

Washington State Cosmetology, Barbering, Esthetics, and Manicuring Advisory Board Meeting Transcript November 9, 2023

Chair LaPierre (00:00:03):

Okay, let's get started. It's now 10:03 AM, I'm calling this regular board meeting of the Washington Board of Licensure for Landscape Architects to order. As a courtesy to reduce the background noise when others are speaking, we encourage participants to mute their microphones, or your phone if you called in, when you are not speaking, obviously. One challenge is to remember to unmute yourself, although I'm sure people will remind you. Also for board members, especially the new board members, to help us capture that information correctly for the minutes, please introduce or state your name, when you're making comments. The board's going to provide an opportunity for public comment during the meeting. We ask that you unmute yourself prior to the public comment to allow an opportunity for anyone who would like to speak. Thank you.

(00:01:01):

Susan, could you call the role please?

Susan (00:01:05):

Sure. I'll start with you. Chair LaPierre.

Chair LaPierre (00:01:06):

I'm present.

Susan (00:01:12):

Vice Chair Crabill.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:01:12):

Here.

Susan (00:01:14):

Secretary Robinson-Losey, board member Anderson, and board member Solorio.

Lindsey Solorio (00:01:24):

Present.

Susan (00:01:27):

Thank you.

Chair LaPierre (00:01:32):

Next item is the approval of the agenda, so I need a motion for approval please.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:01:39):

This is Daren. I so move, as written.

Chair LaPierre (00:01:46):

And a second?

Lindsey Solorio (00:01:49):

I second the motion.

Chair LaPierre (00:01:53):

Okay. With no objection, we'll approve the agenda. Next item is approval of minutes. I'll also need a motion for approval of the minutes. That was back on August 10th, seems like a long time ago.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:02:09):

This is Daren. I'll also move as submitted.

Lindsey Solorio (00:02:15):

I second the motion.

Chair LaPierre (00:02:17):

Thank you. Let's have an actual vote on that, for the meeting. So if there's no discussion, all in favor of approving the minutes?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:02:31):

Aye.

Chair LaPierre (00:02:31):

Aye.

Lindsey Solorio (00:02:32):

Aye.

Chair LaPierre (00:02:35):

So moved and approved, and not discussed. We have some awards and recognition, and especially happy this morning that Deborah Peters could come back for this. You have to come back for this. Susan, are you going to take care of introducing that? Sydney, I'm sorry.

Susan (00:03:06):

I'll introduce it.

Sydney (00:03:08):

That's okay. So as the board and staff knows, our current longest serving board member, Deb Peters, has now termed off the board. She was appointed to the board December 5th, of 2012, and her term ended September 5th of this year. And so this is just an opportunity for the board to share their appreciation. I know I have learned so much from Ms. Peters. And with her having the role of chair when

I first started, and taught me so much about the landscape architect profession and about this board and history of the board, and a lot of the nuances for the landscape architect profession that don't exist across some of the other design professions.

(00:04:01):

So it was a very interesting learning curve to start, and I'm very grateful for her taking that time to teach me. But would like to open it up to the board and to other staff members, to share their appreciation as well. We also have a plaque that we'll be getting in the mail, that Susan is showing right now. And then in the packet, we shared the verbiage that is included on it. But it says "On behalf of the Washington State Board of Landscape Architects, this award is presented to Deborah Peters in recognition of contributions, initiative, and leadership as a member of the Washington State Board of Landscape Architects 2012 to 2023."

Chair LaPierre (00:04:49):

Oh, there it is.

Deb (00:04:51):

Yes.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:04:53):

Yeah, excuse me. I did want to just say that Deb was always great with the details and the inner workings of the language of the law, and I certainly appreciated her detail in that. Been helpful to the board overall, and myself specifically, so thank you, Deb, for your work and service, and good luck in retirement.

Deb (00:05:30):

Thank you. I would like to express my gratitude to the staff in particular, because the staff has been incredibly supportive, helpful, and knowledgeable all the way through the 12 years of serving in this position, both current and past staff. And this board could not exist without the staff and the input from all of you. It's been a very enriching experience, and I want to thank all the board members too, current and past, and welcome all your new ones. I haven't met you, but good luck on moving forward with this work.

Lindsey Solorio (00:06:16):

Thank you Deb. As the oldest board staff member here, I just wanted to say a thank you to Deb for all of these years of service to the board. As I stepped into working with the board, Deb was there, and she was a wonderful mentor and guide to me. She taught me a lot over the years, and I'm going to miss getting to work with her in this world, but hopefully I will see her in the CLARB world.

Chair LaPierre (00:06:54):

Well, I'll definitely second that. That's what I wrote down when I was putting my thoughts together. I'm going to miss your wisdom, all the knowledge that you brought to this. And your mentorship for me, was you might not have felt like you were providing a lot of mentorship, but you really were, just by example. I'm going to miss your charm, your wit, your humor, your energy in defense of professional practice in the public interest will be especially missed. The amazing thing is that even after retirement

from [inaudible 00:07:39], you could have been lying on the beach somewhere, but instead you chose to go to CLARB conferences, which is very commendable. So thank you

Deb (00:07:54):

Again, it's always been my pleasure, and thank you for this recognition.

Chair LaPierre (00:08:00):

Well deserved.

Sydney (00:08:02):

Yes, very well deserved. Thank you so much for your service, and we'll be getting that packet out in the mail to you probably next week. So look for that, and if you don't get it in fairly short order, reach out to Susan and just touch base and we'll make sure you get it.

Deb (00:08:18):

Okay, no problem.

Sydney (00:08:19):

And so before we move on to the next item, I don't know if you want to stay for the next meeting. Of course, we'd love to have you stay, but we did put this at the beginning in case you needed to go on.

Deb (00:08:28):

I actually have other things going on today, so I have to move on, but I'm glad this worked out for me to attend the beginning of the meeting. So thank you very much. We'll see you all soon, I hope.

Chair LaPierre (00:08:39):

Best of luck, Deb.

Lindsey Solorio (00:08:40):

Take care, Deb.

Deb (00:08:42):

Thank you.

