

Washington State Board for Architects Meeting Transcript – January 19, 2023

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:2.330

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Shall we get things underway?

0:0:3.750 --> 0:0:3.900

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

0:0:4.820 --> 0:0:5.210

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great.

0:0:6.260 --> 0:0:6.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So.

0:0:7.550 --> 0:0:12.900

Manley, Roch (Chair)

It is now 10:03 AM according to my computer screen.

0:0:14.200 --> 0:0:17.520

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I call the regular meeting of the Architect Board to order.

0:0:18.260 --> 0:0:27.90

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The Board will provide an opportunity for public comment during the meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage participants to mute their mics.

0:0:27.880 --> 0:0:45.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Or phone when not speaking to reduce the background noise when others are speaking. Please remember to unmute your microphone when you're speaking. Also, for Board Members, to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Thank you.

0:0:48.230 --> 0:0:49.280

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Susan.

0:0:50.390 --> 0:0:52.860
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Hi. I am going to call roll. Chair Manley.

0:0:53.950 --> 0:0:54.380
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Present.

0:0:55.290 --> 0:0:56.190
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Vice Chair Harm.

0:0:56.740 --> 0:0:57.230
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
Present.

0:0:58.120 --> 0:0:59.250
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Secretary Cooley.

0:0:59.840 --> 0:1:0.260
Cooley, Susan (Secretary)
Present.

0:1:1.330 --> 0:1:2.420
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Board Member Roberts.

0:1:3.180 --> 0:1:3.690
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Present.

0:1:4.480 --> 0:1:5.350
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Board Member Wu.

0:1:6.160 --> 0:1:6.720
Wu, Paul (Board Member)
Present.

0:1:7.630 --> 0:1:8.540
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Board Member Loynd.

0:1:8.990 --> 0:1:9.560
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Present.

0:1:10.410 --> 0:1:11.620
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
And Board Member Benner.

0:1:12.630 --> 0:1:13.140
Benner, Rick (Board Member)
Present.

0:1:13.900 --> 0:1:14.340
Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Thank you.

0:1:15.890 --> 0:1:16.870
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Very good. Thank you.

0:1:17.510 --> 0:1:18.40
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Umm.

0:1:19.50 --> 0:1:24.560
Manley, Roch (Chair)
We're now into approval of the agenda and, Rick, how are those cats?

0:1:25.870 --> 0:1:30.590
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Do we need to take a break at some specific time for your for your purposes?

0:1:31.560 --> 0:1:45.60
Benner, Rick (Board Member)
Actually, Chair, I'm in the office today, so I am not taking care of the cats. That happened earlier. And so I'm good. Just to remind you though that I'll be leaving about 11:00 o'clock.

0:1:44.690 --> 0:1:46.650
Manley, Roch (Chair)
11:00 o'clock OK.

0:1:46.420 --> 0:1:52.730
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
And you were in the e-mail, Chair, but I have a hard out of about 11:30 to 11:40.

0:1:53.400 --> 0:1:53.840

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:1:53.550 --> 0:1:57.940

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

So we might be quorum less by that point, maybe, I don't know, but yeah.

0:1:57.750 --> 0:2:7.60

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, well, uh Sydney, I'll rely on you and Susan to push any items needing a vote to the forefront.

0:2:8.540 --> 0:2:10.160

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Given the time constraints.

0:2:10.950 --> 0:2:16.880

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

My apologies. I would go ahead and move that we approve the agenda for the meeting of January 19th, 2023.

0:2:19.680 --> 0:2:21.400

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I second. Board Member Roberts.

0:2:22.940 --> 0:2:34.630

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, very good. We've got a motion and a second. Any other comments on the agenda? If none all in favor of approving the agenda say aye.

0:2:35.710 --> 0:2:36.130

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Aye.

0:2:35.810 --> 0:2:36.180

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Aye.

0:2:35.580 --> 0:2:36.290

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Aye.

0:2:35.580 --> 0:2:37.0
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
Aye, aye.

0:2:37.290 --> 0:2:39.40
Manley, Roch (Chair)
All opposed, say nay.

0:2:41.50 --> 0:2:42.850
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Agenda is approved.

0:2:44.120 --> 0:2:55.40
Manley, Roch (Chair)
So the next item is approval of the minutes from the prior meeting, October 20th, 2022. And we do need a motion for approval on that as well.

0:2:56.990 --> 0:2:58.680
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
I move to approve the meeting minutes.

0:2:59.790 --> 0:3:0.520
Wu, Paul (Board Member)
Second.

0:3:1.660 --> 0:3:9.850
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Great. We've got a motion and a second. Any discussion on the meeting minutes, any comments, corrections questions?

0:3:10.380 --> 0:3:27.790
Benner, Rick (Board Member)
Uh, Chair Manley. I have a couple of comments on the minutes. On page 6, it looks like you're there on 2.1. Just a correction to my last name. Remove the R in the one sentence.

0:3:28.770 --> 0:3:39.740
Benner, Rick (Board Member)
And then the other is under 3.1. I don't remember expressing concerns. I think I expressed support for in person meetings.

0:3:42.230 --> 0:3:42.520
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Hmm.

0:3:44.210 --> 0:3:44.500

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:3:45.260 --> 0:3:46.390

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We can make those changes.

0:3:48.560 --> 0:3:49.160

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great.

0:3:50.780 --> 0:3:54.590

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I'm struggling to.

0:3:56.130 --> 0:3:56.820

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:3:58.660 --> 0:3:59.940

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Very good.

0:4:1.60 --> 0:4:2.920

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

You mean you're not related to Yule Brenner?

0:4:3.800 --> 0:4:6.30

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Um, not that I remember.

0:4:8.130 --> 0:4:11.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. Good eye on that one. Good eye on that one, Rick.

0:4:13.610 --> 0:4:15.360

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So the.

0:4:16.560 --> 0:4:18.800

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The regular meeting minutes.

0:4:19.420 --> 0:4:21.500

Manley, Roch (Chair)
Get motion and this?

0:4:20.680 --> 0:4:24.660

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Sorry, I have another edit Roch. If you were gonna go for approval.

0:4:24.860 --> 0:4:26.80

Manley, Roch (Chair)
Very good, yes.

0:4:25.830 --> 0:4:38.600

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
OK. On item 9.1, I am a part of a task force, not too different task forces. And I am actually the Chair of a task force.

0:4:40.320 --> 0:4:41.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)
Ah, OK.

0:4:42.270 --> 0:4:42.650

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Thanks.

0:4:43.520 --> 0:4:44.60

Manley, Roch (Chair)
Got it.

0:4:46.20 --> 0:5:4.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)
So corrections are noted. And I guess what that will mean is we'll need to make some corrections to the meeting minutes and then follow up with signing and sealing them at that point.

0:5:4.950 --> 0:5:5.630

Manley, Roch (Chair)
There we go.

0:5:7.110 --> 0:5:11.830

Wu, Paul (Board Member)
Can I make a motion to approve the Minutes as a amended?

0:5:14.920 --> 0:5:16.530

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Do we hear a second?

0:5:15.760 --> 0:5:17.390

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Board member Harm, I'll second that.

0:5:19.170 --> 0:5:25.720

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Very good. We have a motion and a second and I believe we're done with any comments and corrections.

0:5:26.510 --> 0:5:33.200

Manley, Roch (Chair)

All in favor of approving the minutes from the prior meeting, please say aye.

0:5:34.390 --> 0:5:34.700

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Aye.

0:5:34.50 --> 0:5:34.890

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Aye.

0:5:34.160 --> 0:5:35.420

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Aye.

0:5:35.870 --> 0:5:36.740

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Opposed, nay.

0:5:38.550 --> 0:5:46.10

Manley, Roch (Chair)

No opposition to that, so the meeting minutes are approved with corrections.

0:5:48.720 --> 0:5:50.400

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Moving on to old business.

0:5:51.700 --> 0:5:57.310

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The Board authorizations and I think Sydney, you've got the ball on this one.

0:5:58.180 --> 0:5:58.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I do.

0:5:59.700 --> 0:6:16.490

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So as the Board will remember at the last meeting, we did bring these authorizations forward, previously known as delegations and that, that verbiage change did come from Elizabeth, she just felt more comfortable with the term authorizations rather than delegations.

0:6:17.150 --> 0:7:19.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And with these, we did learn some lessons from the last time this came before the Board. So, in the packet you did have both the cleaned up as well as the red-line showing what changed from the previous delegations to what we are currently asking the Board to approve. The largest departure I believe for the Board is that this is shifting from the Board and Commission Support Services Unit Administrator holding those authorizations to the division leadership, specifically our division Deputy Director, who reports directly to the agency Director, receiving those authorizations. The reason for that change is because previously when we had Rick, Rick was over all of the different functions that these authorizations address when he had the regulatory Board section.

0:7:19.980 --> 0:8:12.540

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And that unit housed investigations, licensing, customer service, the management analyst who reviewed the data. All of that has now been broken up into five separate units across the division. And so rather than doing five separate sets of authorizations to each of those units, when we spoke with Elizabeth, we felt it was best to shift the authorization to the division leadership and our deputy Director to allow that accountability at the very top of our leadership. And then that person works with the staff further down to make sure that those are being met. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions and I hope everybody had a chance to review them since the last meeting.

0:8:18.860 --> 0:8:30.550

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Honestly, I don't have a question. I just wanted to say that I appreciate the giving us the red-line version. It really helped reading what was changed and it made total sense to me. So that's my comment.

0:8:33.20 --> 0:8:36.380

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Rick Benner, you've got your hand up.

0:8:36.420 --> 0:9:11.380

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Thank you. So the only thing I guess I have a question about was, is there any other authorizations that we would want to make, given the experience of the last year or two, or however long this previous one's been in place, that would streamline the process for you guys or make that better? And whether we entertain that now, or whether it's an entertainment of that at a future date is fine with me.

0:9:17.850 --> 0:9:31.970

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I would defer that to the Board, if there were any ideas that the Board had that they wanted to streamline. I think that for staff purposes, this is set up to where this will be the most streamlined version for us under the functional alignment.

0:9:35.230 --> 0:9:35.700

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So.

0:9:38.160 --> 0:9:51.910

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I like the changes. It seems like it's simplified and more easily applied to staffing changes, which was the goal.

0:9:53.110 --> 0:10:5.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The only the only comments I had as far as Rick's streamlining, I think this does some of the streamlining that that we're we were looking for.

0:10:8.640 --> 0:10:22.450

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I had a little bit of a question on the first item, A, on the first page after the primary paragraph.

0:10:25.60 --> 0:10:47.760

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Investigate complaints or reports of unprofessional conduct. The prior version had listed some of the conditions that would establish why we would delegate versus just send it off to the Board.

0:10:48.940 --> 0:11:9.580

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And from a from an instructive standpoint, some somewhere that information lies, you know, what establishes a case that would be up for just being delegated to staff versus being sent to the Board.

0:11:10.630 --> 0:11:17.320

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And an example of that just came up recently, Sydney, with something that Grace sent me.

0:11:18.70 --> 0:11:18.540

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But.

0:11:19.630 --> 0:11:23.170

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So it probably makes sense to remove the conditions.

0:11:24.40 --> 0:11:32.690

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But just throwing it out there that. And I'm fine moving forward with an approval without those, but just for consideration.

0:11:33.730 --> 0:11:36.70

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Should they? Should it be something we consider?

0:11:37.90 --> 0:11:39.500

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And my next comment was on item K.

0:11:41.760 --> 0:11:53.400

Manley, Roch (Chair)

This deals with the. I know this is law on student loans. I believe it's federally guaranteed educational loans.

0:11:55.540 --> 0:12:17.850

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Just wondering if in the future, should we be looking at if the move on the federal level to forgive student loans, if that moves forward, could... We need to take a second look at this and knowing that, you know, state law, state laws that governs it, but.

0:12:20.360 --> 0:12:35.760

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Where I'm going with that is, should we have a regular review of the delegation on some kind of calendar, along with other things that might end up on a calendar?

0:12:36.660 --> 0:12:43.540

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And maybe we discussed this further on in the goals portion that is added to the agenda.

0:12:44.40 --> 0:12:44.340

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Mhm.

0:12:44.730 --> 0:12:50.170

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But that that was it for me, those two comments.

0:12:51.210 --> 0:13:6.340

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh, and authorizations for the Department of Licensing. I know that's probably a protocol thing, and it doesn't really matter, but it just picked at my brain, just that little bit.

0:13:7.290 --> 0:13:9.660

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So that was it for me.

0:13:22.420 --> 0:13:26.170

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Give everybody a chance to take another look.

0:13:33.240 --> 0:13:42.720

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Chair, I'm a little confused by your last one. We were looking at K and then, were you concerned with the very next paragraph?

0:13:43.50 --> 0:13:46.600

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I'm at the... Are you talking about the title comment?

0:13:46.600 --> 0:13:47.190

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yes.

0:13:47.190 --> 0:13:56.600

It reads "the Washington state for Board, for architects, authorizations for the the Department of Licensing."

0:13:58.160 --> 0:14:10.300

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So it's probably the Department of Licensing Assistant Director. It's, what are the the? The first.

0:14:9.510 --> 0:14:11.20
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
We've got two "thes" there.

0:14:11.170 --> 0:14:13.50
Manley, Roch (Chair)
With, does the first "the" need to be there?

0:14:15.250 --> 0:14:17.180
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
So the page on the screen right now, right?

0:14:17.400 --> 0:14:17.750
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Yeah.

0:14:18.260 --> 0:14:19.350
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
Yeah, OK. Yeah.

0:14:17.360 --> 0:14:19.540
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Right, right, right. Yeah. Yeah.

0:14:20.100 --> 0:14:25.310
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
I've got my play at home version up on another screen so I'm jumping back and forth so.

0:14:26.260 --> 0:14:27.170
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
My apologies.

0:14:26.750 --> 0:14:29.540
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Yeah, I agree. I was lost on where you were looking. Good.

0:14:32.20 --> 0:14:32.380
Manley, Roch (Chair)
So.

0:14:33.350 --> 0:14:34.960
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Not a, certainly not a...

0:14:34.200 --> 0:14:35.980

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Yeah, I think there's a redundant "the."

0:14:37.370 --> 0:14:38.240

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We can remove that.

0:14:38.600 --> 0:14:39.20

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:14:41.150 --> 0:14:41.460

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:14:41.780 --> 0:15:9.800

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

But to your questions, Roch. I mean our should we take those one by one? I mean on A, I'm curious. I guess my assumption when I read that was that the conditions were removed just because there could be a reason for investigating a complaint that didn't fall into those two categories, and so it just made sense to make it more open-ended. But I would ask those who edited it if that was indeed the intent, or if there was another reason for making that change.

0:15:11.820 --> 0:15:12.790

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And...

0:15:13.510 --> 0:15:13.800

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But.

0:15:11.820 --> 0:15:19.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. From my perspective, yes, that is the intent. But Elizabeth is also on the call and I'm sure she could also address that.

0:15:19.650 --> 0:15:31.210

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah, I just, I think whatever complaints you get, you need to investigate them. So, yeah, I just removed that because I thought it was redundant and perhaps limiting.

0:15:31.970 --> 0:15:32.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:15:32.130 --> 0:15:33.340

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Limiting. Yeah, I would agree.

0:15:34.340 --> 0:15:34.970

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Very good.

0:15:35.460 --> 0:15:59.380

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

So, Roch to your question on the periodic review of the authorizations. I think that's a good idea that just because, again we're, you know, revolving members through the Board too. So it's good for them to have a collective discussion probably once a year at least anyway on it. And as far as the...

0:16:0.790 --> 0:16:30.490

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Maybe there's a procedures, or something, where we can have some sort of list of what typically is delegated or authorized, verses what would be typically handled by the Board. Maybe that's already in the manual or whatever that's being worked on this rather than a rather than a legal theoretically authorization or a policy type of thing.

0:16:31.960 --> 0:16:33.470

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, exactly.

0:16:35.290 --> 0:16:39.130

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's right. Right, exactly what I was thinking, Rick.

0:16:42.900 --> 0:16:44.700

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Any thoughts on that, Sydney?

