul Wu:

Yeah, this is Board Member Wu. I've been in contact with NOMA student chapter at UDub and we have a couple meetings and they're working on their internal structure right now and funding. But also outside of that, I'm mentoring a couple of UDub graduate students.

Scott Harm:

Great.

Paul Wu:

So I am letting them know that we're here as a board to give them guidance and directions in attaining the license, the proper license procedures, and all the details. So in that sense I'm working with them in [inaudible 00:43:11].

Scott Harm:

Oh, that's great.

Paul Wu:

This transcript was exported on Jul 31, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Yes.

Scott Harm:

That's great. So Paul, do you know if Washington State has a NOMA chapter?

Paul Wu:

I don't know.

Scott Harm:

Okay.

Paul Wu:

That I don't know, but I can find out.

Scott Harm:

Yeah, I'm sure it's on their website or something. Yeah.

Paul Wu:

Right.

Erica Loynd:

This is Board Member... Sorry. This is Board Number Erica. There is a Northwest Chapter of NOMA and the leader of it is actually in my firm that I could connect with if there was something they wanted to connect in with, and their conference is this fall in Portland. So it's very close by if there's any engagement that wants to happen.

Scott Harm:

Nice.

Paul Wu:

Good.

Scott Harm:

Okay. Well, thanks. Yeah. Good job, Paul. So now we're, according to my Cliff Notes, we're in section seven of our agenda, which is the reports, committee and task force reports.

Sydney, you're running through this with us?

Sydney:

Yeah, I can run through all of the reports. We did not have any committee or task force reports for this last quarter.

Complaint status report, we do have several that have gone through and have now been closed. We currently have one that is under investigation, three that are in management review, for a total of 22 cases from January of '22 to current.

Scott Harm:

Okay.

Sydney:

Our licensee count report for our Washington only, we have total of 4,022, and the total including reciprocity is 7,115.

Go to the next one. There we go. This is a new one that we're trying to get included with all of our reports. New licensees since January of this year is 202, and 117 since the last board meeting. Then we've processed almost 1600 renewals, 528 of which since the last board meeting.

I will hand this one off to Susan.

Susan Cooley:

So with our master action item list, we have... Looks like the model law. Sorry, I must have missed that on the top. So we have Sian Roberts on there and Erica Loynd, and we're waiting for possibly one more member. But we'll set up some meeting times.

Set up meeting to review delegations, that's been complete.

Review website for visibility on the green book, that is currently on hold.

Statistics for the law exam next winter, see about management analysts, that's currently in progress.

We scheduled the goal setting meeting and made decisions on the governance resolutions.

Sydney reported out about the MRA. It looks like we're going to have a agenda item next meeting to find out what Elizabeth and Sydney determined from the WACs.

Create a timeline to show the five-year rolling clock. Sydney talked about that today, so it was reported on.

Any questions?

Sian Roberts:

Yeah, the one that's on hold, the green book, which I don't remember. The green book predates me, I don't really understand what that is. I think that was something Colin was interested in. I'm just curious, what does it mean by on hold and does anybody actually know what that item is?

Sydney:

So on the green book, that was a request I believe has come out of several other jurisdictions that outlines the responsibilities of what an architect does, what an engineer does, and goes across the different professions to help line out the different responsibilities and then where there's overlap in incidental practice.

The reason that that is on hold is we had been awaiting the attorney general opinion that came out last year on whether or not anybody in the state really has the ability to differentiate between. Basically what the Attorney General's office opinion stated is that everything relies on the RCWs and the RCWs does not make a clear delineation between the responsibilities of an architect versus an engineer versus the other design professions. So that is on hold because we haven't really been able to have that discussion with the attorney general's office yet on if there is a feasible way for us to proceed with creating any document that outlines that.

Everything we've been told to date is that it would be very unwise and would open up a lot of liability for the board to take that on and to put out a document like that. So we keep having discussions with them as we're able to on if we can find any way, shape, or form to make that happen because there has been some repeated interest from the board on looking at creating some sort of document to provide some guidance and those conversations just have not been getting us anywhere. So we're still trying, but that's why it's been on hold.

Paul Wu:

This is Board Member Wu. I have a side comment. Why do we call it the Green book? Would be the green-

Sydney:

I believe it's called the green book because that's the color that the physical book was I think from Nevada is where the idea came from. It used to be a physical printed book and it was green, so that was where the green book came from.

Paul Wu:

But it might have other implications if you have seen the movie.

Sydney:

Oh, okay.

Paul Wu:

Yeah.

Sydney:

We might want to rename that.

Scott Harm:

I'll have to look that one up.