Chair LaPierre (00:08:42):

We're going to go on to welcome our new board, at least one member, Sydney.

Sydney (00:08:55):

Yeah, and I was just going to double check that Jason had not jumped in, and it doesn't look like he did. So we do have two new board members who have been appointed to the board. We gave a brief introduction of board member Jason Anderson at the last meeting. I know we were trying to meet with him earlier this week and he was having technology challenges, so we'll reach out to him and check on what happened with him today. But he is located in Renton. He brings 25 years of experience in landscape architecture. He is currently a small business owner with his own firm, and currently serves on

the board for the Washington State University of Landscape Architecture School, and participates in educating the next generation of professionals. He's enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the board and its responsibilities, so we're excited to welcome him.

(00:09:47):

And then we are also welcoming Lindsey Solorio, who is coming in with 12 years of landscape architecture experience, and I will turn it over to her to introduce herself.

Lindsey Solorio (00:09:58):

Hello, everybody. Thanks so much for having me. My name is Lindsay Solorio, as Sydney said, I'm really interested to join the board. I've been in the field of both landscape architecture and land development entitlement for, gosh, almost 15 years now, but with my company Core Design for 12. I'm a partner there, and I run the landscape architecture division of the business. And I'm really passionate about all things landscape architecture and providing opportunities for the next generation to step into this field as there's many other options. But STEM and outreach, especially with the elementary age kids, is something I'm also really passionate about, and just excited to serve.

Chair LaPierre (00:10:48):

Thanks, it's great to have you. I was especially glad to see that you were bringing that sort of private side work, whereas, most of us are really involved on the public side, public project type work. That's really important to have that.

Lindsey Solorio (00:11:10):

Thank you.

Susan (00:11:17):

It looks like Sharon is coming into the meeting, I thought I'd let you guys know.

Chair LaPierre (00:11:21):

Oh, great. Welcome Sharon.

Susan (00:11:25):

It's having a hard time letting her in.

Sharon (00:11:30):

I'm actually on audio, just trying to get connected so I can see everybody's face, but I'm here.

Chair LaPierre (00:11:41):

Great to have you. I think the next item, introduction to new boards, commissions, and outreach team member, and Sydney, this is for Jason Lenn?

Sydney (00:11:56):

Yeah. And I just wanted to introduce the board to our new military and military spouse liaison, Jason Lenn. He is a program specialist with the board's Commissions and Outreach unit, and I will turn it over to him to introduce himself.

Jason Lenn ([00:12:09](#)):

Thank you. I'm really glad to be joining you this morning. Thanks for taking the time to allow me to introduce myself. I come from the state of Florida, where I was raised, attended the University of Alabama. I kind of consider that my home now, it's where my most of my family live. After receiving my degree, I joined the Navy and spent... Can everybody hear me?

Chair LaPierre ([00:12:39](#)):

Yes.

Sydney ([00:12:40](#)):

You're very quiet. It almost sounds like there's something over your microphone.

Jason Lenn ([00:12:45](#)):

All right, I'll just try and speak up. But after my time at the University of Alabama, I joined the Navy, spent 20 years in military intelligence as a linguist. I learned Arabic and Pashtu. Met my wife, have three kids, and my wife is from this area, so we decided to try and relocate and retire here in the State of Washington. We love it here. And so back in August, I was able to leave the military service, and I found a spot here, working in the Department of Licensing on a program that's specifically going to help military spouses who come here from other areas due to PCS moves within the military, and allow them to, hopefully, continue their careers here in Washington within the professions that we license here. So I've been here two months, I'm really excited. This is something that is important to me, and so I'm really looking forward to working with everyone.

([00:13:53](#)):

Part of the implementation stage of this, was the training, so I think all the board members should have that training available to them. If you don't, let us know, it's just a 30-minute military spouse culture and experience video that was put out by the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs. It goes through a lot of the challenges that face military spouses in this area. And so I think that's going to be really important for all of us to... I watched it. This is really great information. But if you have any questions, just reach out to me. I'm glad to be here. Thank you for inviting me here this morning, and I look forward to working with you.

Chair LaPierre ([00:14:39](#)):

Well, thanks Jason. Welcome. And you're right, that is a well done video. It was interesting. I definitely learned some things I didn't know.

Jason Lenn ([00:14:55](#)):

Thanks.

Chair LaPierre ([00:14:55](#)):

I think we're going to move on to old business. Let's do our outreach update. We'll go ahead and open the discussion to the board on recent outreach activities. I could just start. I have not heard back from University of Washington on when they would like to have us participate in their professional practice. And Daren, I don't know if you've heard anything back yet.

Vice Chair Crabill ([00:15:33](#)):

I haven't heard back. It's probably time just to bring that back up into their top of their email. I know we reached out, it was sort of appreciating the start of school, so now that they're well into it, I'll go ahead and do that today.

Chair LaPierre (00:15:54):

Right.

Lindsey Solorio (00:15:56):

I'm happy to help with whatever outreach efforts to U-Dub that would be useful to the board, because that's where I am from as well.

Chair LaPierre (00:16:05):

Okay. Not Michigan, yeah.

Lindsey Solorio (00:16:08):

No, University of Washington.

Chair LaPierre (00:16:15):

Yeah. It's not Washington, but it's close, and I continued my work with the University of Idaho students in a studio this semester, that are designing a healing and remembrance garden for the students that were murdered about a year ago. I went over there for [inaudible 00:16:41] last month, and they had done a tremendous job putting together all this background information. Very detailed, a very well organized afternoon, mostly focused on staff and students there at the university. And I followed that up with a couple of presentations on crime prevention through environmental design and accessibility, which relates to their garden design that they're working on this semester. And they hope to have some concepts finished and published, I think right after Thanksgiving. So that's been a very kind of rewarding activity for me.

(00:17:37):

Any other outreach? If not, we'll move on to the CLARB Annual Meeting Report. I'd like to ask the board members and staff that attended, to give a brief report out if you could, please.

Sharon (00:18:02):

Can you guys hear me? This is Sharon. Curtis, are you able to hear me?