0:16:45.490 --> 0:17:0.20

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, we can certainly put together a list. I can tell you that the authorizations before you today are almost identical to the other four regulatory Boards within DOL. I can't speak to any other state agencies.

0:17:1.200 --> 0:17:16.250

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But for the DOL, has there a couple minute changes just because of the statutory differences between the Boards, but the content of it is very much the same across all five, including Architects.

0:17:18.440 --> 0:17:18.870

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right.

0:17:18.200 --> 0:17:48.220

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I think a list that has been described would be beneficial. And the reason is that I feel that we through NCARB we work with a lot of states that have very different authorizations and many of whom have very few authorizations. The Board pretty much does everything. So I think it would just be helpful for our Board maybe to kind of understand where we how we line up you know. So when we're talking to people who are doing investigations or doing things that we don't typically do, we kind of understand that this is how our state works.

0:17:55.20 --> 0:17:56.680

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. Good. Good point, Sian.

0:17:57.270 --> 0:18:0.300

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK. Staff can certainly work on putting that together.

0:18:1.730 --> 0:18:2.100

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:18:4.790 --> 0:18:10.370

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So if there are any other comments on the authorizations?

0:18:14.530 --> 0:18:17.560

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I think it would be appropriate to get a motion.

0:18:19.900 --> 0:18:22.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

For approval with the.

0:18:23.420 --> 0:18:23.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Uh.

0:18:24.940 --> 0:18:28.310

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Remove the correction of the removal of the redundant of the.

0:18:31.210 --> 0:18:44.540

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So, I move that we approve the revised authorizations for the Board to the Department of Licensing Assistant Director.

0:18:45.670 --> 0:18:46.190

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I second.

0:18:48.420 --> 0:18:48.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great.

0:18:50.150 --> 0:18:52.50

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Any other comments or discussion?

0:18:53.980 --> 0:19:5.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And with that, we'll go ahead and vote for approval of the corrected, or updated, version of the authorizations.

0:19:7.530 --> 0:19:13.640

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Do I hear all approving giving the yea sign?

0:19:15.130 --> 0:19:15.340

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yea.

0:19:15.490 --> 0:19:16.0

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Yea.

0:19:14.950 --> 0:19:16.140
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Yea.

0:19:17.170 --> 0:19:18.550
Manley, Roch (Chair)
And all opposed, nay?

0:19:21.120 --> 0:19:21.710
Manley, Roch (Chair)
So. Oh.

0:19:24.40 --> 0:19:25.90
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Are you good, Paul?

0:19:25.790 --> 0:19:25.950
Wu, Paul (Board Member)
No.

0:19:26.20 --> 0:19:29.280
Wu, Paul (Board Member)
I was late raising my hand.

0:19:29.370 --> 0:19:30.160
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Ooh.

0:19:30.670 --> 0:19:32.70
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
For yea for nay?

0:19:32.20 --> 0:19:32.350
Wu, Paul (Board Member)
Yea.

0:19:32.760 --> 0:19:51.440
Manley, Roch (Chair)
OK, OK. Yeah. So the hearing all yeas, no nays, the authorization is updated and with the additional update of the removal of the redundant the, is approved.

0:19:56.570 --> 0:19:57.740
Manley, Roch (Chair)
So let's see.

0:19:57.810 --> 0:19:58.800

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Pay my tax.

0:20:2.190 --> 0:20:14.650

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So Sidney, looks like you're up again with the discussion and consideration of the mutual recognition agreement. The is known as the MRA. Right, Sydney?

0:20:15.20 --> 0:20:15.770

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes.

0:20:16.210 --> 0:20:18.550

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Between the US and the UK.

0:20:19.350 --> 0:20:38.660

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, and the Board will be a bit familiar with this agreement, but this is the first time really that we're seeing it in writing. It did go before the membership at the last NCARB meeting, but this is the first time that this Board is seeing the resolution and the agreement.

0:20:40.160 --> 0:20:41.390

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

In a meeting.

0:20:43.150 --> 0:20:50.680

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

As the Board is aware, this is an agreement to create reciprocal licensing possibilities between the United States and the United Kingdom.

0:20:51.950 --> 0:21:24.460

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

To the best of my knowledge, I have tried to get additional information from NCARB, and just have not received it yet. But to the best of my knowledge, it is still in the UK going through their process. The way that the UK system works is it's not just their organization that has to approve it, but it also has to be approved by Parliament and so that process does take considerably longer. So they are hoping to have that finalized here within the next couple of months and then it will be looking at going forward for implementation.

0:21:25.540 --> 0:21:49.780

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Based on my experience, I will put an asterisk with that, but if the UK side as it moves through Parliament, if they are needing any changes or corrections that could add to that timeline and add to a need for NCARB to consider it again or at least NCARB's board, depending on the extent of those changes.

0:21:50.180 --> 0:23:8.260

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so, as I've noted in the cover sheet, NCARB has requested that the Board just take a look at the MRA and signal whether or not there is a desire or an intention for the Board to adopt this once it has come back from the UK and is ready for actual adoption and implementation at that point. Staff is in the process of reviewing it. Unfortunately, by the time we received it, I didn't have time to bring the DOL staff team together and didn't want that process to be rushed given the size of the MRA and the implications with that. So we will continue working on that prior to the next meeting. And then Elizabeth has also taken a look at it and has expressed some concerns that we've reached out to NCARB regarding and are just waiting so that we can get some of those concerns and questions addressed. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions. This item will be, really, for Board discretion, we're not looking for a "yes, for sure we're going to adopt this," understanding that that is all pending what returns from the UK and what that process looks like after that.

0:23:10.0 --> 0:23:24.10

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But this is really just NCARB requesting whether or not the Board is interested in looking at it and potentially adopting it once that time comes.

0:23:24.700 --> 0:23:27.790

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I see you Rick. You have your hand up?

0:23:30.740 --> 0:23:32.530

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Mic. Put your mic on, Rick.

0:23:34.820 --> 0:23:52.840

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Sorry. Thanks Roch. I guess in my reading through it and maybe I'm misunderstood it. I feel like Washing State Board is somewhat challenged, and if they're that, they're not accepting alternative paths at this point.

0:23:54.50 --> 0:24:12.640

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

But I'm gonna, you know, just leave that. Again, maybe I misunderstood that of the deal, but all it does is talk about, well, they'll be future discussions about that. And I, you know, it's kind of contrary to what our path that we go on with the state of Washington so.

0:24:14.80 --> 0:24:14.580

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah.

0:24:14.480 --> 0:24:15.770

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Just raised that question.

0:24:16.30 --> 0:24:30.640

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

In the, Board Member Harm. I had the same concern and I'm looking at page 22, page 20 on my play at home version. You know where they still don't recognize experience or examination in lieu of education.

0:24:30.870 --> 0:24:31.230

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Right.

0:24:31.730 --> 0:25:6.400

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

And I know our state is, our jurisdiction is not alone, especially I think within Region 6. But, yeah, but your whole for the diversity sake, they're not allowing alternative paths and we think that's a little. I'm sorry, speaking for myself, find that contrary to what we have is a law being moderately more restrictive and disassociates perhaps lower income groups regardless of any other subset that they fit into.

0:25:6.930 --> 0:25:13.380

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And, this is Board Member Roberts. We did discuss that at the annual business meeting quite a bit.

0:25:16.930 --> 0:25:33.900

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I would remind us that we have signed other MRAs with other countries that have the same stipulations. So just to know that there is a precedent for signing MRAs with other countries where there is a requirement for the NAP accredited degree.

0:25:37.350 --> 0:25:38.190

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I thought we...

0:25:37.110 --> 0:26:3.510

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. I guess from a, so there's a, would we preclude anybody from getting a license, from taking advantage of this opportunity because there are some who can't. Or, you know, do we make a statement about that as "I think what we will need to discuss?" And I think that it is also we also heard from NCARB pretty strongly that their desire is to continue that conversation with the UK as time goes forward.

0:26:4.960 --> 0:26:10.890

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And then since I'm speaking, I have one more question. Maybe it's for Elizabeth. I know we're not voting on this.

0:26:11.910 --> 0:26:31.320

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

But I think it's important that I disclose that I am a technically a dual citizen in the UK and I'm also a homeowner in the UK. I have no intention to become licensed in the UK. However, I wonder if that means that I should step out of any official action this Board might take on this issue.

0:26:32.80 --> 0:26:32.940

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Interesting point.

0:26:34.430 --> 0:26:34.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:26:34.540 --> 0:26:51.320

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Can I add on in light of that? I also am a dual citizen to the UK. I did have an opportunity in my career to become a UK citizen, but I opted to return to America and get licensed here. So similarly, I don't have a vested interest, but I have had that as part of my past.

0:26:54.770 --> 0:27:1.880

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Thank you, Erica, and thank you, Sian. Those that's an interesting twist on this discussion.

0:27:3.20 --> 0:27:7.640

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I had. I had similar concerns to.

0:27:8.340 --> 0:27:26.400

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Uh, who? Who was it? Was it Scott and Rick? Both that knowing that we've signed, or agreed to, MRA's with Mexico, Canada, and New Zealand, Australia, which are probably very similar.

0:27:27.620 --> 0:28:12.140

Manley, Roch (Chair)

You know, nonetheless, it is something that rubs against our general policy in the state to help provide alternate paths and support alternate paths. And I'm a little heartened by what looks to me like a change across NCARB nationally in moving forward to opening up to alternative paths and taking away obstacles to licensing. That seems to be a real thing.

0:28:13.330 --> 0:28:28.370

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And when, you know, when we see in the text and hear from NCARB that they're working toward handling those issues, that carries some weight for me.

0:28:30.20 --> 0:29:4.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

One thing that I saw in this, and I don't have my play at home version so I can't pin down what page and what section and what number it is. But it was under the conditions or requirements for a United States citizen getting a license in the UK. And one of those was completion of the AXP. And it looked quite literally, that you needed to be able to show that you've completed the AXP.

0:29:5.410 --> 0:29:28.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Well, some of us older folks who got our licenses when there was no AXP... I didn't do a thorough search of the document, but I don't see where there's an exception to that. So, at face value, it looks like with this document I would not be allowed to be licensed in the UK and that that's a little disconcerting.

0:29:29.950 --> 0:29:33.100

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Well, that's probably a good question to enter.

0:29:32.340 --> 0:29:34.740

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

That. Yeah, I agree. Yeah. I hadn't thought of that Roch.

0:29:33.800 --> 0:29:35.540

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

From this Board, yeah.

0:29:35.940 --> 0:29:37.170

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I'm. I'm with you on that one.

0:29:37.370 --> 0:29:40.880

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

That would mean everybody that it did IDP is also not.

0:29:41.140 --> 0:29:42.290

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right, right.

0:29:41.980 --> 0:29:42.380

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah.

0:29:43.20 --> 0:29:43.290

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:29:41.910 --> 0:29:43.530

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Able to so.

0:29:43.20 --> 0:29:49.80

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I didn't think of that. I mean there was no, IDP, there was no AXP when I was licensed.

0:29:50.970 --> 0:29:56.80

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I don't. I don't know if I'm the senior guy here now, Paul, am I? At 65.

0:29:55.450 --> 0:29:58.10

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I can tell you you're not. You're not.

0:29:55.180 --> 0:29:58.800

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

I am 78.

0:29:58.930 --> 0:29:59.200

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

No.

0:30:0.100 --> 0:30:1.480

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But we got.

0:30:0.820 --> 0:30:3.130

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I was also pre IDP so.

0:30:2.730 --> 0:30:3.360

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:30:14.600 --> 0:30:14.860

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:30:3.410 --> 0:30:15.910

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah, I feel like they have used the terminology AXP in my working with people to kind of blanket over all training and it is a generic thing, especially in agreements like this. I think it should be more specific.

0:30:16.370 --> 0:30:36.850

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And maybe there's something in the glossary of terms or definitions that could... Does or could, you know, clarify that, and give us that exception? But it sure didn't look like it from that brief reading that I did of the document.

0:30:42.270 --> 0:30:46.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And I am taking notes of all of this so that we can get these questions answered with NCARB as well.

0:30:47.250 --> 0:31:15.960

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK. And I think this this discussion is, in my mind, a good argument for proposing that everybody who can should be going to the national meetings, you know, whether they're in Hawaii or whether they're in Seattle to be part of those discussions. So that's my little plug for that.

0:31:18.160 --> 0:31:18.660

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But...

0:31:19.900 --> 0:31:22.270

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I have one comment as the newest member to the Board.

0:31:22.740 --> 0:31:57.640

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I really do appreciate that one of the main conversation pieces that we have as Washington state is keeping the alternative path clear for everybody. It's it is about equity for people and people who've had to have a different life experience and that fruitfulness that comes into our industry is very successful. And I appreciate that that is a standing point that we hold true to here. I know changing the law, that was a big conversation, but this is, it's very palpable to see this be the main conversation point we have in our state.

0:31:58.60 --> 0:31:58.450

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

And.

0:31:59.910 --> 0:32:0.920

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Board member Harm.

0:32:2.160 --> 0:32:10.910

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I believe we were one of, and not for this reason or the reasons that we're talking about, I thought we were one of two jurisdictions that voted against the MRA with Australia.

0:32:12.770 --> 0:32:35.850

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

It wasn't for this reason. It was for other reasons. I won't go into the detail, but if my memory serves me, I thought there were two jurisdictions, and US being the second one, and Guam, I think, being the primary one who voted against the MRA. So we have a split if I remember correctly, split history of agreeing to MRAs, even though it wasn't for the reasons we're talking about today.

0:32:38.100 --> 0:32:45.860

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Well your memory is probably much better than mine Scott, and it wouldn't take much for it to be much better than mine.

0:32:45.960 --> 0:32:48.130

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Oh, thanks. So the bar is really low.

0:32:48.0 --> 0:32:51.90

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The bar is pretty low, yeah, but.

0:32:51.290 --> 0:32:55.620

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Did we actually have? Has the Australian one come before this Board yet?

0:32:58.390 --> 0:32:59.510

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I know, yeah.

0:32:56.580 --> 0:33:0.450

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I just remember there was a vote. I remember the tally Board up on the screen.

0:33:1.410 --> 0:33:1.880

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:33:1.80 --> 0:33:4.430

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Well, I mean, I know that national, I know it was a vote that they.

0:33:17.470 --> 0:33:17.840

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

OK.

0:33:5.300 --> 0:33:25.90

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Approving it national. But then it needs to come to us for us to decide. This is now, my memory's obviously failing me. It's supposed to come here so that we decide whether we accept it or not. And I don't recall ever having a vote on the Australia MRA, but I could be wrong.

0:33:25.420 --> 0:33:26.90

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I.

0:33:25.770 --> 0:33:42.440

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

It's Board Member, Loynd. I did mentor somebody who is from Australia and she did get a Washington state license from it, so I would assume that it did get approved by Washington state to be accepted. Because she worked the system right after and it was, and she did receive licensure in Washington state.

0:33:43.120 --> 0:33:45.100

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I see Elizabeth has her hand up.

0:34:3.820 --> 0:34:4.110

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah.

0:33:45.950 --> 0:34:47.370

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah. I was just gonna say that you don't necessarily have to have an MRA in place to approve someone from another country. You can always just look at their education, their experience and you know whether they've taken the required examination. So it's not a requirement that an MRA exist. And on that, I had just a question. I know that with the similar MRA type situation with the engineers, England didn't have the same testing that's required in, you know, in the state of Washington for engineers. So that was a big stumbling block for them, was the testing process. So I don't even know if they, I couldn't tell from this, if they do any testing or if they just decided that there's enough. The language was something like there's enough you've covered all the points that would be covered in testing. Not that they actually do the testing. So I don't know on this.

0:34:47.790 --> 0:35:40.350

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

So for my experience, when I was going, this is Board Member Loynd, when I was going to get licensed in the UK. The reason I did not was because I had determined to come back to America and the process there was quite arduous. They do have a required course they take. They do have a practical exam that they take as a group. And then they do, or they, like a multiple quick test questionnaire type thing. But their main test is a practical working experience that's a one-week long process that every candidate takes at the same time. And they do a scenario testing. It takes a full week, very long days and hours. And then that's that each exam is reviewed by their Board and deemed for approval once a year. That is the way the process was when I was going to go after it.