Roch Manley:

This is Roch. A little more history on that. We actually did have a green book that was published many, many years ago. I think it was going out of favor when I joined the board because obviously as the law is updated and so forth the green book would need to be updated.

What I've heard from those meetings with building officials across the state is that they are clamoring for something like this. My comment, final thought is I think we have an online version that exists on the website, at least unless it got cleansed from the website during that last regeneration of it. I have not looked, but there was a, I'm not sure what it was called, but there was a form of that green book online.

Just to clarify what I think that this green book is supposed to be is a more or less an instruction manual and a summary of the law that includes things like who can design a building and who can't, and the problems, the pitfalls of this are obvious as the AG's office will point out. So that's all I've got.

Scott Harm:

Yeah, I do remember there was quite a bit of interest for the less populated jurisdictions where the building official staff might be one person who's also the site inspector and they are perceiving themselves as being on an island and need as much assistance as they can get. I remember that there was an online version, like Board Member Manley stated. Again, like he said, not sure if it got swiped when we reconfigured the website or not.

Paul Wu:

This is Board Member Wu. I think we do need to think we might want to change the title of that book because there is other implications. I don't think it goes down well with some of the demographics.

Scott Harm:

Yep.

Sydney:

We will change the name of that. I will also set up a meeting with Elizabeth before the next meeting to discuss this and really dig in and see if we can get some hard answers and make sure that she's available to discuss it with the board at the next meeting.

Paul Wu:

Thank you.

Scott Harm:

Okay. Let's see. So we still have the legislation?

Sydney:

We do. So I will go through this quickly, and Susan, I'm going to take over sharing from you.

All right, so this was another request tied to the rolling clock just to run through what the legislative process is for DOL and the things that we do in the background on behalf of the boards monitoring legislation and all of that. Then when we do have bills that come up that impact the boards, we may reach out to the board as a whole and request comments. So just wanted to run through all of that, especially since we are in the lull between to gear up and prepare for what we may see at the next legislative session.

This is a presentation that we did not put together with the board staff. This was actually put together by our policy and legislative team and Kelsey Stone is our policy and legislative analyst that is assigned specifically to the Business and Professions Division. She does a great job, so we're very grateful to have her.

So this was put in place, or this was reflective of the 2023 session, but still the same rules apply. So the state constitution dictates that legislative sessions for odd years will be 105 days, the long years, those also occur in budget years, and then even years are the in-between budget years, we do run on a biennium, and so those are 60 day sessions. So when we refer to the short session, which will be coming up in 2024, that is what we're talking about is it's a much, much faster turnaround. It's 45 days shorter and it's much less time for us to get things in front of the legislature.

So basically what is a bill? A bill is the legislative proposal that comes from constituent issues, changes in social circumstances, issues with current laws, or recently enacted legislation in response to court cases

and needing to cleanup RCWs, and changes in federal laws or regulations that would put state law in conflict, we have to clean those up as well.

Bills can be drafted by citizens or interest groups, by state agencies, that's where we talked about agency sponsored legislation, or by legislators and legislative staff themselves. Only legislators are able to sponsor and therefore introduce bills and each one must have a sponsor regardless of who drafts it. So Joe Public can't just go draft a bill saying I want all of the streets painted pink and get that put on the floor of the state house. That has to go through a sponsor.

The legislative process starts with filing a bill. A bill can be filed starting one month before the session, which usually happens at the beginning of December. So with our session beginning January 8th, it'll be somewhere around December 8th that they'll be able to start filing bills.

Bills are then introduced in their house of origin, so either in the Senate or the State House. Senate bills are titled with Senate bill or SB, and then House bills are also HB, and then are assigned to a committee from there for review.

This is the list of the standing House and Senate committees. I will not run through this since you do have it in your packet. But a bill has to go before one of these committees in whichever respective house before it can be heard by the full body. Then if it's not in the appropriate committee or once they get into it, if they feel like it needs to be reviewed by a different committee, that committee will shift it, and it can go through several of these before it makes its way to the House or Senate floor.

So at the committee hearings, chairs and ranking members set the agenda and decide which bills are heard in committee. Almost all bills must pass a committee before being introduced on the chamber floor for a vote. Some bills may need to be heard and pass a policy committee or a fiscal committee.

After that, it goes to the rules committee. After the committee votes, but before going to the floor, those go through their chamber rules committee and must be pulled by a legislator to the floor. If they aren't pulled, they die in the rules committee.

If they do get pulled, they go to the floor for a vote. If they are passed by a majority of the members in their chamber of origin, the bills are then sent to the opposite. So if it originates in the Senate, it goes to the House, or vice versa. Then they repeat the process. It goes back through the committee, back through the rules committee, and then has to get pulled by a member of that house to be heard on the floor.