Chair LaPierre (00:18:09):

Oh, yes. Yeah, very well.

Sharon (00:18:10):

Okay, great.

Chair LaPierre (00:18:13):

I remember you took a lot of notes, right?

Sharon (00:18:16):

I did take a lot of notes, but a lot of them were on my, "Oh my gosh, I didn't know this," list. I had no idea that other boards, people could serve for a lifetime, and then no new people were ever let in. And I also didn't understand how many states had multiple boards that meet together, which means to me, that it's really hard to focus on any one thing. So that was kind of fascinating.

(00:18:47):

And the ability to talk to different people who were trying to create change in their state, I'm thinking about Rhode Island, I'm thinking about South Dakota, and those states that were always hitting a wall because the same people had been serving for so long with the same thoughts, that no new thoughts were allowed. So that made me really appreciate what we're doing here, and how new people and new ideas are always so welcome. That was the big thing for me. And just the ability to put the CLARB players, if you will, in, it kind of made a flow chart for me. Because it's always been just a little beyond my grasp to understand who does what. And it was really nice to bring clarity to all of that, so I understand how the boards and CLARB now function together, nationally. So it was a learning experience for sure.

Chair LaPierre (00:19:45):

Yeah, I agree on the different boards. Wasn't Arizona, didn't they have a really kind of crazy composition. There was one landscape architect on their board, and other people that were just in completely unrelated, and apparently disinterested in the profession, which was sort of a surprise.

Sharon (00:20:09):

It was. And I'm thinking about some of them, like the interior design was with landscape architecture. And to me, I get how they could be used together, but the obstacles they hit are completely different. So I don't know. It was interesting.

Chair LaPierre (00:20:30):

Right, right. Thank you Sharon. Is that it?

Sharon (00:20:35):

Yes, that's all my thoughts for right now.

Chair LaPierre (00:20:38):

Okay. And Julia, did you have anything you wanted to share with us?

Julia (00:20:44):

Sure. Actually, well, I love the keynote speaker that they had this year. She talked about the generations and how they work differently, and how we need to recognize that in our own jobs. But then the building public understanding of landscape architecture with Moira O'Neill, that session I really loved. We went into talking about that people lack a clear sense of what landscape architects do, and did some table discussions and projects to come up with like little elevator speeches of talking to people to get them to understand things like people understand nature and human design is fundamentally opposed. And how to get them to understand that nature and design do go together, and the reasons that they go together. So I really found that fascinating and educational for me, as well. And then there was a lot about the Global Job Task Analysis, and international students and pulling them in. And then of course,

they announced that landscape architecture is now officially a STEM profession, which was very exciting. So those were my takeaways.

Chair LaPierre (00:22:22):

I agree on the people's perception of what landscape architecture is. And I was really surprised to find that when asked, there was this big disconnect with design and nature, and I kept thinking in that of a lot of national park work is meant to be invisible. You're not supposed to make it look like the landscape architects just left town and fixed this all up. It's supposed to appear completely natural, and so it's invisible, so we don't make that connection. And you look at how many millions, I mean, some parks have 10 million visitors a year, and maybe there just needs to be a little tiny sign there designed by a landscape architect, might help.

(00:23:21):

So let's move on. I got some of the same things that you and Sharon did out of that, so I won't repeat that, and we can go ahead and move on to new business. Meeting scheduled, Susan.

Susan (00:23:43):

Yeah, so I have up here, posted the proposed dates for the 2024 meeting schedule. We have February 8th, May 9th, August 15th, and November 7th. Those are the proposed dates, and this is what it looks like on the yearly calendar. So this will require a vote from the board to accept the proposed meeting dates.

Chair LaPierre (00:24:19):

I'll ask for some... Well, let's have a motion to approve first of all, then we can have discussion.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:24:30):

This is Daren. I'll move to accept the meeting dates as proposed.

Lindsey Solorio (00:24:36):

I second the motion.

Chair LaPierre (00:24:39):

Thank you. Is there any discussion on the time? Is this time still working for everyone, at 10:00 AM?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:24:52):

Yeah. I mean, it's as good as any, frankly. It's always good to just push these out onto our calendars as invites as soon as this, assuming this goes forward, just so that I can keep my elbows out and protect it from other things. You're always going to come up against other meetings, but this is as good as any for me at least.

Susan (00:25:28):

We'll have to have all of the boards and commissions approve it, and then we'll send out the yearly invites once we have the last meeting and the last approval from the last board and commission. But the meeting invites will also be for the entire year, so we're able to do reoccurring meetings, so it'll automatically block out your whole year's worth of meetings.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:25:50):

Great.

Sydney (00:25:52):

And to that, I'll add, I think part of the problem we ran into this year with the recurring meetings, is when we send that from Outlook, it doesn't always communicate to all the other calendar types. So if you guys could just go back and double check that it added the full series for you. And if not, let us know, and we'll send out the individual meetings. I think that might've been a hiccup that we had this year. So we can do it either way, just to make sure that it reaches everybody.

Sharon (00:26:23):

This is Sharon. Just about the timing, Curtis, I'm open to whatever time works. If it's better for you guys to go beginning of day, end of day, closer to lunch, anything like that. I'm totally open to a time change. This time does work for me, but other times will also.

Chair LaPierre (00:26:42):

Okay. I have a meeting right after this one, but it's only four times a year. And I do like this time, and I think we all have it kind of in our minds now, that 10:00 is the time to meet. So if it's okay, we'll leave it there. And any further discussion then, we'll go ahead and take a vote. The motion, and second is to approve the time and dates for next year's meetings. All in favor?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:27:23):

Aye.

Lindsey Solorio (00:27:23):

Aye.

Chair LaPierre (00:27:26):

Aye.

Sharon (00:27:26):

Aye.

Chair LaPierre (00:27:26):

Opposed? Hearing no opposition, motion carries. Let's go on to board goals, and that's Sydney, please.