0:35:40.740 --> 0:35:48.700

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

It was it was quite extensive and fairly comprehensive of the whole system, but it's not a similar one to ours where we take the AARE exams.

0:35:50.150 --> 0:35:51.740

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good. Paul, you've got your hand up.

0:35:52.420 --> 0:36:18.160

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Uh, yes, I have a similar experience with Canada back in the 1990s. I have to drag all my textbooks up for face-to-face interviews and answer questions before I got approved in. That's before the MRA with Canada. So, it doesn't require MRA to be licensed, but the journey is arduous.

0:36:20.130 --> 0:36:20.620

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right.

0:36:22.170 --> 0:36:30.900

Manley, Roch (Chair)

This this Roch again, but just a comment. And again, I don't know where in the document I saw this don't have it up in front of me.

0:36:31.810 --> 0:36:33.560

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But it sounded like.

0:36:34.550 --> 0:36:41.740

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The document had embedded in it an allowance for each jurisdiction to.

0:36:43.990 --> 0:36:44.630

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Opt out.

0:36:45.390 --> 0:36:49.340

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Which is, you know, as Sian said, well, we haven't voted for.

0:36:50.850 --> 0:36:54.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

We maybe have, maybe have not voted. I don't remember voting for.

0:36:55.820 --> 0:37:2.930

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Australia and New Zealand. But I also very, only very, very vaguely, remember voting for Mexico and Canada.

0:37:4.870 --> 0:37:5.320

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But.

0:37:6.790 --> 0:37:7.760

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So so.

0:37:9.120 --> 0:37:11.30

Manley, Roch (Chair)

There is an opt out.

0:37:12.350 --> 0:37:16.100

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I guess what I'm trying to say, there is an opt out for the state of Washington.

0:37:18.200 --> 0:37:19.200

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Should this.

0:37:19.920 --> 0:37:24.940

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Continue in a direction that doesn't work with our laws or doesn't work with our philosophies.

0:37:27.490 --> 0:37:27.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:37:27.390 --> 0:37:35.630

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

And again, if we were to hold firm on, let's say, not being in favor of this particular MRA because of the strict educational requirements.

0:37:37.310 --> 0:37:57.650

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

It's really a one-way street, because we're taking issue with the fact that the UK may not register a minority of our applicants due to the educational criteria. We would certainly be accepting, from the primary read of it, you know, almost all candidates coming this way from the UK so.

0:37:58.40 --> 0:38:0.240

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, be one way street almost, yeah.

0:38:0.110 --> 0:38:0.510

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yep.

0:38:1.560 --> 0:38:7.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I had an interesting conversation several years ago, at a national meeting I believe it was.

0:38:10.80 --> 0:38:44.880

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I was seated at the lunch table with Harry Falconer and the director of the German AIAA and Board, which in Germany, are apparently combined. So he was the he was the guy. He was the CEO, or President or whatever it was, of the combined unit. And we got into a conversation of, apparently, they were having some early discussions with Germany on an agreement.

0:38:45.550 --> 0:38:57.500

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And we got into a conversation about it. And I mentioned Washington State and the fact that we have this alternative, you know, path where you don't have to have an accredited degree. You don't have to have a degree at all.

0:38:58.390 --> 0:39:14.490

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And, Harry, that was a big sticking point for the Germans. Apparently they were just like the British. They were sticklers on education. And Harry became just a little livid that I brought that up.

0:39:15.900 --> 0:39:24.470

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So I could see where the negotiations are probably pretty tough with different ideas and different philosophies over.

0:39:35.660 --> 0:39:36.170

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yes.

0:39:24.430 --> 0:39:38.740

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I would also say that in the UK and in Germany, higher education is subsidized to a much higher degree than it is here. So it is not as exclusive a thing as it is in our country.

0:39:39.370 --> 0:39:42.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yes, good point, good point.

0:39:44.690 --> 0:39:45.350

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So.

0:39:46.460 --> 0:39:56.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Any more discussion? Anymore ideas or comments on this? Do you think we've gotten everything that we can out on the Table for the time being?

0:40:0.530 --> 0:40:11.830

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. I mean, I think if NCARB is looking for a sort of an indication, I guess maybe we just respond with our continuing concern about the educational requirement.

0:40:13.310 --> 0:40:13.570

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:40:14.370 --> 0:40:14.660

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:40:14.380 --> 0:41:10.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. As I said, I took extensive notes. I've got a lot of your concerns written down. So I'll let them know that the Board has concerns and doesn't wanna give an indication one way or another until we can address those. And with that, I would say if the Board has any additional comments, questions, concerns that they would like addressed, if you could get those over to myself and Susan as quickly as possible, we'll make sure that those are part of the discussion. We'll be pulling the staff grouped together to do the full review and seeing what all we can get addressed. And we'll keep the Board apprised of the progress. And part of staff's review process, we'll also look at when the other MRAs were approved by the Board as well and that adoption did happen. So we'll return that and we'll just let NCARB know that at this point the Board hasn't made a determination and wants some answers first.

0:41:13.440 --> 0:41:15.630

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That sounds good to me, Sydney.

0:41:18.280 --> 0:41:23.740

Manley, Roch (Chair)

If there are any more concerns or discussions on this.

0:41:24.550 --> 0:41:36.240

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Perhaps we should get the meeting moving along again and get to item 5.3 which is the report out from the Washington Association of Building Officials annual meeting.

0:41:38.380 --> 0:41:40.10

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's I believe.

0:41:43.380 --> 0:41:43.760

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yep.

0:41:40.940 --> 0:41:47.940

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Scott, you were present there. Paul and Sydney, you were, If not present, you were kind of monitoring the situation.

0:41:47.820 --> 0:41:49.970

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

She was very much present.

0:41:48.970 --> 0:41:51.640

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So you're present to you. OK, good.

0:41:52.540 --> 0:41:53.950

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, take it away.

0:41:56.640 --> 0:42:0.530

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I guess I'll go. Sydney is OK if I go jump in?

0:42:0.530 --> 0:42:1.230

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely.

0:42:1.230 --> 0:42:6.950

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I think I'm the only one who it was my repeat performance at this meeting.

0:42:8.30 --> 0:42:17.110

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Again, I would, because I don't wanna be three-peat, volunteer for this one because it's fun, very informative, very well attended.

0:42:18.510 --> 0:42:30.190

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

We were the last, I think, agenda item on their multi-day meeting, and we ran long. We had a kerfuffle with a table collapse.

0:42:32.930 --> 0:42:34.810

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

That was fun to deal with.

0:42:36.130 --> 0:42:45.240

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I remember, I think, maybe Elizabeth was involved as well and drinks went everywhere. So it started off with a vein of comedy.

0:42:46.420 --> 0:43:1.780

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Very much engaged group, and again, the plethora from the city of Bellevue and I think someone from the City of Seattle all the way to somebody, you know where they're the lead building official, the plans examiner, and the fire Marshall.

0:43:3.80 --> 0:43:40.60

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

And a lot of hypothetical. They just seem like they kept making situations up, you know, "let's just say it's a Tuesday and somebody walks in with us." And so there was a lot of repeating of, you know, "you have the right to require whatever stamps you deem necessary." I think there was one individual, and Paul and Sydney, maybe you can remember who was, I think getting under some pressure to approve a process for a large developer or design build entity and you know, while we felt their agony, there was quite frankly, I don't think anything that the Board specifically could help them with, which was our response.

0:43:41.220 --> 0:43:49.940

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

But you know, it's just another one of the reasons I, what I get out of this is, this is why I do what we're doing now.

0:43:51.320 --> 0:44:20.70

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

You know, as much as licensed architects are constituents, I would say building officials and people who support them are probably very much more relying on us than we sometimes assume. And they were very much attentive to everything that we were speaking about. And, again, I found it both personally and professionally rewarding to participate. So when and if we get invited next year, again, I don't want to be a three-peat. So please volunteer to do it. I don't know, Paul, got anything you wanna add?

0:44:20.630 --> 0:44:50.790

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Well, you have said almost everything. I don't want to repeat that, but that was an interesting story where one of the building examiners, her father was an architect, retired, and this guy came in with several drawings with her father's name on it. Which she knows that that is a fraudulent application. And there was an interesting scenario that she presented so.

0:44:50.940 --> 0:44:56.270

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

But anyway, it's good to meet those people, let them know that we're behind them and help them.

0:44:59.40 --> 0:45:15.710

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And I would just piggyback on that. We did have a representative from the Engineers Board as well. And Elizabeth was gracious enough to come over with us. And unfortunately, yes, she was in the center of the table when everything collapsed right on top of her lap.

0:45:14.800 --> 0:45:16.230

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

That, I couldn't remember who it was. Yep.

0:45:17.410 --> 0:46:16.650

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Por Elizabeth, hung in there with us though. She was fantastic. The presentation was really well received. We got excellent comments back from the WABO group. And I have asked that if they received anything in writing, if they could share that with us, we would appreciate that and haven't seen anything. But I can keep that conversation going with them. But it was a really great group and I think a lot of it was trying to figure out where they need to look for what. And I think it really helped them having the industry professionals say "we're looking at you. We're asking you what you feel you need." And you're helping talk through a few of those scenarios and ended up creating a very good dialogue among just the numbers and how different jurisdictions are handling different things. So we are hoping that they are taking that and continuing to run with it within the WABO organization.

0:46:19.150 --> 0:46:23.260

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And just again, it was just a really great conversation. It was a lot of fun.

0:46:24.640 --> 0:46:24.930

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great.

0:46:24.530 --> 0:46:27.90

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

It was just always a really good group there.

0:46:27.540 --> 0:47:20.870

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

I would add that, you know, one of the goals we had was to try to empower. You know, let people know that they're the ones that have the power to make these decisions and they shouldn't be intimidated by, you know, people that come in and try to push them around. And there were some, you know, afterwards I talked to some building officials that have been doing it for many, many years and they had participated quite a bit in the sort of question asking and stuff just to try to. And yes, they had some pretty specific questions, but their goal was to raise the questions so that they could be answered so that the people with less experience could hear, you know, could hear the answers. So yeah, it was a very it was a good group and that I think the people with more experience participated to kind of educate the people with less experience, which was what I was looking for out of that.

0:47:20.720 --> 0:47:23.430

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And Rick, you have your hand up.

0:47:24.600 --> 0:47:28.730

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Yeah, thanks Roch.

0:47:30.150 --> 0:48:1.810

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

And this may be separate from the conversations you have. Which is to me, you know, I appreciate all those folks who are in our group that help participate in it. I'm just curious, and this may be more personal than not, of, you know, we are experiencing longer and longer lead times for permitting processes. And I'm just curious of whether WABO has had any of those conversations or anything that would help move projects forward.

0:48:3.450 --> 0:48:11.830

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Because it's just, you know, pre-COVID there was a shortage, obviously, of plans examiners.

0:48:12.730 --> 0:48:25.650

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

And post-COVID it's... I'm sure they're experiencing kind of the same things we are. So I just, you know, at least at Western, we're finding a huge problem with trying to get any sort of thing permitted.

0:48:28.460 --> 0:48:50.200

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I don't remember that was a topic of discussion, at least while we were in the room. They may have discussed it throughout the other portions of their conference, but Board Member Benner, I can reach out to WABO and just see if that's something that they are discussing internally with the other building officials and let you know if that's something on their radar.

0:48:50.630 --> 0:48:51.190

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:48:50.630 --> 0:48:51.190

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah, I will go ahead.

0:48:51.950 --> 0:48:52.480

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Oh, go ahead.

0:48:50.370 --> 0:48:57.460

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Sorry. Oh. I would agree with Sidney. I don't remember it being actually mentioned at all that topic. They kind of jumped in outside.

0:48:58.660 --> 0:49:8.990

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Do also wanna send appreciation to the Board member from the Engineers Board who joined us. I'm sorry I didn't mention that individual. But yep.

0:49:10.580 --> 0:49:12.870

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Yeah. I just wonder if maybe there's some sort of...

0:49:15.860 --> 0:49:32.920

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

And this would be again probably more of an AIA, a question about whether or not there's some sort of pathway or something we can help, with apprenticeship or some way, of helping get more people into the building officials pipeline too.

0:49:37.140 --> 0:49:38.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. Good. Good point, Rick and.

0:49:39.930 --> 0:49:52.300

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Really appreciate their report out on this. Uh, Scott and Paul in Sydney and Elizabeth I. I hope you didn't sustain any lasting injuries. Elizabeth with that table collapse.

0:49:53.270 --> 0:50:3.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And it seems very ironic that that would happen at an engineers, architects, and building officials forum. So.

0:50:4.500 --> 0:50:5.350

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Well, the funny part.

0:50:4.600 --> 0:50:8.930

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah, kind of thing. I think the engineer was the one who knocked the leg out, is that right?

0:50:9.140 --> 0:50:9.930

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Ah.

0:50:9.750 --> 0:50:10.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Think so?

0:50:8.550 --> 0:50:16.520

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah. I was gonna say. We weren't the last agenda item. We weren't the first ones to sit at the table. So I don't know how it survived 2 days.

0:50:17.810 --> 0:50:19.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's pretty good.

0:50:21.210 --> 0:50:30.240

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good, good. And that's another thing we'll have to make sure you get on the calendar for next year.

0:50:31.700 --> 0:50:33.130

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Paul, you had your hand up.

0:50:34.90 --> 0:50:51.900

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yes. Talking about the long lead time for permit approvals. Is that something that our Board can reach out to WABO and ask them, ask them for answers, Instead of the other way around? We should request that.

0:50:54.80 --> 0:51:17.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I think we can. As far as the Boards work, it doesn't necessarily have to do with the Board's work necessarily, but it does impact our licensees and our cooperation with WABO. So I can reach out to them and just see if that's something that they're hearing among their membership. And then just let the Board know if that is a discussion that they're having just in an effort to keep that conversation going with WABO.

0:51:18.830 --> 0:51:42.460

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That kind of sounds like an AIA outreach thing to me, you know, as far as... Who was it, Rick, you were talking about? Trying to pump up the pipeline for building officials and you know, maybe there's maybe there's a committee out there in the future. That's...

0:51:41.880 --> 0:51:42.510

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:51:43.710 --> 0:51:44.30

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That is.

0:51:43.300 --> 0:51:55.570

Benner, Rick (Board Member)

I mean, it's more building industry questions than it is, you know how to streamline or, you know, expedite work because we're all kind of facing the same challenges.

0:51:56.350 --> 0:51:57.590

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right. Paul.

0:51:58.340 --> 0:52:22.350

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yes, it's me again. I think I remember not many years ago there was a proposal that the building official will accept and approve drawings by licensed architects off hand, and that the responsibility of code compliance on the professional's realm of jurisdiction.

0:52:23.410 --> 0:52:42.390

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

So that was proposed at one time. So like, I think that might be something that our Board needs to explore. Maybe there is a movement, or there is some intention or wish list on our part to streamline that approval process.

0:52:46.300 --> 0:52:52.110

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right. Maybe that's more of an Elizabeth question.

0:52:57.490 --> 0:52:57.810

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:52:54.860 --> 0:53:2.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But Paul's throwing that out there. So, I have a vague recollection of that coming up at some point as well, Paul.

0:53:3.990 --> 0:53:4.830

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Elizabeth?

0:53:6.90 --> 0:53:53.110

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah, I have a vague recollection of that too. At the same time, I know that, and I don't know if you guys run into it as much as the engineers do, but building officials really tend to scrutinize and, you know, engineer's work and give back, you know. "This is how you have to do it." So, like, second guessing engineer's work, which, which frustrates them because they are the licensed engineers and they're getting feedback and instructions from unlicensed building officials. So, knowing that, I have a feeling that most building officials would be unlikely to cart-blanche say "anything submitted by an architect should automatically be approved" even though you have the licenses. So, I think that would be a statutory, if you wanted to have that, that would be some kind of statutory change. But the odds of success would be very low.

0:54:9.720 --> 0:54:10.50

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

0:54:10.820 --> 0:54:11.270

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Alright.

0:54:11.970 --> 0:54:12.170

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:54:13.550 --> 0:54:15.340

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good, good question though, Paul.

0:54:15.880 --> 0:54:16.800

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yes. Thank you.