Once it has passed both chambers, then it is delivered to the governor for signature. Bills can be amended and often are, especially through the committee process. Amendments are proposed by legislators to change the language of a proposed bill. Bills can be amended in committee or on the floor before a final vote and they must be within the bill's scope in order to be accepted. Once the bill passes one chamber to the next, then the new chamber can make amendments, but then the original chamber has to agree to that amendment and they can dispute the amendment and move to a conference committee to determine the outcome between the two chambers, or bills can often go there to die as well.

So the governor's role, once the bill passes both chambers and it's delivered to the governor, if it occurs more than five days before the legislature adjourns, it must be signed within five days. If it occurs in those final five days or less, then it must be signed within 20 days. Bills do have a default effective date of 90 days after the legislature adjourns [inaudible 00:59:35], but they can have emergency clauses or specific effective dates that cause them to take effect either earlier or later. We do have several of those happening right now. One for funeral and cemetery was assigned an earlier effective date and then we have a couple that are moving through for some of our advisory committees and commissions that have a much later that they don't go into effect until this upcoming December or even next January. So it just

depends on when the legislature feels it's time to put that in place. Then the governor always has the authority to veto entire non-fiscal bills or veto specific sections of a bill.

So I know that was very quick, it was very, very high level, but that just gives you a little bit of an overview. In that, and part of what Kelsey does, is she keeps track of all of the bills that are introduced, and as they come up, if there is any impact that we can foresee, there's always some that come up that nobody foresaw it having an impact, but if there's anything that we can foresee having an impact on our licensees, it's then assigned out to the other units of the agency. So our unit on behalf of the boards licensing looks at it from their perspective investigations and audits from theirs. We all get together and teamwork these and review them for potential impact for licensees with the board staff taking a look at it from what I like to think is a little bit more general perspective, but also on behalf of you as the board and then seek your input as we are able to.

That did come up. We didn't have any architect bills last year, but that did come up for funeral and cemetery a couple of different times. For some reason it was a hot year for them. So just to give you a heads up, that when we do send those, we do send them with very short turnaround windows. We do not control that. We beg and cry and use every means necessary to get any additional time we can for you guys. It almost never works, but we do try and get you guys as much time to review them as we can because we know you're busy.

But then that's a way that we can get some comments up to the agency and then the agency, Kelsey's team, carries that message to the legislature for us in a lot of different forms, whatever's going to get the legislature's attention, and let them know either, "Hey, this is a really great bill. We really wholeheartedly support this. Please put it forward," or "Hey, this is a really bad bill. This is going to have really big fiscal impacts. This is going to impact our licensees in a negative way. You really need to look at how this is going to look big picture and see this whole thing." And then we point out the specifics on what harm or what issues can come.

A lot of times we use your comments to send that message because you are the subject matter experts. You are the ones that have to live with the consequences of what these bills do.

So I already see that there are questions. So Paul?

Scott Harm:

Mute. You're muted.

Sydney:

Paul, you're muted.

Scott Harm:

Paul, you're muted.

Paul, you're muted.

Paul Wu:

Okay. Did I read it right that the governor has no veto rights over fiscal bills?

Sydney:

So he does, but it's an entirely different set of rules that we didn't get into with this presentation. This just talks about bills that are non-fiscal specific. So he does, but a whole separate can of worms and a monster unto itself.

Paul Wu:

Okay, thank you.

Sydney:

Sian?

Sian Roberts:

Yeah. There's this tool that NCARB has that they actually look at all the legislation that's happening across the country, they have some service that they pull all that information from, and I've noticed that there's always a few bills up in Washington State and we never really hear about those. So I'm just curious, are those through the board we don't hear about them? I'm just looking at it right now, what they have, and they've got five House bills up there right now. I don't know if they've expired or what's going on with them, but military spouse, employment, alternative professional licensing standards. Expediting professional licenses for Washington.

So anyway, these are just House bills that I'm not sure what the status of those are and whether this is a help or if these are enacted.

Sydney:

Yeah, I can go take a look at that, but it sounds like all of those are tied to House Bill 1009. I think I mentioned that maybe really, really early on this year as just an aside, oh hey. But what that bill did, that is the military spouse bill, but it also added in requirements for us as staff to put through licensing applications more quickly, especially for military service members and their spouses who are transferring into Washington State. It sets tighter time deadlines for us to issue licenses and even temporary licenses, especially those applying for reciprocity.