Sydney (00:27:41):

So this'll be a really quick item. As the board will remember, about middle of last year or middle of this year, we were able to set some board priorities and board goals for '23, with the understanding a lot of those would carry over into 2024. So just wanted to take a couple of minutes to review those with the board and see if there are any adjustments that need to be made, or if all of these are good, if we want to look at adopting these for the '24 goals and priorities.

(00:28:11):

So the board priorities were set at increasing the efficiency of our board operations, trying to set a two meeting maximum on items on committee work, understanding that sometimes things come up and that won't always be the case, but trying to strive for that. And then providing opportunities to be open to licensees and constituents, creating a greater connection, showing up in person at the universities for each of the professional practice classes, which we are still working on, in-person connection is the most important piece.

(00:28:47):

With that, I will say we are working to get the in-person meeting for next year. What our plan is, because of the challenges that we face traversing the state sometimes, our hope is that we will have one in-person. We will always have a hybrid option, that is something that came out of COVID, is by state law, we have to provide a virtual option. So it will always be hybrid, but our hope is that our summer quarter meeting will be the in-person meeting, and all of those we'll have a meeting space here. We will bring the board, make all the travel arrangements, and actually have you guys here, in person in Olympia for that one meeting a year. And then leave the others in this virtual setting, just because spring, winter, and fall, it is so hard to get across the pass, and you never know what's going to happen. And so just to make it easier for all of our boards, we're just trying to focus on that summer court.

(00:29:48):

The caveat with that, is we are still testing the technology and trying to find ones that will work. The one that had previously tested, it wasn't the greatest option, and it came with some challenges, including a lot of delays with both the video and the audio. So when we tried it in a hybrid environment, we ran into an issue where we were really having to extremely slow the cadence of the meeting, and it made it very frustrating for the people in person, made it very frustrating for the people online, and so that technology just wasn't ideal. We are in the process of testing another one that seems to be much better. So that's the only caveat, is we have to make sure that that technology is in place so that we can have that hybrid environment, it's needed.

(00:30:38):

Prioritizing student outreach, and then rethinking our WASA interactions, and all of those have been ongoing. So the goals that had been set were to focus on education, what to do when encountering unlicensed practice, and looking at using the website as more of a tool for public education about the profession and when to file a complaint. How can the public interface with the website, why are landscape architects licensed? And having those components near the top of the webpage, and creating more public knowledge around licensure, that is something we, as staff, are keeping going in the background at the moment, just because the website, if you've been on it lately, has undergone a full redesign. It has a whole new face to it, and there have been a whole lot of re-buildings happening behind the scenes. And so we haven't been able to get as many of those things rolling just yet, because so many of those pages are still being rebuilt by that web team.

(00:31:44):

So we are keeping it at the forefront. We have some ideas that I'm hoping to bring to you at the next meeting, but I wanted to make sure we're done shifting pages around and reorganizing everything before we bring that to you guys and say, "Here's where it will be," and then only have it shift a couple months later. And so then aligning rules with CLARB, which we are working on with the WAC update, and then board recruitment and CLARB leadership recruitment.

(00:32:11):

So with that I will turn it over to the board to see if there are any tweaks, adjustments, things you guys want to add or take away maybe, and kind of leave it to you guys to have a brief discussion on.

Lindsey Solorio (00:32:21):

Can I ask for some context about the bullet point of rethinking WASLA interactions?

Chair LaPierre (00:32:30):

I was going to bring that one up, that probably needs some explanation. We want to make sure that... And I'm not sure entirely, but I think that came from speaking at the conference. And I ended up doing all this work, and just speaking to three people Friday afternoon licensure presentation, you can imagine. Anyway, so I think it was rethink how we can make more efficient use of time and energy to reach out to more people than that particular time. So that's what that was about, and maybe that needs to be reworded somehow, like prioritize WASLA interactions, or maximize efficiency of their interactions.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:33:27):

Maximize efficient, that's what I was going to go with.

Chair LaPierre (00:33:30):

Yeah.

Lindsey Solorio (00:33:33):

Thank you.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:33:35):

We want to make sure it's useful to people and not, you get it.

Sydney (00:33:42):

If I remember correctly, Curtis, didn't you also do an article for the WASLA newsletter, you and Julia maybe combined for a WASLA newsletter article early this year, end of last year?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:33:55):

It's up for a Pulitzer, isn't it?

Chair LaPierre (00:34:00):

I beg your pardon?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:34:01):

It's up for a Pulitzer Prize?

Chair LaPierre (00:34:04):

Yes. Yeah, when to sign your stamp, I think that was the topic. Anyway, it's a good time to do another one, and I really had meant to by now. I was going to do kind of a follow up on the CLARB conference and touch on some of the highlights from that. So hopefully, I'll still find time to do that and submit it. Other than that one, Lindsey, I didn't have anything else on the goals. Darren or Sharon, anything you've changed?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:34:47):

No, I think these are still appropriate and good ones. But I might want to circle back to outreach update when we get back to... You just reminded me of something around an email blast that we got from the state around, which we'll probably touch on a little bit later, but it might be a good thing to highlight to WASLA, it's not already done.

Chair LaPierre (00:35:19):

Oh, that's true. So nobody assumes the worst on that.

Lindsey Solorio (00:35:25):

I'm curious too, I imagine the goals for this year developed out of action items, or pinch points from prior years. Has there been an ongoing problem with unlicensed practices? Is that why this is on the agenda for this year?

Susan (00:35:48):

I wouldn't say an ongoing problem. I will say, across all of our programs, landscape architects is probably the most well-behaved. And that's saying a lot, because we have really great licensees. So I wouldn't say it's a big problem. I think there's just been some confusion, and when this discussion was happening, I think the board wanted to look at is it that our licensees are just really well behaved, or does the public not know how to file a complaint. And that landscape architects are licensed, and if you're having an issue, you should. So wanting to make sure that that information is very forward to the public, just as kind of, more or less, a fail safe, that "Yeah, we push this information out." And so if we're really not getting very many complaints, we are going to assume that that's-

Vice Chair Crabill (00:36:45):

The other thing around goals, is 2023 is, I think, the first time we actually wrote down goals for the board. That was a new request, for all boards to set goals and priorities, so this was our first attempt.