0:54:18.280 --> 0:54:37.320

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good discussion. If there isn't anything else. The things like, well, we can keep things going by getting on to new business. Any other last comments on the report out for the building officials meeting?

0:54:38.680 --> 0:55:2.880

Manley, Roch (Chair)

If that's the case, we'll get on to, and it's a good segue, I suppose, the new business item 6.1 is Interprofessional Council on Registration Committee to address overlapping and incidental practice among design professions. So that's a kind of related to the last item in some respects.

0:55:3.940 --> 0:55:6.460

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Sydney, what can you share with us on this?

0:55:7.60 --> 0:55:14.0

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And that's why this is on new business rather than in the report out is because it did tie into the work with WABO.

0:55:14.620 --> 0:55:46.270

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This is an ICOR committee that's been put together among the design profession: national organizations, so NCARB, the engineers, CLARB for the landscape architects, and then the interior design group. I believe they are working on getting some building official representation on there or will be at some point. But right now, it's just a committee that's come together to address those overlapping and incidental practice issues because we are not the only ones getting those questions.

0:55:46.820 --> 0:56:34.990

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

It's a pretty frequent question for all of the groups nationwide. So this was more just to put it on the Board's radar that this committee is coming together and they're working on whether this can be addressed through continuing education, if this is something where we just need to provide more education to the building officials, to the local jurisdictions who are reviewing, or if this is something where we can start creating some pathways and Model Law that creates some delineation and some better lines. So they're taking a really holistic look at it. And so I'll be making it part of the board executives report going forward. But I just wanted to get it on the Board's radar. If you happen to see, hear anything about that committee, that is something that we're monitoring.

0:56:38.920 --> 0:56:55.10

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I'd be curious as to what group is advocating. And who's been selected to be on the committee? And how is all that working? Do we know that?

0:56:55.990 --> 0:57:8.420

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I do not know. Unfortunately, this is one that was put together as Rick was leaving and before I was fully involved with NCARB. So I was not a part of the discussions on who was involved, but I can certainly get that information.

0:57:8.620 --> 0:57:11.440

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So it's an, it's an NCARB and it's an...

0:57:10.340 --> 0:57:16.910

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

It's an NCARB committee and they are collaborating with the other committees from the other organizations so.

0:57:17.600 --> 0:57:17.920

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:57:17.600 --> 0:57:17.920

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:57:19.590 --> 0:57:19.950

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah.

0:57:16.860 --> 0:57:21.40

I thought so I just wasn't sure where it was coming from.

0:57:21.840 --> 0:57:26.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Let's see. Someone had their hand up. Was that you, Paul?

0:57:27.250 --> 0:57:27.700

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

No.

0:57:28.540 --> 0:57:32.110

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Or Scott? OK. Oh. Sian. Yes, Sian?

0:57:33.290 --> 0:57:52.380

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK. I was also gonna add that our committee to review our law in relation to the Model Law met recently. And as a as a follow up to that, I reached out to, now this is maybe another agenda item, but it relates to this. So I'm gonna say it now instead.

0:57:53.900 --> 0:58:46.630

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I reached out to AIA Washington Council and just said, "hey, you know, you guys we're doing this review. If there's anything that was on your docket or anything that you guys were really particularly have been issues recently, you know, let us know." And she was gonna circulate it. But her immediate response to me was this very issue, was incidental practice with engineers and architects. And I think it relates to the AGO opinion that we had been discussing earlier on challenges with the definition of the practice of architecture and all of that. So I think this is all kind of coming together potentially at a good time if we are thinking about making some changes to our law that could potentially clarify some of some of these issues. So I look forward to following what comes out of this committees work.

0:58:49.460 --> 0:58:52.500

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Well, I agree with you there, Sian.

0:58:54.750 --> 0:59:30.470

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I'm like very, very cautiously optimistic based on what the discussions have been in the past with Elizabeth and others on the immovable forces involved with the legal issues and how we ended up here. It'll be interesting to see how it all comes forward and what results from the Commission's work.

0:59:34.750 --> 0:59:38.360

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Any other thoughts? Comments?

0:59:41.790 --> 0:59:42.330

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

0:59:43.30 --> 0:59:45.270

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Hearing, no.

0:59:47.830 --> 1:0:2.840

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Sounds like we're done with our discussion there. Next item on the new business on the agenda is 6.2, the NCARB regional summit, which I think we're all aware of, is coming up in March.

1:0:3.840 --> 1:0:6.670

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Do you wanna start the discussion off Sydney?

1:0:7.940 --> 1:0:37.550

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, I can. This item is really just to formalize the attendance at the regional summit coming up in March. As the Board is aware we we're well down the path of getting everybody registered and working toward getting flights booked, all of that. And I do apologize that this process has been a little bit chaotic. Unfortunately in our unit this is a very new process for all of us. Sherry was handling all of this the last time any NCARB travel happened.

1:0:37.910 --> 1:1:13.910

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And now Sherry, as you guys know, has left us. So, it's been a very new learning process for us and the NCARB travel piece is an additional layer in there that we weren't anticipating. So, thank you for your patience and working with us. So, really this item is just to finalize attendance. I believe Board Member Benner is the only one who has indicated that he would like to attend remotely. So, it would just be the Board okaying the other six of you all attending.

1:1:18.150 --> 1:1:21.920

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Do we need? We don't typically formally approve this. Do we need to formally approve this?

1:1:24.400 --> 1:1:31.580

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I think really, just kind of a head nod that you guys are OK with everybody attending and then staff will work through the rest of it.

1:1:32.270 --> 1:1:35.740

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, right, right. Scott has got his hand up. Scott?

1:1:35.550 --> 1:1:38.820

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah. Now I've gotta figure out how to put my hand down.

1:1:40.620 --> 1:1:52.30

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah, just for everyone's edification in the call, I declared my intention of running for Regional Director, and it now appears that I may be unopposed.

1:1:54.520 --> 1:1:54.820

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Good.

1:1:53.710 --> 1:2:3.900

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

So, I was generally well received and a lot of people were, "It's about time. We kept waiting for you to do this." kind of reaction, so...

1:2:5.820 --> 1:2:6.450

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Very good.

1:2:6.520 --> 1:2:7.410

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Congratulations.

1:2:7.720 --> 1:2:8.200

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I mean.

1:2:7.680 --> 1:2:8.360

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Congratulations.

1:2:11.880 --> 1:2:12.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

1:2:7.680 --> 1:2:13.270

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

But I mean, yeah, I mean, I'm goosebumpy. Because it's like, "be careful what you ask for because you might get it" kind of thing.

1:2:15.310 --> 1:2:15.750

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

1:2:15.470 --> 1:2:15.750

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:2:16.940 --> 1:2:17.110

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:2:16.780 --> 1:2:19.600

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Huh. Yeah, very. That's exciting news, Scott.

1:2:19.430 --> 1:2:22.300

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah. Had a good follow up conversation with Corey Solum.

1:2:23.810 --> 1:2:26.120

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

And he did a "who!" kind of a thing.

1:2:27.640 --> 1:2:33.200

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Because an illness, there was someone who couldn't move up. So there was going to be, there was fear that there would be a void.

1:2:34.490 --> 1:2:34.730

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Right.

1:2:34.670 --> 1:2:34.960

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Here.

1:2:37.10 --> 1:2:50.40

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah, I was actually wondering if anybody was going to be running for the open XCOM seat. Because I was considering potentially doing that, but didn't want to do that if anybody else from this Board was planning on doing that.

1:2:50.460 --> 1:2:50.720

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

1:2:50.720 --> 1:3:4

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And I don't know if that would be problematic to have two Washington folks. And I will definitely defer if we think it makes more sense for us to put our eggs in the Scott Harm basket.

1:3:4 --> 1:3:7.490

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Paul. You've got your hand up.

1:3:7.490 --> 1:3:10.60

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yes. I fully support you, Sian.

1:3:11.10 --> 1:3:19.30

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

I think it's about time that Washington has to make a lot of noise out there.

1:3:20.80 --> 1:3:22.920

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

So I fully support your candidacy.

1:3:23.520 --> 1:3:43.510

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Thank you. Well, we'll see. I'll be thinking about it. I do think that the nice thing about it, and one of the reasons I wanted to do it, quite frankly, is that it does get us that extra NCARB, I remember, Scott, from your days, it gets us that extra NCARB sponsored individual for our Board. So, it helps us be able to fund everybody's attendance.

1:3:45.560 --> 1:3:45.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

1:3:45.400 --> 1:3:52.970

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

But if you're a regional, then you know we won't have to worry about that as much. So I will give it some. I'll give it some thought.

1:3:53.780 --> 1:3:54.390

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

1:3:54.20 --> 1:4:5.110

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yes, it's looking at the Board of what your obligations are and, "can I take one more thing on?" and, all the calories that it takes. So, I may have to drop a, not off of this, but one of my other couple commitments.

1:4:5.550 --> 1:4:5.850

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:4:6.610 --> 1:4:30.80

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And I'm with Paul. I would support both of you in advancing forward into NCARB leadership, I think you're both excellent advocates for our region and state and very sharp cookies that would do a good job in that position.

1:4:30.720 --> 1:4:31.390

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Oh, thank you.

1:4:31.820 --> 1:4:32.290

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Thank you.

1:4:33.870 --> 1:4:36.540

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I agree. I am at full support of you representing us.

1:4:38.10 --> 1:4:38.670

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, yeah.

1:4:40.530 --> 1:5:19.40

Manley, Roch (Chair)

On the coming meeting and travel, and so forth to the meeting, just an FYI. I booked flights yesterday and booked an early flight out of Portland. I didn't look at the Seattle area flights. However, our return flight is through Seattle, and you better book fast because these flights were very, very, very full.

1:5:19.860 --> 1:5:44.650

Manley, Roch (Chair)

It was like, if you want a seat, if you're traveling with a partner or spouse, on the flight we looked at, the morning flight, there were three seats, the ones way at the back, wedged in between the two toilets. There are two seats together. Those were the only two adjacent seats on the entire flight and just a sprinkling of empty seats. Sydney.

1:5:44.650 --> 1:6:12.120

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, just wanted to let the Board know that Alyssa, our Administrative Assistant for our unit, and Susan will be reaching out to the remaining Board members who we haven't spoken with yet later today and finalizing those last tidbits of travel information. So be looking for those phone calls, emails. We'll be wrapping it up as quickly as we can today.

1:6:13.400 --> 1:6:46.660

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And the other point on that, on the urgency is, I know everyone's looked at the emails from whoever they're coming from at NCARB, I can't remember the name. Melissa? The 20th is their deadline, is NCARB's deadline, and I think that might impact hotel rooms and so forth as well. So, there is an urgency to this, as we all know. I'm just stating it out loud.

1:6:48.380 --> 1:6:49.20

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So, Paul, did you just..?

1:6:48.430 --> 1:6:58.530

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yes, I will. Susan, sent out some questionnaire regarding the accommodation. And so I'll be responding to that after this meeting.

1:6:59.810 --> 1:7:2.240

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Hmm. Oh, OK. OK.

1:7:4.240 --> 1:7:5.420

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I'll have to look for that.

1:7:6.990 --> 1:7:13.140

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So, very good. Any other discussion on the regional summit?

1:7:19.120 --> 1:7:24.70

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The next item is the annual business meeting, which is in June.

1:7:25.430 --> 1:7:26.40

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Sydney.

1:7:26.40 --> 1:7:27.170

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Oh. I'm sorry Chair. Before we move on..?

1:7:27.170 --> 1:7:28.540

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh, Scott yes.

1:7:28.540 --> 1:8:16.990

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Because of my plan, run for the regional position, I registered myself really early thinking, even if I had to, I was just going to pay for it myself. There is a hiccup. Whoever's doing it, I declared I was bringing a companion, let's call her "Tess," and registering her for the dinner. I never got charged for any of that. And Sydney's been rolled up in it, trying to figure out what happened. Because my receipt clearly says I registered a guest to go to everything, including the dinner, and it never showed up on the invoice, so I think it's something that's still maybe NCARB is trying to noodle through, why that didn't happen. So just be aware, Roch, if you registered someone, let's call her "Linda," and you register for the meal, you may have not been charged for it yet.

1:8:16.990 --> 1:8:25.550

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Well Scott, I think you got the Scott Harm deal. Because I got charged \$250.00.

1:8:25.550 --> 1:8:30.980

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I don't... Yeah, so did I. But there was another charge for the...

1:8:31.940 --> 1:8:33.170

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah, exactly. Yep, yep.

1:8:28.820 --> 1:8:34.100

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh, for the for the meal. Yeah, I didn't see anything for the meal. Yeah, OK. OK.

1:8:34.200 --> 1:9:2.000

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. That was something that Melanie Gonzales from New Mexico brought up to me yesterday. She and I had a very lovely hour-long conversation. And, yeah, she brought that up to me. That was a glitch, that they can't figure out what happened, so they're still waiting to hear from NCARB what that's going to look like. So, you may be getting a follow-up email asking for that additional, for attendance at the regional dinner on Thursday.

1:9:2.260 --> 1:9:5.30

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Said there's no free lunch after all, I guess.

1:9:5.270 --> 1:9:6.60

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Nope.

1:9:6.790 --> 1:9:7.420

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

1:9:7.390 --> 1:9:9.590

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Those are quite literally the good old days.

1:9:9.820 --> 1:9:11.150

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. OK.

1:9:12.300 --> 1:9:19.170

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Hey Scott, could you confirm are you running for the Regional Director or the Chair of the region?

1:9:19.400 --> 1:9:24.310

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

No Regional Director. Sylvia's current position. Yep. Yep. And.

1:9:21.720 --> 1:9:26.10

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK. OK. Is Sylvia ill, or is this because of the..?

1:9:26.530 --> 1:9:27.20

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Pardon me?

1:9:27.390 --> 1:9:30.620

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Is Sylvia ill? Or is this because of the Terra thing?

1:9:31.670 --> 1:9:32.100

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK.

1:9:36.680 --> 1:9:36.910

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK.

1:9:28.870 --> 1:9:39.500

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

No, no. Tara, and I don't know the details, nor would I discuss them if I did. But yeah. Yes, it's Tara. I don't think she was even on the call.

1:9:39.500 -->

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. So. OK. Thanks.

1:9:48.500 --> 1:9:49.000

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yep.

1:9:53.470 --> 1:9:53.930

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK. Alright, well.

1:9:54.500 --> 1:9:53.930

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I'm glad there's not another ill person on our regional board. That's all.

1:9:59.150 --> 1:10:0.950

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Don't get sick, Scott, right?

1:10:4.110 --> 1:10:4.880

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So.

1:10:6.630 --> 1:10:11.0

Manley, Roch (Chair)

On to the discussion of the regional summit. If everyone's ready for that. In Tampa, in June of this year. Sydney?

1:10:18.110 --> 1:10:31.880

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, this was just to lead it off, but I believe most of the Board, or if not all of the Board, has been contacted by Susan just confirming whether or not you intend to go to Tampa for the annual meeting.

1:10:33.120 --> 1:10:37.230

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We do have funding available to send you, if you would like to go.

1:10:37.740 --> 1:10:49.260

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so I know Vice Chair Harm is planning on attending. But beyond that, if you could just confirm whether or not you plan to attend.

1:10:50.0 --> 1:11:0.650

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I just got another e-mail yesterday saying that they will be opening up the registration for that here within the next few weeks. So we'll be working on that and getting all of those arrangements done as soon as they open.

1:11:3.200 --> 1:11:6.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

For me, I would be planning on attending.

1:11:8.160 --> 1:11:12.490

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Board Member Loynd. I confirmed with Susan, I thought that I was going to attend.

1:11:13.430 --> 1:11:14.110

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I believe you did.

1:11:15.590 --> 1:11:21.220

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And yeah, Board Member Roberts. I am planning on attending. I believe I'll be funded by NCARB for that.

1:11:21.900 --> 1:11:23.550

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

For my committee position.

1:11:28.30 --> 1:11:35.460

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

And this is Susan. I think I said yes, but I might be tentative. When is that that we needed to confirm?

1:11:36.790 --> 1:11:41.360

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I would say if you could confirm by the end of February, we would be safe.

1:11:46.220 --> 1:11:46.720

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Thank you.