So if somebody is being transferred here, they're stationed in Texas and their spouse is being transferred here, it sets requirements for us across all of our programs to issue even a temporary license while the person works through checking all of the boxes for licensure in Washington State. But to lessen the impact on military spouses having to take a very long period of time off or a very long delay behind transferring with their spouse in order to keep working, it shortens that interval for them.

So we'll be bringing more on that to the board actually. I don't know if it'll be the next meeting or the first meeting of '24, but on specifically what that looks like, there will also be trainings that all of our boards and commissions have to go through and those are being put together by the Department of Veterans Affairs. That will be an annual required training that we have to bring to all of you every year in coordination with them.

The other thing that it did is it created an additional position that has been assigned to the board and commission and outreach unit, so our unit, to provide additional outreach and support to military spouses or military service members and their spouses on getting licensed in Washington State and how the two work through all of the different licensing requirements quickly.

So from architects to cosmetologists to security guards, it doesn't matter if it's licensed by the Department of Licensing, this person will be the one to be the subject matter expert and walk military

service members and their spouses through how to get licensed and do so quickly and correctly so that they're not experiencing long delays with their transfers.

We'll bring more information on that to you guys. I will make sure we have something to bring to you on it at the next meeting, but the more detailed version, I don't know if it will be at the next one or the first one in January of next year.

Sian Roberts:

Yeah. There's also House Bill 1301 that it looks like it wasn't enacted that says creating license and review and reporting requirements. That may be part of what you're talking about. It may be something different. I don't know.

Sydney:

I'm not sure. I don't know if that's one that made it down to me for review, but I can take a look at that.

Sian Roberts:

Then there's one that's out of committee. I don't know. Anyway, what I would appreciate, Sydney, is if you just take a look at these bills. Again, I don't know what this service is, but it would be nice for us to understand better what people are putting forward that might have implications for us, and then of course after they've been enacted, absolutely. But even if there's some rumblings about something that is going forward through committee, it'd be good for us to be aware of that.

Sydney:

Absolutely. I will put something together on all the bills that are up and get that in an email out to the board.

Sian Roberts:

Great. Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Roch Manley:

This is Roch. I don't know if it still exists, but I think the AIA Washington used to have a pretty active legislative tracking service, or whatever you want to call it. I don't know if staff has a connection with AIA or if that's even appropriate, but that might be another item to check in looking at what legislation is coming our way.

Sydney:

We will check with them. It's a relationship that we as staff have to be very careful about just because AIA is a lobbying group as well and so we have to be very careful even about perceptions. But we will work with them on whatever tracking that they have so we can provide that to the board as well.

Sian Roberts:

Yeah, I wouldn't be surprised if they use the same service. It'd be interesting to know.

Sydney:

It's quite plausible.

All right. Well thank you for letting me take a couple of minutes and run you guys through that. Again, we'll bring more at the next meeting.

Sian Roberts:

That was great. Thank you.

Scott Harm:

Yep, thank you.

Susan Cooley:

It was very helpful. Thank you.

Scott Harm:

Now we enter the public comment phase of our agenda. It looks like everyone on my screen is people that are either staff or on the commission. I'm not sure that there are any members of the public virtually attending, and if so, could you please raise your hand?

Not seeing any action, the chair will assume that there are no public attendees or no public attendees who wish to make a comment or ask a question.

Section nine is the conclusions. There's a couple new things. Again, this is Board Chair Harm. The announcements, this is a new item for the board to make any announcements or reports on meetings or other events that they have attended pertinent to the board's work that was not covered under the reports item.

Do any board members have any announcements or additional reports that they would like to make at this time? Yes. Someone had their hand up. I missed it.

Sydney, it looks like you're first.

Sydney:

Mine will be quick. I do have an announcement with Rick Benner's retirement off of the board, his terming off. We do have a position open. The recruitment is up and active on the governor's website. But if you know of anybody that you think would be a great member of the board, please let us know and we will get that information over to you. We can send the link for the application out to the board in an email just so you guys have it handy. But we would welcome any and all applicants.

It's actually been up for a month or so. We don't have any applicants yet, but I know it's hard to weed through and find on the governor's website. But we always seem to have really great results when our board members are actively helping us recruit so just wanted to throw that out there that please feel free to share.

Scott Harm:

Roch, if it's okay, I'm going to jump in here because Sydney stole my thunder. It's a pet project of mine, I won't say pee, a pet project of mine to try to solicit volunteers from the eastern side of the state, the other side of the mountains. I've done it on a couple occasions and one time I actually went over there on my own dime and visited I think five architectural firms. Just in being perfectly candid, I plan on not doing actual driving over there, but I will be doing a email canvassing of the firms that I can identify because you don't have a need for a public member fortunately.