Sydney (00:37:08):

It was. This was something that we, as staff, brought forward just because, not this board, but some of our other boards, we felt like we were getting pulled in a hundred different directions, and that every action item we were giving was going way out here and way out here and way out here. And so just to kind of give us some focus back in, and go, "Okay, if we're asking for this way out here thing, what are we trying to accomplish? What are we tying that into?" And it really kind of helped narrow in for the boards, "Okay, what are we really working on? If we're asking for this way out here thing, why are we putting those resources into it?"

Chair LaPierre (00:37:46):

Right. Does this need a vote?

Susan (00:37:54):

I don't think so. I think we can just take it as an agreement, that if these are sufficient, you want to carry them forward. You guys can certainly make a motion and adopt them for this year, but really, these are not hard and fast. They're not tied to any specific board action, so I don't think we have to have a motion.

Chair LaPierre (00:38:12):

Okay, great. If there's nothing else on item 7.2, then let's move on to our staff reports. Item eight, Sydney.

Sydney (00:38:27):

And this I will just provide a really brief update on the WAC Review Committee, with the committee members and Julia, please feel free to jump in at any point.

(00:38:42):

At the last meeting, the WAC Review Committee had said that the review was very, very close, and they had hoped to send it out to the board in between that meeting and this one, for full board review, to hopefully at least take comments at this meeting, if not take action, to start moving that WAC update forward. Since then, we had sent the update to our assistant attorney general Elizabeth Lagerberg, who came back with several comments that we needed further clarification on.

(00:39:14):

She and myself and Julia met with the committee, which is Curtis and Darren, and went through all of those. And there are some things that Julia and I need to go back and refine, and we just haven't been able to set aside the time to do that in order to get it on the agenda for this meeting. So we will prioritize it before the next meeting, and hopefully get that rolled back out to the committee to send to the full board for review ahead of that next meeting. So that is where we're at right now, and it was just some further clarifications from the AG's office that they really wanted us to prioritize. And so we want to get everything finalized for the committee to give you guys a report. I don't know if you guys have anything to add.

Chair LaPierre (00:39:58):

No, [inaudible 00:39:59] get it wrapped up.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:40:01):

Yeah. And I think they're worthwhile language notifications that just sort of ended it up, so appreciate your review.

Susan (00:40:13):

All right, so then moving on to our complaint status report. There we go. You guys are at a grand total of two, both are closed. And so again, like I said with the goals and priorities, when I say fairly well-behaved licensee group, this is probably by far the smallest number of complaints that we have across any of our boards and commissions. We always appreciate that. But two in there and closed status, we don't have any that are pending currently.

(00:40:49):

And a review of our licensee counts. So far, as of the end of September, we have a grand total of 932 licensees, of that 878 are active. As I had pointed out to the board at the last meeting, we are kind of revamping how these reports are being presented, just to give you guys the information in a few different ways. This came at the request of several of our boards, and we're trying to make that data uniform across all of them. Understanding if one is wanting to see it a little differently, chances are all going to benefit from that. But also that makes it more streamlined for the staff that are pulling that data, to have one list of data sets that they need to pull, rather than a different list for each board.

(00:41:53):

So this just gives you a look over our time period for this year, how our renewals and new licenses fluctuate throughout the year. And then also, our three-year at a glance, which the way that this is listed, feels kind of reversed, so we're going most recent to further out. So as you guys can see, you guys are on an upswing. Which is different from what we're seeing across some of our other licensee bases. A lot of them took a dip during COVID and have yet to rebound, whereas you guys appear to be on a steady incline. So that is very good to see.

Chair LaPierre (00:42:37):

Just for clarification, under new, that's by exam and reciprocity combined?

Susan (00:42:43):

Correct.

Chair LaPierre (00:42:44):

Okay.

Sydney (00:42:44):

And did we have another slide on this Susan?

Susan (00:42:51):

Nope.

Sydney (00:42:52):

Okay. So from that, and we can go back to the charts, but Chair LaPierre had requested an item for the board to discuss the licensee demographics, specifically looking at our numbers that are going to inactive, as well as in the age group categories. So we do not keep track of specific dates of birth, but we do have the categories broken out. So Susan, if we can go back a couple of slides.

(00:43:29):

So this was specifically to look at, as you guys can see, the bulk of our licensees are 45 and older, with not an insignificant number being 55 and over. So I'll turn it over to Chair LaPierre to go a little bit more in depth, but he wanted you guys to be able to take a look at those and see that licensee shift.

Chair LaPierre (00:43:56):

Yeah, really my concern was are we getting enough replacements, so to speak? If you take 65 and above, 147, and 198 in 55 and above, that's a significant portion of the licensees, theoretically, being less active, or even retiring in maybe the next 10 or 12 years.

(00:44:30):

And you just wonder on the other end, are we getting that many graduates and people taking the exam and becoming licensed to replace them? I don't know that there's any really good way. I'm looking like between 25 and 34, only 58 people, that's significantly less than the 300 and something that might be retiring in the next 10 years. It doesn't look like to me, just looking at these gross numbers, that that's enough new licensees, so to speak, to replace the old ones.

(00:45:19):

And I don't know if there's some more discussion on this, or what do we do. Do we reach out to the university programs and say, "Hey, stick with it. There's going to be a lot of opportunity." I mean, there's a lot of opportunity now if you look at the number of jobs available, especially over the last couple of years. It seems like there are quite a few jobs out there.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:45:50):

Oh, go ahead. Go ahead

Lindsey Solorio (00:45:53):

Lindsay Solorio. I was wondering do we have any kind of statistics from WAZU and U-Dub about the number of graduates that would help guide how statistics might trend?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:46:14):

Or second to that, would be who stay in the area, so who stay in the field, Washington would be-

Lindsey Solorio (00:46:21):

Yep.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:46:22):

I was-

Chair LaPierre (00:46:22):

And stay in the profession.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:46:24):

Yeah, stays in profession. That's a good point too.