1:11:47.590 --> 1:11:52.350

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

And thanks for all your work in getting us all the travel and everything. I appreciate that.

1:11:54.660 --> 1:12:11.520

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. Likewise, Sydney. I know it's a it's kind of a convoluted process and a lot to take on with everything else you're taking on right now that's new. So, appreciate your work on that.

1:12:12.260 --> 1:12:30.370

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I appreciate that they give you... it's been a team effort for our unit between myself, Alyssa and Susan, trying to make sure that we're operating within the States, travel policies and then NCARB's travel policies and trying to make sure everything's aligning correctly. But we'll get it squared away and it will be much smoother moving forward.

1:12:31.80 --> 1:12:31.490

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great.

1:12:33.310 --> 1:13:19.120

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So moving on to item 6.4, which is the developing initiative for leadership changes with NCARB. I think most of us have updated ourselves to the best of our abilities considering what's been presented to us to absorb this, but this is yet another good reason for attendance at the regional and the national because it's been proposed that we'll be voting on this leadership change at the National Conference in June.

1:13:20.240 --> 1:13:21.470

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So Sydney, what can you tell us?

1:13:22.660 --> 1:13:34.520

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The committee that's working on this through NCARB has had a couple of listening sessions already, with several more planned throughout the spring in the run up to the annual meeting.

1:13:35.40 --> 1:14:20.520

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The highlights from the proposed change, first this is to look at changes to the governing board as a whole and to create space for a little bit more diversity and NBE's different folks from more open seats. They're looking at a lot of different proposals. So, one of the biggest changes and I think, at least the call that I was on, the one that raised the most concern for several of the other regions was looking at taking it from the current 6 region structure down to a 4-region structure.

1:14:22.490 --> 1:14:37.500

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Part of that is to increase diversity in some of the regions that really don't have that currently and to create a little bit more of a balanced structure within each of those.

1:14:38.300 --> 1:14:47.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There are three options that are being reviewed at this point. Option A would add a regional director position.

1:14:49.190 --> 1:15:36.530

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Which, the nominee would be chosen by the Regional Leadership Committee, and then opening director position to those who have served in NCARB outside of regional leadership. Option B is virtually the same, except that the regional director position would be removed, and an eighth at-large seat would be elected. And option C would shift four of the eight at-large positions to regional director positions. So, as you can, see wide variety of changes possible and anything that's what they're really looking for membership input on, is what the membership would like to see, understanding that there is a need to increase diversity.

1:15:40.210 --> 1:16:3.470

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There are also some proposed changes, including a credentials committee that would kind of do the initial, more or less, filtering of applicants, but just really making sure that the applicants are meeting the requirements and that they're being selected for the appropriate seats.

1:16:7.420 --> 1:16:26.950

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

They're working on what that process would look like. They're trying to create a blind process so that any potential for shifting focus to one individual over another may be weeded out. And that committee would be chaired by the immediate past president of NCARB.

1:16:29.130 --> 1:16:37.890

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions. I believe a lot more information is going to be coming out about this at the regional summit. And so we'll be looking forward to that.

1:16:42.200 --> 1:16:42.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Let's say...

1:16:42.850 --> 1:17:4.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I sat in on one of the informational listening sessions, and this topic was introduced to me and to Sydney at the board chair, member board executive meeting back a couple months ago, whenever it was.

1:17:4.230--> 1:17:6.230

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

October, I believe.

1:17:5.810 --> 1:17:23.670

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. And it is something they've been, it's been in the works for couple of years now. But it's now kind of gelled into this harder outline form that makes sense to me.

1:17:25.810 --> 1:17:26.360

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Sydney.

1:17:27.100 --> 1:18:45.510

Manley, Roch (Chair)

NCARB, and architects and our industry in general, is pretty conservative. So this is kind of a big deal to make a change that, structural change, that is this dramatic. But what I'm seeing so far and I'm, you know, applauding change, and I'm in favor of the change. And just wanna see how some of the blanks get filled in on how does this credentialing committee get put together. Who's on it? What are the guardrails for them to make sure that all the regions are equally represented? One of the touch points that their guiding consultant has voiced is that, the idea of a regional representation is a thing of the past with organizations like NCARB. And I guess I get that, but at the same time I'm struggling with that concept a little bit.

1:18:46.490 --> 1:19:0.680

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So, it'll be really good for all of us to get up to speed on this and just be able to discuss it at the regional summit and hear what is said there.

1:19:1.970 --> 1:19:5.700

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So I think, Sian, I think you had your hand up first.

1:19:7.660 --> 1:19:24.340

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. Just. I did attend also one of those listening sessions and I would say that I agree with Sydney that the two regions that are being considered to be combined, or I guess the four regions that were considered to be combined into two, were probably not super happy about that.

1:19:25.680 --> 1:19:47.550

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

That was the direction, or what I kind of heard from that. And I think the rationale for doing that wasn't clearly explained, wasn't explained very well. It was explained as primarily a diversity move, when I actually think it was more kind of a representation, kind of level of representation for state and certificate holder and all of that rationale.

1:19:48.750 --> 1:20:13.530

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

But at any rate, I would imagine that's gonna be really hard. To me, it feels like they're trying to do three things at once. They're trying to do this regional change. They're trying to expand or they're trying to reduce the executive committee at the at the at the national board level so that you can cycle through that in fewer years.

1:20:13.530 --> 1:20:38.150

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So secretary treasure instead of secretary treasurer. Right? I mean, there's so many freaking levels at that point. So they're trying to collapse that, which makes all the sense in the world to me. 'Cuz who needs to spend six years in that? You could probably spend four years and be very effective. And they're trying to open up the director positions to people who haven't gone through the crazy, as we know, regional leadership thing.

1:20:39.510 --> 1:21:8.940

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And so I'm definitely in favor. As, as Roch was saying, there's a number of ways this could go. And I'll be really curious to see what their next iteration is and whether they're even ready to make this a proposal for the annual business meeting. My guess is it's going to take another

year for them to kind of get to a strategy that they can get enough backing on to be able to put in front of the membership. But the idea that there would at least be some positions that are more at large, I think, would be great.

1:21:9.170 --> 1:21:25.920

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

There was a lot of concern that you could get people who weren't even on their boards to be on a board seat in this scenario. So you could get somebody who was a committee member who would kind of work their way into a board seat. And if you got a lot of those, then all of a sudden we've got our member boards being represented not by people who are serving on member boards.

1:21:26.580 --> 1:21:32.900

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So that I think that was that was a valid concern as well that you know, we want to make sure that...

1:21:33.880 --> 1:21:43.40

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I felt like having them all be at large positions seemed maybe like not the right solution, but having some at large positions makes a lot of sense.

1:21:44.310 --> 1:22:1.400

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So anyway, that's just my kind of random, my thoughts after sitting in on that session and then looking at this. My guess is we're not gonna have to make any big decisions anytime soon. But I'm supportive of the effort that they're making and the fact that they're really thinking broadly about what they could do to change it.

1:22:7.130 --> 1:22:7.830

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah, I...

1:22:4.310 --> 1:22:8.160

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Agreed. Erica, I think you were next.

1:22:8.540 --> 1:22:44.270

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Sian, you answered some of my questions. But one of my concerns would be a way for people to, or a way to build diversity, is to have the leadership spots at the top where people can sit in on them. And by combining regions, it seems like there's less leadership spots because there's only so many people in the region. So having six leadership groups becoming four, then that's less voices at the table at that higher level. That maybe, that would be a concern of mine of

where are people getting to the forefront and be able to be heard in those decision making levels.

1:22:46.470 --> 1:23:45.310

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So I think that the idea is that, rather than having people, rather than getting your board members from the regional director position, which is what Scott is going for now, those people will be at-large people that would be selected, would be vetted through the Credentials Committee, and then sort of sponsored by the Leadership Committee. So NCARB would take, I believe, much more control over looking at, over identifying and nurturing the future leadership of the organization through the Leadership Committee and the Credential Committee, as opposed to the regions growing it individually for each region. So you could potentially, it opens, the theory is that that opens diversity because you're not having, you're able to cast a broader net for leadership than who the regions decided to elevate because those can be kind of "good old boy."

1:23:47.220 --> 1:23:47.490

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Right.

1:23:49.910 --> 1:23:50.480

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Sure does.

1:23:46.0 --> 1:23:53.950

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Those tend to be good old boy things. So that that's the thinking behind it, as I understand it.

1:23:54.100 --> 1:24:8.730

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Right. Or even at a regional level, like if they're taking some people, some areas of a region, that was less diverse, or that was more diverse, and putting it in when there was less, there's still only that many positions at that new larger region. Right?

1:24:12.720 --> 1:24:12.940

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:24:9.380 --> 1:24:17.570

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Correct. Which is why I didn't understand the rationale for the, I mean, the rationale I believe is that with four regions you open up more at large seats.

1:24:18.200 --> 1:24:18.520
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Right.

1:24:18.590 --> 1:24:25.960
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
And it's the at large seats where you're going to be getting them. But so I struggled to understand how they presented it. It did not make sense to me.

1:24:26.700 --> 1:24:32.800
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Yeah. I still see that being, even at a regional level, being a little bit disheartening.

1:24:34.260 --> 1:24:35.60
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Where people can speak.

1:24:36.670 --> 1:24:38.410
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Okay, Scott. You've got your hand up.

1:24:39.410 --> 1:24:58.760
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
Yeah. I can tell you there is a groundswell of rather significant group is who's not excited about this. And there's a lot of work going, Sian you may be aware of, there's a lot of work going on behind the scenes to prove out the mathematics. I mean, you know, combining regions one and two, I think it was.

1:25:0.340 --> 1:25:29.430
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
I guess the proof in the pudding in the number is that they've had as much, as many, if not more, NCARB presidents than a couple of the other regions. And so, the basis for wanting a lot of this from what I'm hearing from the groundswell people that are getting ready to make this an issue. And therefore, I agree with Sian, this is probably going to be another full year before anything of this happens. Because I think this is going to be one of those sessions where they're just going to, we're just going to time out and have to move on to something else.

1:25:30.500 --> 1:25:59.710
Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)
But there are, there's a pretty good number of individuals that I've been contacted by that are, you know, I don't think they're trying to preserve the good old boy. My concern is, you know, we don't preclude anybody from our Board to run or join our Board. It's always really hard to get people to volunteer. And my fear is, having gotten close to being the Regional Director

before, it's drinking from a fire hose, you know. And you have to be at a certain stage where you're ready to take all that on.

1:26:0.10 --> 1:26:28.250

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

And my fear is fewer people might wanna run cause it's such a larger jump right away, rather than growing into it. But I'm welcoming some of the changes. Not in favor or not in favor of it. You know there's, and I unfortunately missed the presentations. I'm trying to get a recording, but I was conflicted out. Had to leave the country on the one that I had determined I was going to listen in on.

1:26:29.700 --> 1:26:40.490

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

But it it's gonna be a very interesting dialogue when this comes up with the agenda, because it's gonna fill a day I'm sure.

1:26:42.820 --> 1:26:43.940

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I have a question.

1:26:43.80 --> 1:26:52.950

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. And I don't know anything about what's going on behind the scenes. I'm just speaking from what I heard in the session and just my guess about kind of where this is headed.

1:26:52.760 --> 1:26:53.210

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah.

1:26:54.360 --> 1:27:5.660

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Was there, is there, Board Member Loynd. Is there a ListServ or something that goes out that has the sessions on it? Because I don't recall seeing this one, and I'm on NCARB's list for different things.

1:27:6.350 --> 1:27:13.790

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

But is there a list that goes to Board members here of "these are the events that NCARB is talking about" to join into? I did not see that.

1:27:18.730 --> 1:27:19.280

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Three of them.

1:27:13.820 --> 1:27:23.30

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Probably. We got invites to a few sessions. Like they had three of them, so you might not be on that list.

1:27:23.780 --> 1:27:25.50

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Sydney, maybe you could make sure it...

1:27:26.150 --> 1:27:26.480

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:27:26.100 --> 1:27:35.590

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah, I don't know, I don't remember. I can't remember if it was an actual invite, or "these are the dates and times we're doing..." and then you had to kind of put your own reminder in your calendar and then find...

1:27:38.710 --> 1:27:39.10

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

1:27:36.990 --> 1:27:39.200

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Maybe yeah, I can't remember either.

1:27:36.530 --> 1:27:41.850

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

I don't remember. Yeah, I think that's... which is frustrating that they haven't figured out the invite system.

1:27:42.270 --> 1:27:42.990

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, yeah.

1:27:42.670 --> 1:27:43.450

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I found out.

1:27:42.50 --> 1:28:1.240

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Right. Well, and I have other roles on NCARB, so it may get lost in the shuffle and not understanding that that's something that this Board is, which are more a priority to me. So I'm

not sure, Sydney, if you could maybe help point out some of the ones, like “this is coming up,” and “this is one that you should be on for this rule” for a little bit as I learn.

1:28:9.860 --> 1:28:10.230

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah.

1:28:14.910 --> 1:28:15.400

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Well, it's...

1:28:20.410 --> 1:28:20.670

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

What...

1:28:1.880 --> 1:28:23.300

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely. And I'm starting to realize I'm not on all of the distribution lists. And when we got into it yesterday and started realizing that, in certain places, a different inbox that now goes to our licensing unit is tied to some of them, but not to the rest. So I'm not getting all the emails either. But I'm working on this right now.

1:28:29.430 --> 1:28:30.590

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That's true.

1:28:21.550 --> 1:28:32.420

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

What complicates it for you, Sydney, is the Rick Storvick of the world hasn't gone away in NCARB. And hopefully he's changed his e-mail address.

1:28:35.480 --> 1:28:36.540

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, yeah.

1:28:36.360 --> 1:28:40.770

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

He still the chair of the Futures... Was it collaborative or task force? Yeah.

1:28:41.570 --> 1:28:55.80

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right, right. But yeah. There was a, I think they were just informational emails that said “we are providing these listening sessions here are the dates” and it was... What's the COO's name, Mary ...?

1:28:56.70 --> 1:28:56.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Is it?

1:28:56.210 --> 1:28:56.680

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Oh.

1:28:57.540 --> 1:28:57.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But.

1:28:59.780 --> 1:29:0.490

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

DeSousa.

1:28:59.80 --> 1:29:0.490

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Oh, God. Yeah.

1:29:2.130 --> 1:29:2.910

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

DeSousa, yeah.

1:29:0.90 --> 1:29:3.260

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I know it. DeSousa. Thank you. Yes. DeSousa.

1:29:4.780 --> 1:29:5.990

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That sent those and.

1:29:8.460 --> 1:29:24.40

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, it it'd be nice if we had more of a kind of a clearing house for this sort of thing versus ad hoc and if you can find staff room for taking on just one more thing, Sydney.

1:29:26.160 --> 1:29:44.130

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Like little reminders or of summations to the Board on what are these things that are coming up, that would help all of us. But I'm not sure how practical it is for you to do that.

1:29:43.650 --> 1:29:46.900

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Between Susan and I, we will find a way to make it happen.

1:29:47.890 --> 1:29:49.660

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Gotcha. OK. Scott?

1:29:50.200 --> 1:29:58.890

Harm, Scott (Vice Chair)

Yeah, Chair, just as an advanced warning, I'm approaching my hard out. So, like Mr. Benner, I probably will just all of a sudden disappear.

1:29:59.560 --> 1:30:8.340

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, OK. We've got the next item coming up. I think that was a big topic, so I don't know if we're done with it.

1:30:9.730 --> 1:30:14.160

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But the next item coming up is establishment of Board goals.

1:30:16.710 --> 1:30:27.840

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Let me ask. Normally we try to take a break somewhere in the middle. Does everyone feel they could power through and just keep going, or is a break needed?

1:30:28.740 --> 1:30:29.510

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Keep going? OK.

1:30:28.890 --> 1:30:31.700

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I think we should power through if we're going to have more representation.

1:30:32.120 --> 1:30:45.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I agree. OK, very good. So let's move on to the Board goals. That's also kind of a big item and I think Sydney has a little PowerPoint presentation for us on that.

1:30:47.50 --> 1:30:47.360

Manley, Roch (Chair)

We.