So I will be again trying. Especially since we now meet virtually, there's not that burden of having to drive across the state or fly from Spokane to Seattle and then getting transportation from Seattle to where the meeting is. I think just letting the commission know that I was going to be really trying to pull in somebody from the east side for that diversity inclusion aspect.

Board Member Manley?

Roch Manley:

Okay. Yeah, that sounds like a good plan, Scott. I know NAC, who Colin was with, is I think over in Spokane, so maybe that's one connection we'd have.

The announcement I was going to make was, and I think this is where we do this, I did volunteer for committee assignment, and as far as I can tell, I was tapped for the Experience Committee. So I'll be waiting to see what the schedule is on that.

As far as the Model Law Committee, my only concern is that my availability might be limited. I was able to look at the schedule for the Experience Committee and got some travel coming up. I was actually two days ago I was staring at a buffalo harassing the buffalo in Yellowstone Park. So there's travel coming up and limited availability and I would want to look at the schedule before I committed to anything for the board.

The comment on the seeking the new board member, I saw in the newsletter that was forwarded to NCARB members that you staff forwarded to us, but it's going out to NCARB membership, they did mention boards that are seeking new board members and I noticed that Washington State was not included among those. So that might be another, as NCARB reaches out to its membership, even if we can get that little mention it might draw more people out and help with our seeking diversity and so forth.

That's all I had.

Scott Harm:

Good point. Anyone else? No. Thanks, Sydney and Roch.

Item 9.2, request for future agenda items. I think this is another new item. Are there any additional future agenda items that the board has not discussed that any board members would like to request for the next meeting?

Oh, we've got a hand up. Yes, Erica?

Erica Loynd:

This Board Member Erica Loynd. A conversation came up about, and this is more maybe some information that I could garner of mandatory continuing education requirements for Washington for CEUs, in particular kind of comparing to in California requiring more credits about net zero carbon and things just coming up in there and wondering if this was something that Washington mandates or is going to expand on? I don't know if we could have a agenda item of continuing education credit requirements of what topics we require. This would be more informational for me and maybe are there some that the board would be thinking we need to become a part of our ongoing training?

Scott Harm:

We'd have to agree, it might be time to consider something because I don't know when that was established. That predates my service. I think, Roch, you're the more senior member of the board. I think it's just been there as long as I know. Anyone else?

Sian Roberts:

Well, Scott, you know this. We have very lax or minimal CEU requirements in this state and it hasn't been looked at in a long time. I think that's a good idea.

Scott Harm:

Yeah.

Roch Manley:

Sounds like another committee.

Erica Loynd:

We'll have a meeting of introduction before we start a committee. Next meeting.

Scott Harm:

It looks like a committee, it smells like a committee, it must be a committee.

Okay. Yeah, very good, Erica. Yeah. Yeah. So I don't know exactly, Sydney, what we do with that, but I think you're hearing that we're in agreement that is something we should probably at least give it a passing view and have a discussion.

Sydney:

Yep. We've taken note of it and we'll get it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Scott Harm:

Great. Great. I'm not sure we need to do this. The next agenda item I have is the review of the action items list. I think we did that earlier, but maybe there's this review of the CE credits. So Susan, you have another update for the action items list?

Susan Cooley:

Yeah, so what I'll do is list is what I've got from today's meeting for the next meeting. So I did take note of a couple agenda items. Sydney and Elizabeth will have a conversation about the MRAs and what's allowed in the WACs. Then Sydney and Elizabeth will also have a discussion about the book with the duties that are performed by the different professions. Then I have added Board Member Loynd's request on there to discuss continued education requirements, maybe topics and ongoing training.

Two action items I've got down was outreach, reaching out to the universities and getting on their list, and also reaching out to NCARB and coordinating for their visits with the universities so that you guys are aware when they're going out there. Then staff will send out the information for the position that's available, how people can get in contact with the governor's office so that they can apply the part of the board.

So those are the things that I captured today.

This transcript was exported on Jul 31, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Scott Harm:

Great.

Sydney:

And I'll be sending a legislative update to the board as well.

Susan Cooley:

I'll note that one too.

Scott Harm:

Great. Well thank you everyone. When Sydney and I did our prep for this, we thought it was going to be a very brief meeting, so I want to applaud everyone for the spirited discussion and input. It's great that we communicate as well as we do and feel safe enough to voice our opinions and everything. So very much appreciate that.

With that, I'll go ahead and adjourn the meeting. The time is now, according to my clock, which is never wrong, 11:20, and this meeting is now adjourned.

Sydney:

Thanks, everyone.

Roch Manley:

Thank you.

Scott Harm:

Thanks, everyone.

Sian Roberts:

Thanks everyone.