(00:46:30):

Well, this Daren. I was trying to do my own math of when I actually got first license, and I think I was 28-ish, somewhere around there. But I don't know if there's a particular action, other than it might be worth, if what we're thinking about, a post with WASA bringing up as a point, a demographic trend that we're seeing in our licensees and how that potentially has an effect within the profession going forward, might be a nice interesting point that could resonate with our constituents.

Chair LaPierre (00:47:26):

Yeah.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:47:26):

I don't know there's an action for the board though, is, I guess, I'm beyond that.

Chair LaPierre (00:47:32):

I don't think so. Maybe just like an outreach educational thing. Lindsay, to let you know, my concern has been that as these older practitioners retire, if they're not getting replaced. That's a problem because other people are going to start doing the work of landscape architects, whether it's engineering interns,

or whoever it is, EITs or architecture interns. And that's going to... That's not in the public interest obviously, for that to happen. So that's why I was just wanting to take a deeper dive into this.

Jason Lenn (00:48:14):

[inaudible 00:48:15].

Vice Chair Crabill (00:48:15):

Lindsay, go ahead.

Sharon (00:48:22):

This is Sharon, if I may. Do we have anything that goes to career centers at high schools? Do we have any way to reach to those who go to the horticulture programs that are at some of the skill centers? I think that we need to look at it like other... I'm thinking of service academies. So the service academies we have in the United States, they start reaching out when kids are sophomores. And they start making sure that their paraphernalia is available at all the career centers, and then they have people who go to the career days and who speak and things like that. I realize that's a huge undertaking, but do we have anything that even approaches a brochure for a career day?

Vice Chair Crabill (00:49:11):

I think WASLA tends to take care of that. And they, I believe, also have a program that has been doing some high school outreach, if I remember correctly, or if they were pre-COVID, I thought. My sense of it is actually more that landscape designers who are working in the profession, don't necessarily just go through the process of licensing. Either they feel like they're doing the work that they want to do, they don't see the benefit, or whatnot. So I really encounter a more interesting sort of other study would be asking WASLA to consider... Or the firm, as they look at their staff, how many have been in the profession for three or more years and still are not licensed? That would be an interesting counterpoint to the demographics that we see. I don't know how we get that information, but that would give us some indication of maybe why or why not, or not.

Chair LaPierre (00:50:32):

Yeah, that's a good point. I think a lot of folks tend to, if they're especially at a larger firm, they're not having to seal drawings, and so they don't see the real value in getting licensed, that their job doesn't depend on it. Although, I would argue that certainly, their long-term career does. But Sharon, to get to your point that is... And advocating for the profession is more of a ASLA function than it is for our board. I'm just kind of pointing this out, and maybe that's good to communicate this to, in this case WASLA, to say, "Hey, we really ought to be looking ahead," and how important it is to keep getting new folks.

Vice Chair Crabill (00:51:28):

Sydney.

Chair LaPierre (00:51:31):

Yeah, unless there's anything else, I'd like to go ahead and move on.

Speaker 11 (00:51:35):

Can you guys hear me?

Sydney (00:51:38):

Yes.

Speaker 11 (00:51:39):

Oh, okay. Sorry, I was having microphone problems. My question is, do you have the demographics for how many people are taking the test?

Sydney (00:51:53):

I do not.

Julia (00:51:54):

That's something, sorry Sydney. I was say that's something that CLARP could get.

Sydney (00:51:59):

I was going to refer to you, so thanks.

Speaker 11 (00:52:03):

Then speaking for WSU, I know as a board member there, we've worked hard the past few years to increase enrollment, and there are currently about 25 students per class. So overall, I think in the program there's between sophomore, juniors, and seniors, we're looking at 75 new landscape... Well, 25 new landscape designers graduating from WSU a year.

(00:52:42):

And the way that they have changed things around there, because their enrollment was lagging for quite a few years because we've combined with architecture, interior design, and construction management. When the students are freshmen, they're given a poll, and they are asked to choose which is their top choices. So it goes by a ranking system, and depending on how it shakes out with the other people in the program, if you don't get your first choice, you get your second choice. And that's what's driven up enrollment within the landscape architecture program. And also the program there, the program head there, Jolie Kates, she's got agreements with, I think it's Spokane Falls Community College, South Seattle Community College, and I think Lake Washington Tech, to bring people in from those areas where they've been in the horticulture program, or associated degrees, to be able to bring them into landscape architecture and shave a couple of years off of the degree.

Chair LaPierre (00:54:10):

That's great. Great to know. So 25 per year, and I don't know how many. Maybe Lindsay, you know how many are coming out of UW.

Lindsey Solorio (00:54:23):

Yeah, I could certainly follow up with what their current enrollment looks like, but I want to say that the numbers are probably similar between the BLA and MLA programs.

Chair LaPierre (00:54:36):

And then we have students that really come from other states, like North Dakota, where there's very little opportunity for employment. Yeah.

Lindsey Solorio ([00:54:48](#)):

On the demographics, was it the 25 to 34 that was the earliest category that was recorded for the profession. I would be interested to see, just by default with given more time as professionals graduate and then start to work, if those numbers start to look similar. Within a few years of graduating without much action, as folks are qualified to sit for the exam and then to obtain a license. I mean, some of that just may be low, just by age.

Chair LaPierre ([00:55:27](#)):

Well, look how much it jumps up too, at the 35 to 44. So maybe people, as you say, are delaying getting licensed until later.

Lindsey Solorio ([00:55:40](#)):

I think it's worthwhile too. I mean, I see this in my own work, but as a generalization, that young people coming into the profession have different priorities and alignments than I think have traditionally been, that advancement and some of the carrots for getting licensed of higher pay and more opportunity, may not translate to a different age group the way that it resonated with me personally, and I think, with those that came before me,

Lauren Gilmore ([00:56:15](#)):

I know for my office, I have stipulated in my employee's compensation package, that the office pays for it and that... They're being compensated, at least on my end, to go out and give an incentive to go and get that accreditation. And from my impression, there's still no movement towards doing that.

Chair LaPierre ([00:56:50](#)):

Maybe we need an article that's about why it looks bad when you're 40 and still not licensed. Doesn't look good on your resume.