1:30:46.820 --> 1:30:54.480

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I do and using PowerPoint kind of as our white board just to make it easier in this virtual world.

1:30:55.10 --> 1:31:33.600

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And this is going to be an ongoing fluid topic. This is not anything that I'm looking for the Board to commit hard and fast to, "these are the only things we're doing for 2023." This is just to kind of start giving our boards a little bit of focus. And for example, the topic of outreach is a priority across all nine boards and commissions for our unit, without any real definition behind what does outreach mean for this particular group. And so wanting to work through a process with each of our boards to set some intentionality behind the work that we do for the coming year.

1:31:34.790 --> 1:32:7.130

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So our process is going to be setting the overall big pie in the sky ideas for the priorities, and then narrowing down what goals can we look at to meet part of those priorities for the coming year, understanding that as a Board we only get together four times a year. There's only so much capacity for committees in between. And now, with Board members looking at joining national leadership, that cuts down their availability.

1:32:8.30 --> 1:32:38.770

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So without wanting to overwhelm all of you but trying to make sure that we have the structures in place that we can begin chipping away at some of the ideas that the Board has. And then after we set what those goals are going to be, making sure we have that structure in place behind it. And then looking for the Board to adopt the goals for the year. That adoption does not need to take place today. Understanding that we're running low on time, we can look at moving that adoption and continuing this discussion at the next meeting.

1:32:38.860 --> 1:32:55.200

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And again, this is gonna be a fluid topic changing, probably, a couple of times throughout the year, and then for sure every year we'll be bringing this back. So setting our priorities for this year, just some things for the Board to consider as your listing what your priorities are going to be:

1:32:56.250 --> 1:33:0.630

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

What does the Board really want to focus on? Not just this year, but beyond this year?

1:33:1.570 --> 1:33:20.460

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Who do we need to get involved in addressing those? What is the process to address these

priorities the correct way? How do we measure how we're addressing these, and if those are being addressed successfully? And as these priorities grow and evolve, how will that impact the Board's work?

1:33:21.560 --> 1:33:26.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So with that, I would open it to discussion among the Board on let you feel the priorities are for this group.

1:33:33.320 --> 1:33:41.480

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Well, this is Roch. Maybe not so much priorities, but just addressing this overall topic of getting a goal setting.

1:33:42.140 --> 1:33:46.10

Manley, Roch (Chair)

You know, we took a very brief run at, at least talking about, doing a master planning a couple of years ago. And I think this is kind of a looks to me like this is a scaled down version of that that's much more doable.

1:33:59.570 --> 1:34:8.980

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And I appreciate that you were doing that. I think we got a couple items that we've discussed already.

1:34:10.430 --> 1:34:17.600

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And one of them would be, well maybe one we've discussed one we've not discussed.

1:34:18.310 --> 1:34:22.420

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But one of them would be the authorizations being, you find, being on some kind of calendar.

1:34:23.670 --> 1:34:54.700

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And so the priority item would be well, why don't we have a calendar that we can tick off and make sure we do things that happen again, and again, and again that we're that we're just, we have the appearance that they just are, like they just happened to come along. That's how it feels at this point, so that that regular calendar idea.

1:34:56.940 --> 1:35:23.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And then my other thought that might not be a priority, but we should take a look at when this discussion, on planning for the coming year. Should that happen, like maybe at the last meeting

of the previous year? Or is it, does it work that it's the first meeting of the year that it's happening in? Or does it matter? So those are my two comments.

1:35:24.540 --> 1:35:27.150

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I think Erica, you had your hand up.

1:35:28.970 --> 1:35:52.150

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah. I would... In my opinion, a priority for the Board now to start, but really kind of focusing on it beyond this year even, of what are the impacts of diversity in our state for licensure, both as people are entering the industry from school, how our Board criteria matches that. I think we do a very good job, like we discussed earlier.

1:35:52.770 --> 1:36:23.190

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

But I think this is a new generation now, that there's a lot of different things. And if we as the Board that manages this do not kind of take it on as an initiative at the forefront, we will have to respond instead of develop. And I think that the more we can be a part of conversating about it would be beneficial. I think that we are advancing our system. I don't think that we are fixing necessarily, but I think there's things to just ensure that we're doing what we wanna do.

1:36:35.170 --> 1:36:38.160

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Thanks, Erica. Had a hard time finding my mic button.

1:36:39.880 --> 1:36:43.540

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh. Looks like we lost Scott. That's too bad.

1:36:46.460 --> 1:36:47.70

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Anyway...

1:37:4.570 --> 1:37:4.830

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:36:46.510 --> 1:37:15.730

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Well, I think in regards to that, Erica, you know, the outreach question that is usually on our list relates to that and how we want to, and especially post Covid, now it's a little more difficult, but how we want to strategize on our outreach plan for this year. We've already got a couple of

feelers out and events planned. But we may want to focus our outreach on a, you know, a more diverse audience.

1:37:16.470 --> 1:37:23.600

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah, that's a great opportunity. And demystifying licensure obstacles and things.

1:37:24.370 --> 1:37:25.360

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I get a lot of that in...

1:37:24.360 --> 1:37:26.160

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. Understanding obstacles, yeah.

1:37:26.590 --> 1:37:32.570

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

As a licensure advisor for the state, those are the biggest questions. "How do you..?"

1:37:33.230 --> 1:37:41.550

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

"The system is so complex and so hard and I don't know where to go." And "How do I get in?" and stuff. It's a big issue for people.

1:37:42.940 --> 1:38:14.280

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So if I can, before we get too far away from the discussion on outreach. One thing that myself, and in discussion with my other staff members, I will take the liberty to speak for them. We would really love for the Boards to declare what specifically on outreach that you would like to work toward. What is the end goal with that outreach? Is it reaching out to students and preparing them for licensure? Is it maintaining the licenses that we have and showing the value in licensure?

1:38:15.940 --> 1:38:47.110

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Is it, you know, reaching out with WABO and building officials and building those relationships across the different disciplines involved in the design professions? Because all of those require entirely different approaches. And we can drill down a little bit more on that with our goals. But if we could just set kind of an intentionality on, you know, are we looking more towards students or current licensees, a mixture of both? And just kind of where the Board feels that needs to go.

1:38:47.190 --> 1:39:22.750

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The other caveat I will put on that is part of the restructuring that occurred within DOL, and that is continuing to happen within our unit, is we are taking on outreach for all 39 businesses and professions licensed by DOL. And so we will be tying that in with the Boards work and we're still working on how that's going to look. But you will have additional resources and support because of that coming into our unit. So we'll be bringing on additional people and resources as that grows. So that capacity will increase as we go along.

1:39:24.990 --> 1:39:26.550

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good. Paul, you had your hand up.

1:39:27.120 --> 1:39:46.550

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yes. Just before this meeting, Sian and I met with the, I guess, the President of NOMA Northwest talking about minority architects and potential licensees for architecture.

1:39:48.570 --> 1:40:10.640

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Tomorrow I'm meeting with a group of UW architectural students in Chinatown International District. Again, we'll be talking about licensure and the career planning for a young architects. So I guess that's how much outreach that we've been trying to do so far.

1:40:11.400 --> 1:40:43.970

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. And I'll just add on to that, Paul, that what we discussed with NOMA was that they are now working on trying to get a scholarship program for candidates to be able to take the AREs. Candidates whose firms don't support them, to be able to afford to take the AREs. And so they're working on that. And once they get that in place, they think that would be a great time for us to come in and do kind of a spiel on "what does licensure look like? How do we make that... How do we demystify that for you?" To your point, Erica.

1:40:44.970 --> 1:41:5.700

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

We also have a plan in March with the Young Architects Forum. They do these happy hours and so we, Paul and I, have identified a date. I believe we're confirmed for that, to attend one of their happy hours and kind of do the same thing. Like you know... and you know, listen to their gripes of course as well and understand, see if there's anything we can do to help support them.

1:41:7.160 --> 1:41:7.590

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good.

1:41:7.590 --> 1:41:23.890

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

There's a role for income to play also. If they can provide maybe free exams for minorities or candidates in need. That kind of a scholarship also. I think that might be a good way to go.

1:41:25.950 --> 1:41:29.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Thanks, Paul and Sian. Erica, you had your hand up.

1:41:30.310 --> 1:42:11.480

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah, just one follow up. As you were talking, all those are exactly what I think, are awesome. The ones that Sydney was mentioning and the work you're doing with NOMA and the YAF. I think, in my mind as I was describing is exactly those of kind of personalizing the Board, making it where we're not, it's not this empty, "I submitted and it's out there." It's more "what is the benefits of licensure?" "Why are we advocates in the industry for this?" "Why do we care about what you're going through and how hard it is?" So, the things like WABO are super important.

1:42:11.620 --> 1:42:39.140

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

But the more the connections to the other committees or agencies are in my mind are not as much of the issue is we have the ability to really build our industry by the encouragement and the support for our constituency. I think because they're very young. and maybe not working in the industry as much or with things like Boards, they seem intimidated by us and we are, we are advocates and we're people and want to be there with them.

1:42:58.790 --> 1:42:59.260

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Awesome.

1:42:40.530 --> 1:42:45.400

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yeah. And the other thing we've done in the past, Erica, is gone to the University of Washington and WSU and met with students there. We've also gone to the Community College programs throughout the state. We've visited over the last decade, probably, every single program that has an architecture. You know, it's probably time for us to start again. I know that NCARB, Sydney, NCARB meets both with WSU and UW on an annual, or maybe not an annual, but close to annual basis.

1:43:9.770 --> 1:43:33.40

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And sometimes they forget to invite us as well. But we think that we should be there as well. So it's always a reminder to NCARB if they're going to do something in our state, we're actually happy to attend. And you know, the DOL usually sends somebody as well to be able to answer

Washington specific questions. Although NCARB knows, has good information on that. To your point, it's nice for us to just be there to be that local face, you know. So.

1:43:33.590 --> 1:43:34.240

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, there.

1:43:43.120 --> 1:43:43.400

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Yep.

1:43:56.970 --> 1:43:57.310

Manley, Roch (Chair)

The.

1:43:33.520 --> 1:44:12.830

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, absolutely. And I actually was able to participate in one of those last fall with NCARB. And it was a, they forgot to notify the local Board that they were doing. And so they notified me at like 4:30. And, luckily, I was able to just to stay on. But I didn't feel it was fair to any of the Board members to "hey, last minute, can you all cancel your plans for me on an hour's notice?" So, I just jumped in there. And, luckily, the event went great, and they were able to get all of their questions answered. But I know NCARB is trying to kind of reinvigorate that program and reimagine how that looks in the post COVID world so.

1:44:13.230 --> 1:44:13.780

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

1:44:13.800 --> 1:44:34.590

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Just as a note for you, Board Member Loynd, if that does ever happen, even just an e-mail of like, "I know you may not be able to attend, but if by chance..." 'Cause I am passionate about, as we all are, of speaking for that. And so if I was free, I'd be like, "oh, I can rearrange and come." So, to encourage you. Don't feel like you can't reach out, to me at least.

1:44:35.190 --> 1:44:37.180

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK, absolutely. I will send it.

1:44:38.670 --> 1:45:15.720

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, there, there have been instances in the past. I don't know if there's anybody present here who was a Board member at that time. But where NCARB did come and make a presentation

to, I think it was either Seattle AIA, or one of the schools or something, and the information they were providing didn't match our laws. So that was a little issue and we kind of had to straighten that one out. I think they're totally tracking at this point. NCARB improves every year has been my observation.

1:45:16.720 --> 1:45:21.390

Manley, Roch (Chair)

But yeah, it's important for us to be there when NCARB presents, I think.

1:45:22.870 --> 1:46:9.170

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Just a thought about the outreach you kind of read my mind, Sydney, on doing some indents. We've named a number of organizations, you know, WABO and NOMA and community colleges and accredited university programs. Maybe if one of our goals is to prioritize those and perhaps get them on a calendar at some point. Maybe that would be more indented bullet point items under outreach to list all those parties that we do want to do outreach to.

1:46:11.10 --> 1:46:11.350

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK.

1:46:12.490 --> 1:46:16.140

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So. That's...

1:46:15.360 --> 1:46:38.250

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And I think we can drill down on that, maybe under the goals, and look specifically at "which relationships do we wanna focus on for this year?" Which one... And again, this will be a fluid thing. It'll likely be part of my report out at all of the meetings moving forward. "Just as a reminder, you know, here's what the Board had determined."

1:46:38.770 --> 1:46:54.250

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And we'll be trying to tie as much of the Board's work back into meeting these goals and chipping away at this as we can just to set that intentionality. So, I think we can do that under the goals and drill down a little bit more.

1:46:55.350 --> 1:46:56.580

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, OK.

1:46:58.950 --> 1:47:21.690

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So is the Board happy with this for the priorities for this year? Understanding next year we're going to be bringing this exact thing back and "OK, this was what the Board had for priorities last year. How did we do with that? Do we need to change any of these priorities, shift them, reword them, refocus? Whatever we need to do." So those will be a constant fluid changing document.

1:47:22.550 --> 1:47:23.120

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And then...

1:47:23.80 --> 1:47:35.490

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

It feels to me, Sydney, like we did this in a really rushed way. This is a kind of an important thing. So I would be in favor of us making this an agenda item for our next meeting and spending a little bit more time to be a little bit more thoughtful about this.

1:47:35.870 --> 1:47:37.320

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK, we can do that.

1:47:36.730 --> 1:48:27.190

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And this is this is Roch. I'm having that same feeling, Sian, that I'd see this as a pretty fluid document that probably gets touched on at every meeting. Because you know, as we go through the days and months, things happen. Things happen at NCARB, things happen in the state, things happen in the laws. Different cases come up that make us realize something we hadn't thought about, or what have you. So, I'd see it as a live document that, you know, we've got, thrown a few items on there now. It's certainly not the end of it even for even for today. It wouldn't be the end of it. But you know we knew we do need to keep going at some point here. But Paul, what did you have?

1:48:28.40 --> 1:48:36.770

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

I wish to get a copy of the latest, this screenshot. You can send it to us?

1:48:37.490 --> 1:48:38.210

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yep. Absolutely.

1:48:38.850 --> 1:48:51.50

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. When we're done today, that's one of the things you'll send out for us, Sydney, is the results of this discussion, I'm sure.

1:48:51.460 --> 1:48:51.850

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Yeah.

1:48:51.890 --> 1:49:21.300

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. I will send it out. And in the interest of time, perhaps if Board members would like to submit some comments back. I can be compiling those. I'm sure there's gonna be a lot of overlap. So that way I can have them compiled and ready to go for the next meeting, and just kind of clear up some of that, that background discussion, show where there's overlap between, and give us kind of that platform to launch the discussion for next go around.

1:49:22.570 --> 1:49:22.970

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

1:49:23.390 --> 1:49:23.760

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Thank you.

1:49:23.790 --> 1:49:25.40

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Sounds great. Thanks Sydney.

1:49:25.810 --> 1:49:26.900

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yes, thank you.

1:49:29.830 --> 1:49:39.150

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Do you think we're ready to move on to your next slide? Knowing that we will come back to reviewing and establishing priorities and there will be more things.

1:49:40.140 --> 1:50:1.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, I would say. I think I'm kind of hearing two things from the Board. Do you guys want to continue this discussion today? Or do we want to leave it with kind of the priorities that we've set, allow you guys to really dig in and give some thought behind it before the next meeting? And then we can start adding to the list for next meeting. Or do you want to continue the discussion right now?

1:50:3.750 --> 1:50:18.460

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I would prefer to table it, with two of our Board members having had to leave, and come back

to it after a little bit more consideration. I don't feel we have enough time today to give this the attention that it deserves.

1:50:19.990 --> 1:50:20.440

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So.

1:50:19.990 --> 1:50:20.590

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I concur.

1:50:21.290 --> 1:50:47.220

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, and I can cure as well. But, if you could, in your wrap up at this topic, Sydney, maybe you can... You know, you did have a program lined out with steps and so forth. Just kind of cement that in our minds and share what was on those following slides so we can understand and anticipate where this whole thing is headed.