Speaker 11 ([00:57:04](#)):

Well, I see people that are 40 and are currently not licensed heading big projects. And I just am curious, I'd like to pull the people I've seen aside and just say, "Why is it that you have chose not to get that accreditation?"

Chair LaPierre ([00:57:20](#)):

Right.

Lindsey Solorio ([00:57:23](#)):

I mean, I see a big part of that being the financial obligations to follow through with licensure, that if they're not being sponsored or at least subsidized by an employer, I mean, it can be thousands of dollars to go through the rigor, and that may not be possible for some people.

Chair LaPierre ([00:57:48](#)):

Yeah. Well, I think that's a good one to keep the discussion going. At the next time. Let's go ahead and move on. I forgot where we were.

Sydney ([00:58:14](#)):

We're on-

Chair LaPierre (00:58:14):

There we are. Okay.

Sydney (00:58:14):

Yep. Item 8.4.1. So I will introduce this, and then I'll turn it over to my esteemed colleague. So this is going to be a presentation on House Bill 1301, which is our professional license review. This was passed by the legislature earlier this year, and it requires the Department of Licensing to review 10% of our professional licensing programs per year for 10 years, and then every 10 years after that. And the reason you guys are seeing this when our other boards are not, is because the landscape architects was the first board commission program that was selected for inclusion. So I will turn it over and introduce Lauren Gilmore, she's with our Central Services Unit, and she is heading up this review for the agency. I'll turn it over to her. And Susan, I believe she's going to be sharing a presentation as well.

Lauren Gilmore (00:59:10):

Yes. Good afternoon. I'm trying to present. Yelling at me, there we go. Present. Please work. Perfect. Is that okay for everybody?

Chair LaPierre (00:59:35):

There it is.

Lauren Gilmore (00:59:40):

Okay. So good morning Landscape Architects Board. My name is Lauren Gilmore. I am the project lead for the Professional License Review Act that was passed with House Bill 1301 this last legislative session. I'm here with Austin Kohler, who is our lead researcher and analyst for this report. We both work in the business and professional division at DOL. This morning, we want to briefly introduce you to the work we are conducting by reviewing the requirements of 1301 and discussing our plans for landscape architects.

(01:00:15):

So House Bill 1301 requires us to, beginning in 2024, annually review and analyze approximately 10% of the professional licenses we regulate. We must complete a review of all professional licenses within 10 years, and every 10 years after that. We have 40 professional licenses we'll be reviewing that meet these requirements. By August 31st of each year, DOL must prepare and submit a report to the legislature and recommend whether each professional license reviewed should be terminated, continued, or modified. If DOL recommends a change to professional regulations, DOL must recommend the least restrictive regulation consistent with the public interest. This year, we're reviewing the following four professions to meet our 10%: court reporters, employment agencies, landscape architects, and whitewater outfitters.

(01:01:15):

So this slide is going to go into the language around 1301 that I tried to get into smaller chunks. 1301 states that we must report on the following items. I have highlighted in yellow the key areas that will affect the Landscape Architect Board. I'm hoping that in sharing this, you'll see that the report requirements are really just asking to share a snapshot of the current state of your profession by discussing this overview with the board. So we're required to give the statutory citation that provides

the board authority, the number of members, qualifications and appointment of members, and how many times you're required and have met for the preceding five calendar years. Beyond the board and into the license profession, we are examining the number of licenses the department professional board or commission has issued, revoked, denied, or assessed penalties against for the previous five calendar years.

(01:02:14):

We're conducting a review of the basic assumptions underlying the creation of the license, a comparison of whether, and how other states regulate the profession. A review and analysis of the license or credential hours, education, training, experience required to obtain. A summary of any regulatory changes made by, as a result of the review, the department board or commission, and any recommendations regarding whether the professional license should be terminated, continued, or modified.

(01:02:49):

So I would like to take a moment to state that this review of the landscape architects is by no means seeking deregulation of the license. In choosing the four professions, we wanted to select professions that would be best to build our program and processes around for completing this report and reports in the future, including a profession for one of the nine boards and commissions. We are hoping to work closely with the board and licensees to build our stakeholder outreach so that this report can provide recommendations for improvements to the profession that is based on licensees experiences.

(01:03:25):

We are really excited about this work, and hope that the end result is something that licensees and DOL can proudly say we worked together on and best shows the current state of the profession in Washington State. We're still in discussion around the best way to conduct our stakeholder outreach, as it is a new process, but we'll be in contact with the board and licensees to collect feedback on your experiences, not only with DOL, but in your day-to-day professional expertise.

(01:03:53):

This final slide provides contact information for us. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us here at DOL-BPDPLRA@dol.wa.gov. We just really want to have your input and be fully transparent in this work as we are doing it. That is all I have, and I am happy to take any questions you might have now, or contact you over email.

Chair LaPierre (01:04:35):

Thanks, Lauren. I do have a question. It seems like the intent might not be deregulation, but it seems like an open invitation for any organization or individuals to promote terminating, or significantly modifying our licensure. Is that likely to happen?

Lauren Gilmore (01:05:05):

Yes. So that is written for all of the 40 professions we have. However, I do want to state that with landscape architects, you are all very proud of your work. We're proud of your work. We chose you as our first board because the boards and commissions likes you also. So I really just want to clarify that is not the intention. We like you, and we want to work the best we can with you to provide a really good first report. And I believe that your profession and how active you all are in it, can provide that information.

Sydney (01:05:46):

And I can expand on that a little bit, Curtis.

Lauren Gilmore (01:05:52):

Thank you.

Sydney (01:05:52):

So with your concerns, and Lauren and I have already kind of talked about this a little bit, and she understands that there is that push for deregulation in some sections of the country, particularly around landscape architects. I know we all saw the headlines last year in Montana, and there were a couple of states back east as well, that we're kind of in that push. And so Lauren is aware of that, and that she may be hearing some of that feedback from licensees as well. From the DOL perspective, as Lauren said, that is not something we are looking at, but this is really a bill that is requiring us, as an agency, to take a holistic look at all 40, give or take, programs that we have, because we do have some programs that are being maintained and we have one licensee.

(01:06:44):

And so it is looking at those, that it's, "Well, we have the program, we have to maintain the program because it's on the books. And it's a law that we have to." But for one licensee, does it really make fiscal sense for us to do that, understanding one licensee isn't going to pay the bills to keep the lights on for that program.

Chair LaPierre (01:07:02):

Right.

Sydney (01:07:02):

And so then that is something that is then being subsidized through the agency. So it's taking that holistic look at some of those things, and hopefully looking at the professions that... Or not professions, the licensee types that maybe only have that one licensee, or a small number of licensees that don't have, necessarily, a large public protection piece to them, or provide a big public protection, or public benefits. Sorry, that's what I was trying to say.

(01:07:41):

And so with that, because it's 10%, and looking at the fact that we have nine boards and commissions, that made sense that one board or commission gets pulled each year. So you guys are just the first one up. And because you are a smaller board, you're a very active board, and very interactive board, and we all have a really great working relationship with you. It was felt that somebody has to go first, and so landscape architects was selected just based on that.

(01:08:15):

So the answer to your question, yes, that exists, but that exists regardless of this bill. That deregulation push could come at any time, and we are cognizant of that and we are keeping that in the background.

Chair LaPierre (01:08:33):

Okay. Any other questions for Lauren or Austin?

Lauren Gilmore (01:08:39):

I'd just like to say thank you so much for having us here. And I hope that we can be in contact soon, and really make this report good. And if you start thinking about recommendations, or ideas or things that you think could be improvements, or issues you're having, I'd love to see how we can implement that and bring it to the attention at a larger level.

Chair LaPierre (01:09:16):

Well, it sounds like you're doing a lot of outreach to licensees and others. And then Daren, I think you were starting to bring up the possibility of maybe that's something the board should do as well, on HB 1301.

Vice Chair Crabill (01:09:39):

Yeah. I guess, I'd look to Sydney or our staff to see if that's an appropriate thing to provide a FYI to WASLA.

Sydney (01:09:53):

So let me work with Lauren on the background because they are still working on that public outreach campaign, what that's going to look like. Lauren does have me on the team for that. So as we get closer to that, that is absolutely an option that I will make sure we keep on the list. And I'll bring that back to the board once we have a little bit more information, a little more structure around what that will look like.

Chair LaPierre (01:10:16):

Okay.

Sydney (01:10:18):

And just to throw it out there, before we let Lauren and Austin get on with their day, I know she gave you guys that email address. If at any point in time, you don't have it, can't remember what it is, you can always reach out to Susan or I, and we can get you in touch with Lauren and her team at any time.

Chair LaPierre (01:10:36):

Right. Okay. If there's nothing further, let's move on to the master action item list.

Sydney (01:10:46):

And I'll turn that one over to Susan.

Susan (01:10:49):

Yeah, we don't have too much on our list. We have the charter update. We're still waiting on a few things before that gets completely finalized. The WAC update, Sydney gave a brief one. And I will be scheduling a meeting with Julia and Sydney, so that they can finalize it for the presentation to the board at the next meeting. And the outreach for our universities, it sounds like we got a good strong team moving forward. And we had an update from everybody earlier in the meeting, in regards to that.

Chair LaPierre (01:11:27):

Great, thank you.

Susan (01:11:29):

Yeah.

Chair LaPierre (01:11:31):

Let's move on to agenda item nine, public comments. The public may address the board on matters within the board's jurisdiction, either verbally during the meeting, or by submitting written comments in advance. Verbal comments are limited to one three-minute comment. Written comments are limited to no more than 500 words. It must be emailed to the boards at DOLboards@dol.wa.gov no less than two business days prior to the meeting, with a subject line "Public comment landscape architect board." In response to all public comments, the board is limited to requesting 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. Are there any public members present, that would have questions or comments?

Sydney (01:12:57):

I was just scrolling through our list. I don't think we have any public members in attendance.

Chair LaPierre (01:13:12):

Okay. [inaudible 01:13:13].

(01:13:13):

Hearing none. Let's move on to item 10, our conclusion. Are there any announcements from the board or staff members that you'd like to share? I'd like to say welcome, Jason. I guess, you had connection problems. I've experienced that. Glad that you could make it.

Sydney (01:13:44):

Mr. Chair, Jason does have his hand.

Chair LaPierre (01:13:47):

Oh, Jason, did you have a comment? You are muted. There you go. Still a connection problem I guess. I can't hear.

Susan (01:14:22):

Jason, we can't hear you.

Sydney (01:14:32):

Unfortunately, he has had to log in multiple times. I don't know if he's still having technical difficulties.

Chair LaPierre (01:14:41):

And we reach out to him after, and maybe set up a meeting where he can connect in, just to kind of test it out before the next one.

Susan (01:14:53):

Absolutely.

Chair LaPierre (01:14:54):

Yeah, that'd be great. Sorry Jason, we can't hear you. I'm assuming it's nothing life-threatening, that you have your hand raised for. Any requests for future agenda items? Any board members like to request something that we haven't already discussed on the next agenda?

Vice Chair Crabill (01:15:24):

None from me.

Chair LaPierre (01:15:25):

Okay. And review of action items, Susan, do you have action items from today's meeting?

Susan (01:15:35):

Yeah, I've captured a few things. Like I said just a few minutes ago, to schedule a meeting with Sydney and Julia so they can work on that WAC review. And the continued discussion for the licensee demographics. And then when available, Sydney will give an update on House bill 1301. Those are the items that I captured today.

Chair LaPierre (01:15:58):

Yeah, I think that the outreach on HB 1301 is something that we should be doing with WASLA so that people don't get overly concerned. And it's going to come from DOL, but it also would be good to come from the board as well. All right. Well, if there's nothing else, we'll go ahead and adjourn. It's now 11:20 Thursday, November 9th, 2023. This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you very much.

Susan (01:16:40):

Thank you everyone.

Vice Chair Crabill (01:16:40):

Thanks everybody.

Chair LaPierre (01:16:40):

See you all next time.