1:50:47.980 --> 1:51:13.620

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely. OK. So now that we have some priorities outlined, we'll be moving that over here into the goals. That way you can see that side-by-side comparison. "OK, we have these priorities, what goals do we wanna set to meet those?" We're not looking for a huge list of goals. We're looking for a really manageable bite that the Board can take out of those goals for the coming year and then continue working on them year over year.

1:51:14.80 --> 1:51:41.170

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so it would just be, you know, for outreach: Is the partnership piece, something that each Board member can maybe take a partner group and partner with? And we can knock out a couple of pieces of outreach. Or is that going to be a really heavy lift, and we need to look at kind of narrowing that focus for the year? So that's part of the discussion that will be happening.

1:51:42.490 --> 1:52:4.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then, once we have those goals set for the year, we'll be looking at establishing what that support structure is going to look like. So is it going to be just, you know, an individual Board member helping out here or there? Is it a staff piece that we really need to get some resources in place? Is it a committee that needs to come behind that goal and really champion it and rally behind it?

1:52:5.860 --> 1:52:36.150

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Establishing what that support structure needs to look like. And then from there looking at Board adoption. Again, this would not be a hard and fast adoption. This would just be that setting intentionality behind what the Board wants to look at for the coming year, and then going over what those next steps would be. Scheduling committee meetings, staff bringing back reports, resources working with those partner groups. What does that need to look like? So that's what the process will be moving forward. I will get this presentation.

1:52:36.250 --> 1:52:47.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I'll put it into a PDF, that way it's readable for everybody, and get it out to the group, and would love the feedback and the comments so that we can begin building that for the discussion next time.

1:52:48.640 --> 1:52:49.160

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Thank you.

1:52:49.710 --> 1:52:51.20

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great. Yeah, thank you, Sydney.

1:52:53.980 --> 1:52:59.650

Manley, Roch (Chair)

We're on to Section 7 reports. Committee Task Force reports.

1:53:1.150 --> 1:53:11.510

Manley, Roch (Chair)

7.1.1 is the Model Law Committee, with Sydney, Sian, and Scott, who has had to leave the meeting.

1:53:12.270 --> 1:53:13.700

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So, Sydney and Sian?

1:53:15.750 --> 1:54:15.420

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I can take it, Sydney, if you're OK with that. So we don't have a whole lot to report, but we did meet, so that's good. And staff had put together a kind of a spreadsheet comparing NCARB's the model law to our law. So what we did is sort of divide and conquer that. So we're each gonna take a section of the law and kind of look. Review model law, review our law and see if we believe there's anything that we should, any discrepancies that we feel we should discuss or any issues we think, you know beyond Model Law, we would want to address. As I said, I had also reached out to AIA Washington Council to see if we were going to do anything. What is on their mind in terms of our current law and how it reads, and whether there are any

modifications that they would be in favor of recommending. Part of the... So the things that have come up so far are, as I mentioned, Washington Council brought up the incidental practice.

1:54:15.660 --> 1:54:24.550

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Is there a way we can use this as an opportunity to clarify the practice of architecture as distinct from practice of engineering, interior design? Blah blah blah.

1:54:25.740 --> 1:55:5.200

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And then, the other thing that has been brought up by NCARB, is the fact that our years of experience to serve on the Board is longer than their Model Law. So we are at eight years they're at five years. And so this brings up just a question of whether... our Board composition and should we consider Board composition. Those are the two things that we've already identified we might, as a Board, want to discuss going forward. But we don't have any proposals yet. So it'll take us a little while to kind of digest and come back to this group with what our analysis is and whether we have any proposals and to gather your input and your thoughts about it as well.

1:55:11.250 --> 1:55:13.620

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK. Thank you. Thank you, Sian, that's...

1:55:14.660 --> 1:55:31.170

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Eager to see how the ICOR meshes with what we're looking at for model law, and possibly AIA picking up the torch on that one on some changes if they're needed.

1:55:32.630 --> 1:55:36.460

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Anything else on the model law committee discussion?

1:55:38.230 --> 1:55:44.110

Manley, Roch (Chair)

If not, Sydney, the famous charter effort.

1:55:44.920 --> 1:56:14.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The famous charter effort. And unfortunately, I'm going to be a broken record. I am still working on putting those final finishing touches on the last couple of pieces of the Charter. Unfortunately, in December we as staff realized that there were a couple of pieces that we really wanted to make sure were included in all of the charters. And so going back and figuring

out what those need to look like. So, I will be getting them over to Elizabeth as quickly as possible and then hopefully returning them to the Board at the next meeting.

1:56:17.0 --> 1:56:18.110

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, fair enough.

1:56:18.970 --> 1:56:30.720

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Item 7.2 is staff reports. And it looks like there's some new information for us there, Sydney.

1:56:31.850 --> 1:56:46.800

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There is. And so a couple of these were actually requested by Chair Manley. So Susan, if I could get you go to the next one. The first part was an update on the staffing changes, so.

1:56:46.950 --> 1:57:33.180

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And with the functional alignment, I know that the Boards have heard a lot about the functional alignment, but really haven't necessarily seen the visual on what has changed. And so this is what the new structure looks like. A couple slides later, I will be giving you what you had previously, and then referring back to what we have now. So, our Assistant Director for our division, the way that DOL is structured is, we have the Director at the top, and then there are three assistant directors below handling each of the three divisions. Jennifer Clawson is the assistant director for our division and then under her she also has a deputy assistant director in Sarah Pittman.

1:57:34.440 --> 1:57:45.30

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Under Sarah is the Central Services group. They provide reporting, analytics, and contract management specifically for the Board.

1:57:45.860 --> 1:58:6.180

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

When you see the licensee count, the case counts, those are put together by the central services team, and they provide all of the analytics behind that. They also handle any contract management. I don't believe architects have any ongoing contracts, but we do have a couple of Boards who have contracts.

1:58:7.670 --> 1:58:15.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

One is a shared examination between Washington State and Oregon, and so they maintain that contract for the Boards.

1:58:17.30 --> 1:58:29.980

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Anytime we have rule changes and updates to the RCWs and WACs, they are directly involved in that and help with the monitoring. So, they are very, very busy right now that we're in legislative session.

1:58:32.300 --> 1:58:40.840

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We also have under Sarah is our unit which we have changed from Board and Commission Support Services to Board and Outreach Support Services, shortened to BOSS. And we love our new little acronym.

1:58:41.340 --> 1:59:18.920

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But we are the ones that you guys are going to be the most familiar with because we're the ones that manage that day-to-day for the Boards. We're the ones that support Board members for travel, pay, any questions that come in. Those will typically come to us and then we coordinate any efforts across the different units to accomplish that Board work and provide... We will be beefing up the efforts. We're still working on what that looks like, supporting outreach efforts both for the Boards and for the unit as a whole.

1:59:19.910 --> 1:59:58.650

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then reporting directly under Ms. Clawson, is our Licensing Customer Service Support team. And they have an interim administrator because our team stole their administrator. We do have a replacement for Rick, who unfortunately was unable to attend today, but Mike George was the administrator over the Licensing Customer Service Support team, and we were fortunate enough to steal him. And so, they do have an interim administrator right now in Vanessa Simpson, who has been with the licensing group for quite a while.

1:59:58.740 --> 2:0:19.440

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So they are the team that supports all of the customer support, addressing all of the issues with licensing, managing renewals... Anything to do with a license, from the time it started to the end of the life of that license, they are involved in. And so they are the ones that handle all aspects of that including reviewing, examination, and making sure that everybody meets the minimum qualifications for licensure.

2:0:20.200 --> 2:0:48.250

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The Regulatory Compliance, UCC and Firearms, most of that you guys will not see, specifically the firearms and the financial statements. But that is the group that when a Board does refer a matter for charges to be taken against a licensee, they're the team that works with the

prosecuting attorneys at the Attorney General's Office to make sure that all of that is done in compliance and in a fair and equitable manner.

2:0:49.110 --> 2:1:23.740

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then our Centralized Investigations and Audit unit. They are the ones handling all of the complaint intake, all of the case investigations, and then the audits for those professions that have audits tied to their licensing as well. And they handle the investigation from the onset of the complaint, through the investigation process, and then see it all the way through to closure, whether that's through charges or simply a case closure. And then we do have Prorate and Fuel Tax, who you have met, but they do not have a direct impact on the Board's work.

2:1:23.880 --> 2:1:26.920

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If you could go to the next one Susan.

2:1:28.450 --> 2:1:39.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This is just a revised update of what our unit looks like supporting all of you. So we do have Mike George as our new administrator, Alyssa Woods as our administrative assistant for our unit.

2:1:40.930 --> 2:2:0.400

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Deborah Allen-Ba is still our assistant administrator, and I believe will still be the one that you guys, the piece of our leadership that you really see face to face most often. And then for this Board, myself and Susan Nieves are your support team. So go to the next one.

2:2:4.440 --> 2:2:39.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So previously, and I understand this is a little bit small, I will make sure the Board gets a copy of this. But previously, the support structure for all five Regulatory Boards handled by DOL was comprised of six, 16 sorry, full-time positions. And those 16 personnel handled all of the investigations, all of the reporting, all of the analytics, all of the contract management, all of the licensing, all of the customer support and regulatory compliance. And then the program administration was handled all underneath those 16 positions.

2:2:40.660 --> 2:2:52.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The unit handled everything the exact same across landscape, architects, collection agencies, funeral and cemetery, and geology. Those are the other four regulatory Boards that we have.

2:2:52.990 --> 2:2:57.580

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And essentially, this program was paying one fifth of the cost for that unit.

2:2:58.850 --> 2:3:23.500

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Now the program has 17 positions tied specifically to the architect program across the five separate units. So, our unit central services, investigations, licensing and regulatory compliance, so added one position that is tied to. However, that's not the full picture.

2:3:24.290 --> 2:4:0.660

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Behind each of those units represents an entire group of people that offer indirect support in the form of administration staff, support and backup services. So, for example, those positions don't tie directly into complaint intake, but there is an entire team now handling complaint intake. And when we get that complaint in, they're the ones that conduct that initial review and make sure that all of those pieces are coming in and being sent to the investigators in the way that the investigators need. So when the investigator gets it they can take it and run. They're not having to perform a lot of chasing down documents.

2:4:2.230 --> 2:4:27.890

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Each unit has its own administrator, assistant administrator and administrative assistant who are handling those administrative pieces. So it's not all Rick and Julia, when she was in that position, and then Kim Hall, when she was the administrative assistant under Rick with Sherry, Honeywell assisting. Now you have that, times five.

2:4:29.130 --> 2:4:47.630

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The Licensing Customer Support Services unit houses all of those customer service professionals, including the subject matter experts that you are all familiar with. But they have additional leadership levels that are providing a much more streamlined way to address issues and concerns when they arise.

2:4:49.350 --> 2:5:17.580

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The reporting, the analytics, the contract management - all of that is now housed together in that Central Services Unit, so that all of the professionals that were across the different units that all have those pieces, all of that expertise has been brought together in one room. So even though the architect unit has one or two people still tied to that, they have a whole team behind them offering support and expertise. And "hey, I had this come up and I haven't had this before."

2:5:17.730 --> 2:5:20.40

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

All of that is right there house together.

2:5:21.490 --> 2:5:36.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The regulatory compliance unit, there are now, there's now an entire group of dedicated individuals. That is all they do, is make sure that all of our cases meet the regulatory compliance and make sure that the process is fair, equitable, and consistent.

2:5:37.800 --> 2:6:9.590

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

In the investigations team, it's not just the three or four investigators that we had working on the cases for those five units before. We do still have that core group of investigators, but they have a whole team behind them that if they have a really big case coming on, that group is able to shift their focus and bring in additional support where they need to. And so all of this to say that with this functional alignment, we know that it has looked different and that it's been a bit hard to kind of see that full picture.

2:6:9.760 --> 2:6:43.620

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Even though with this functional alignment, we only changed by adding one position specifically dedicated to, or specifically tied to the architect program, there's probably 100 individuals behind them now having full access and support to assist the program. And so, are there any questions on that before I move through to the next item on the reports?

2:6:44.630 --> 2:6:46.0

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Anyway, I can't believe it went that fast.

2:6:50.290 --> 2:6:52.60

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So many questions, there are no questions.

2:6:53.510 --> 2:6:54.260

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Is this?

2:6:52.600 --> 2:7:2.120

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK, I will make sure that I send this out so that it's a good visual for all of you and that way you have it for reference back as well.

2:7:3.240 --> 2:7:6.750

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I was gonna say, Sian, you look like you had questions all over your face.

2:7:10.430 --> 2:7:10.780

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

2:7:7.620 --> 2:7:12.100

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I know I blew through that so fast. I know. I'm trying not to chew up too much more of your time.

2:7:11.730 --> 2:7:13.800

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That and you? Yeah, you just.

2:7:10.780 --> 2:7:18.460

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

It's a lot, but I I'm confident that you that you have the support in place for this Board. How's that?

2:7:19.520 --> 2:7:19.740

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

2:7:18.750 --> 2:7:40.520

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah. And I'm also confident. It's a big change. I think what we've been seeing is, you know, there's a steep, steep learning curve for staff, that's newer to the peculiarities of each individual Board.

2:7:41.760 --> 2:8:1.430

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So my hope is that in spreading things out, the institutional memory and institutional knowledge that helps keep track on those peculiarities that each Board has, I hope that doesn't get too lost in the new efficiency.

2:8:2.850 --> 2:8:3.200

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So.

2:8:2.710 --> 2:8:10.0

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And I think that's the intent is that that institutional knowledge will be spread among a greater group of people this way.

2:8:13.520 --> 2:8:13.970

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

2:8:16.10 --> 2:8:16.630

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Next.

2:8:16.380 --> 2:8:53.670

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK. So the next report before we go into the master action item list, which I will actually let Susan do, the hybrid meeting status update. I know everybody is chomping at the bit for that. We did get notification that we do have some new hardware that has arrived at the DOL facility in Olympia. That will be undergoing testing. The biggest reason for the delay, is we wanna create a hybrid environment because we do have such an increased participation across almost all of our Boards in the virtual world.

2:8:53.820 --> 2:9:24.60

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We don't want to do anything that inhibits that participation, but we also understand wanting to get back to that face to face. So for now, the intent is once that hardware is in place and it's tested and we've worked out all of the kinks with that, we'll be able to bring the Boards in for an in person meeting here in Olympia at a DOL facility. And the Board will be in person, but the audience will still be virtual.

2:9:24.280 --> 2:9:44.870

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But then you'll have staff in the room with you, and you'll be receiving those reports face to face. So, I do not have a definitive date on when that testing will be wrapped up. The hardware just arrived. I don't even know if it's actually been installed yet, but once it is installed, they will be working on that, testing. And as we get updates, we will be sure to keep you updated.

2:9:51.30 --> 2:9:51.500

Manley, Roch (Chair)

All right.

2:9:53.780 --> 2:10:0.910

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So that's... Is that the full review of the Master Action Item List, Sydney?

2:10:2.150 --> 2:10:5.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

No. Susam is gonna do the master action items next.

2:10:6.170 --> 2:10:7.280

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK, I see. OK, OK.

2:10:7.10 --> 2:10:13.480

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

All right. Send board building official e-mail work group with WABO has been completed.

2:10:14.500 --> 2:10:26.850

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Set up WABO Outreach Committee meeting with Paul, Scott and Roch and Engineers. That has been completed.

2:10:28.930 --> 2:10:32.560

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Meet up with... Oh, set up meeting to review architect law. That is in progress.

2:10:33.730 --> 2:10:50.160

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Set up meeting to review delegations. That has been put on hold. Review website for visibility on the Green Book. That has been put on hold. Statistics for law exams for next winter. That is currently in progress.

2:10:51.540 --> 2:10:52.300

Manley, Roch (Chair)

[background noise] Okay.

2:10:56.350 --> 2:11:4.240

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Can you help me understand what...? I'm sorry, I just don't remember what all these things are. The meeting to review delegation?

2:11:6.350 --> 2:11:8.60

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So that was set up...

2:11:10.660 --> 2:11:13.550

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, a year ago this week.

2:11:14.670 --> 2:11:35.290

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

To review the delegations. And then with Rick leaving staff, was forced to review the delegations with Elizabeth. And so that is what the Board approved. And so part of that I guess, is determining whether or not the Board still wants to conduct a further review of the delegations, or if we want to wait and see if that comes out of the goals. So that is why we put that on hold.

2:11:36.130 --> 2:11:38.540

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK, because technically we just completed it, right?

2:11:38.800 --> 2:11:39.50

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

2:11:39.500 --> 2:11:39.840

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK.

2:11:40.500 --> 2:11:40.910

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great.

2:11:40.870 --> 2:11:45.240

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

And then statistics for the law exam? Or so...

2:11:45.900 --> 2:11:51.490

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

We're going to be tracking how it's going? Is that what that was? I'm sorry that I've forgotten.

2:11:52.120 --> 2:12:14.240

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That's OK. That is my understanding is that yes, we will be tracking how that goes. And we just received some information this morning. I didn't even have a chance to look at it, preparing for the meeting, on the next round of examinations for NCARB. So, I'll take a look at that and we'll work with our management analyst team on what we need to review those analytics.

2:12:16.880 --> 2:12:17.110

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

2:12:20.80 --> 2:12:28.0

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right. So we'll expect to see something come out on that between now and the next meeting probably.

2:12:28.740 --> 2:12:32.470

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We hope, depending on when we get statistics back from NCARB.

2:12:33.360 --> 2:12:33.600

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

2:12:33.590 --> 2:12:37.380

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

So this was I think this was meant to be for our law exam, not for NCARB's exam.

2:12:38.40 --> 2:12:38.650

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Oh, OK.

2:12:36.930 --> 2:12:38.910

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right, right.

2:12:38.270 --> 2:12:39.880

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

This is our exam.

2:12:40.890 --> 2:12:55.980

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Because I we made some changes to it. Correct? There was a couple of questions that were not great questions. In other words, the answer was unclear. You could have chosen either way. So anyway, there was a review that was done.

2:12:57.70 --> 2:12:59.900

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Oh, it looks like Julia maybe can answer some of this.

2:12:59.330 --> 2:13:1.190

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Great. Great, Julia.

2:13:3.570 --> 2:13:34.150

Manley, Julia (DOL)

Excuse me. Yeah. Yeah, we did review the statistics from the previous exam. And then, so the law review exam was updated, as Sian said, because some of those questions they were duplicate answers, and some things weren't really clear. So I think, if I'm remembering correctly on this one, it was to look at how the new exam has been performing. You know, since it's been updated. Has it made a difference?

2:13:44.740 --> 2:13:45.630

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

It was me.

2:13:35.200 --> 2:13:45.870

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And just this is Roch dusting off my memory on that. Yeah. I think Colin and I and maybe someone else. Sian, were you on that committee? We did have a committee.

2:13:46.120 --> 2:13:47.700

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Susan, I think, right, yeah.

2:13:46.990 --> 2:13:48.170

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Yeah, yeah.

2:13:47.210 --> 2:14:7.320

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh, Susan. OK, Susan. OK, Susan. We did look at each question. And then, if memory serves me, there's a pool of backup questions and backup tests, like a light version of what NCARB does with its exams.

2:14:8.730 --> 2:14:20.420

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And because we made those changes, as you're saying, Julia, we wanted to see how that worked in terms of the pass/fail rate and which questions were more successful than others.

2:14:21.130 --> 2:14:24.560

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So yeah that that matches my memory of it as well.

2:14:26.700 --> 2:14:34.280

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Yeah. We also had a point to look at if we need to update it again or in the next year or two, right.

2:14:40.230 --> 2:14:40.680
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Thank you.

2:14:34.830 --> 2:14:41.170
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Yeah, that would. That would be another good item to include on that calendar of things that we might regularly review.

2:14:42.550 --> 2:14:43.50
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Yes.

2:14:45.170 --> 2:14:45.540
Manley, Roch (Chair)
So.

2:14:45.720 --> 2:14:46.560
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
Make sure that's on there.

2:14:47.520 --> 2:14:47.960
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Great.

2:14:49.380 --> 2:14:56.520
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Questions, anything else on the action item list from last time?

2:14:59.120 --> 2:14:59.700
Manley, Roch (Chair)
If not...

2:14:59.300 --> 2:15:13.850
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Well, I guess the review web... I'm just calling it out because it's gotta due date that's passed, and it says on hold. So I mean, I feel like we should like... If we're reviewing this list, we should review the list. So what... Is this something we're still doing or..?

2:15:14.790 --> 2:15:15.560
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
So.

2:15:16.610 --> 2:15:33.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Technically there is the sort of Green Book that is out there on the website. It is out of date. My understanding is once... the DOL is working on revamping its website. And my understanding is that is a piece that will be coming off because of the AG's opinion that that is not something that we can determine.

2:15:35.230 --> 2:15:55.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So that was kind of the guidance that we've been given from Elizabeth, that that would include the Green Book. So the reason that that has been on hold is just kind of waiting to have that discussion with Elizabeth on if anything of that sort can move forward. I don't think it will be able to, but also.

2:15:56.350 --> 2:16:23.300

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

To bring back to the Board once we have that determination from the ICOR committee on a way forward that might replace that Green Book. So that's why that had been placed on hold is, there's just a lot of unknown variables still. But it had been initially placed on hold waiting for that AG's office opinion. And then if from that opinion, we could continue doing the Green Book. And I'm still waiting to hear from Elizabeth on a final determination. So I'll get that before the next meeting.

2:16:24.160 --> 2:16:24.580

Manley, Roch (Chair)

You know.

2:16:24.340 --> 2:16:25.300

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Great. Thank you.

2:16:25.740 --> 2:17:23.950

Manley, Roch (Chair)

From my part, under goals, I've made a note Green Book a little while ago, you know. Just because it seems as though we've had an interpretation in the past, of the rules anyway, that that the Green Book provided. And it's going to keep coming up. And if there's a way to provide that without running afoul of our liabilities under the law, that would be a worthwhile effort. So, I'm not seeing this one is quite dead. I think maybe Elizabeth's input will steer and spark the discussion, but I don't think the discussion is dead. I think it's got a... It's something that's gotta still be considered.

2:17:20.940 --> 2:17:21.90

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

2:17:24.840 --> 2:17:25.450

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's my.

2:17:24.890 --> 2:17:37.990

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I think it can still be considered. It's just whether or not we're able to do the traditional Green Book, or if we need to start looking at maybe some alternative ideas. So, I'll make that part of the discussion with Elizabeth on it.

2:17:40.820 --> 2:17:46.420

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good. Thanks. Thanks Sian for holding our feet to the fire on our review here.

2:17:47.880 --> 2:17:53.70

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Next item is for executive's report.

2:17:53.840 --> 2:18:23.940

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Alright, this is gonna be a really quick report because I know you are all probably getting fatigued with this marathon meeting that we've got today. The only other thing that Roch had asked me to look in on was the five-year rolling clock on licensing. There are on examination. I happen to be on a call with the NCARB team and they happen to mention the five-year rolling clock and I said hey funny you should mention that I just got a question about it.

2:18:42.370 --> 2:18:42.640

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good.

2:18:24.160 --> 2:18:51.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And they kind of laughed because apparently that rumor is just kind of swirling in architect world right now, that the five-year clock is being touched. They have not made any determinations, and thereby no new discussions, on touching the five-year clock at this particular point. So that that is the latest update. And they kind of laughed because they're like, "Oh my gosh, we need to do some rumor controls." So, apparently they've gotten the question a lot lately.

2:18:51.970 --> 2:18:52.370

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

2:18:52.130 --> 2:18:54.250

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

What do you mean, touching the five-year clock?

2:18:55.350 --> 2:19:29.200

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I asked the question because looking at some notes from a previous NCARB meeting. There it was that someone from NCARB made a comment that there were taking a look at the five-year rolling clock and, you know, changing that. You know much like the AXP came about, and other changes that come about. So, I was curious because that would impact a lot. I was curious if there was any movement on that. And apparently, it's kind of a circular rumor.

2:19:30.850 --> 2:19:54.680

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And there's been talk of either extending the clock or doing away with it altogether because of the addition of the AXP, and just the changes that have happened with the examination altogether. And apparently, it's one of those topics that comes up pretty frequently and just nobody has really taken up the mantle to run with it yet.

2:19:56.850 --> 2:19:59.300

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Thanks Sydney.

2:20:1.360 --> 2:20:4.220

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Do you have anything else for us on the Board, executives report?

2:20:6.90 --> 2:20:6.780

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's it.

2:20:4.780 --> 2:20:7.570

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That's it for this go round. I'll save it all for the next time.

2:20:7.970 --> 2:20:14.530

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Alright. 7.2.2 centralized investigations and audits unit reports.

2:20:16.980 --> 2:20:18.440

Manley, Roch (Chair)

This about complaints, I guess.

2:20:19.540 --> 2:20:19.960

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Didn't...

2:20:19.440 --> 2:20:48.880

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yep. And Susan, if you can go to the next one. We do not have a closed case report this time because we didn't have any newly closed cases. But right now we, so far have had, as of December 15th, we did have a grand total of 27 closed cases, four that were in investigation status, one that is in a case manager review, for a grand total of 32 on the year.

2:20:50.930 --> 2:20:55.330

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Can I ask what management review is? Because apparently, I have one that's in management review.

2:20:56.150 --> 2:21:0.160

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That is, in the case manager review, so that would be one that.

2:21:0.330 --> 2:21:1.360

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Has been sent to me?

2:21:2.0 --> 2:21:9.450

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Either has been sent to you, or maybe that you've been in discussions with Grace on. If it hasn't been sent to you yet, it may be newly coming.

2:21:10.370 --> 2:21:10.780

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

OK.

2:21:10.410 --> 2:21:15.400

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I'm not certain, and I don't believe that Grace is on here at the moment to be able to answer that.

2:21:16.920 --> 2:21:20.230

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

I don't believe that I have any balls in my court, so...

2:21:20.710 --> 2:21:22.730
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
OK, I will make a note to follow up.

2:21:22.940 --> 2:21:23.460
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Thank you.

2:21:25.720 --> 2:21:33.260
Manley, Roch (Chair)
OK. And then, it looks like Scott won the prize on cases for the year. So...

2:21:33.790 --> 2:21:34.180
Roberts, Sian (Board Member)
Yep.

2:21:33.990 --> 2:21:35.280
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Goes Scott.

2:21:36.740 --> 2:21:42.750
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Just for clarification is my, this is Board Member Loynd, is my name is supposed to be on this list too?

2:21:44.870 --> 2:21:45.50
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
OK.

2:21:42.750 --> 2:21:47.770
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
It will be, but you have not had any cases assigned to you yet.

2:21:47.510 --> 2:21:47.700
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Yeah.

2:21:47.770 --> 2:21:50.420
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
And once you get your first case assigned to you, then it will be.

2:21:50.980 --> 2:21:52.20
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
OK, very good.

2:21:53.710 --> 2:21:59.800

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And just curiosity. Do public members get assigned cases?

2:22:2.180 --> 2:22:11.500

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That is an excellent question that I am going to have to look into. I think that was a question that I raised early on, and I don't know that I ever received an answer on that.

2:22:11.540 --> 2:22:11.780

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

2:22:13.40 --> 2:22:26.690

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Yeah. And I talked to Rick about that and said I'd be willing to do it, but I would like to shadow first and see what all is entailed. But I think they do on other boards, and I think it's open to it, but...

2:22:29.420 --> 2:22:43.180

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Might depend on the case. I mean some of them are pretty much just the, you know, the law. You're just kind of looking at the law based on the situation. But some of them require kind of reviewing documents for whether it's sort of meets, you know.

2:22:44.720 --> 2:22:45.10

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

2:22:45.90 --> 2:22:53.220

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Well, if there are complaints about quality, you know, and whether an architect could be considered incompetent, that would probably be something that you would want...

2:22:54.160 --> 2:22:54.850

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Not to do.

2:22:57.530 --> 2:22:58.60

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Yes.

2:22:55.250 --> 2:22:58.180

Manley, Roch (Chair)

A subject Matter expert should be involved, right?

2:22:59.340 --> 2:23:0.250

Cooley, Susan (Secretary)

Right, right.

2:23:0.90 --> 2:23:3.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK. Any other comments on the complaint status?

2:23:6.790 --> 2:23:9.430

Manley, Roch (Chair)

If none, let's see. Where we at?

2:23:10.610 --> 2:23:14.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Closed case report. Anything on that, Sydney?

2:23:13.590 --> 2:23:17.900

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

No. We did not have any newly closed, so there was no report for us to go over.

2:23:19.370 --> 2:23:25.990

Manley, Roch (Chair)

LCSS reports. Can anyone remember what LCSS stands for? I can't. I'd have to look it up right now.

2:23:26.300 --> 2:23:28.970

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Licensing and customer service support.

2:23:30.470 --> 2:23:30.840

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes.

2:23:29.310 --> 2:23:30.950

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Of course. OK, Sydney.

2:23:32.420 --> 2:23:33.700

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Susan, can you go to the next one?

2:23:36.300 --> 2:23:37.880
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
Oh wow, that is really small.

2:23:38.140 --> 2:23:38.590
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Tiny.

2:23:39.570 --> 2:23:40.430
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
That is tiny.

2:23:41.170 --> 2:23:42.540
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
Uh, if I can see it...

2:23:43.520 --> 2:23:45.620
Muhle, Sydney (DOL).
Are you able to zoom in?

2:23:47.120 --> 2:23:48.370
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
There we go. That's a little better.

2:23:52.410 --> 2:23:54.240
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
There we go. She's going to make it really big for me.

2:24:2.580 --> 2:24:3.270
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
There we go.

2:24:4.390 --> 2:24:27.590
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
OK. So, for our active licensees we have 6,819, expired 331, inactive 18, and inactive-retired we are at 31, for a grand total of 7,199.

2:24:28.300 --> 2:24:45.830
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
And then Washington State only licensees active we have 3,903, expired 170, inactive 9, and inactive-retired 15, for a grand total of 4,097.

2:24:50.740 --> 2:24:53.400

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Are there any questions on the license account?

2:25:1.690 --> 2:25:2.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

This is Roch.

2:25:3.810 --> 2:25:20.420

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Are the two..? Are they two different categories that are cumulative, or is the Washington state only just carved out of the number, the 7,199 number which is which is the total of licenses?

2:25:22.170 --> 2:25:23.20

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh, I see.

2:25:20.920 --> 2:25:24.210

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I'm going to see if Deb or Julia can answer that.

2:25:28.270 --> 2:25:28.750

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There we go.

2:25:24.20 --> 2:25:34.250

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I see. I see what I was looking for. It says all. So that must be, on the blue line above it. It does say all in parentheses, so I get it. It is carved out.

2:25:35.220 --> 2:25:35.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's all.

2:25:36.420 --> 2:25:36.920

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There we go.

2:25:42.660 --> 2:25:48.20

Manley, Roch (Chair)

It's interesting to see this. Any comments on it? Shall we move on?

2:25:51.10 --> 2:25:52.320

Manley, Roch (Chair)

CS report, Sydney.

2:25:54.730 --> 2:25:55.570

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And.

2:26:1.830 --> 2:26:2.680

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Can you go one more.

2:26:7.440 --> 2:26:11.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There we go. This was another request from Chair Manley.

2:26:13.100 --> 2:26:14.380

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

On full screen on it.

2:26:19.310 --> 2:26:31.370

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There we go. Just to provide a really quick review of the funding structure, just as a very brief reminder. Again, this is another one that was put together very quickly, so I will make sure the Board gets a copy of it.

2:26:31.920 --> 2:26:41.200

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

As the Board is aware, DOL is required to collect licensing fees sufficient to cover the cost of administering the program and its operations.

2:26:42.270 --> 2:27:1.190

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Currently, the architect program pays for about two and three quarter full time employees across 17 positions in the five separate units that support the program. So very small percentage that comes out of the program that funds that much larger number.

2:27:3.770 --> 2:27:33.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

As shown in the staffing update that I provided a little bit ago, those 17 positions do not represent that full picture of the expertise that's offered from the department but are not directly funded by the program. There are some additional allocations that cover things like the technology, the licensing software services, such as the Attorney General's Office. Elizabeth is not tied into those full-time employee numbers.

2:27:33.920 --> 2:27:53.940

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Her services are charged through that services item. Travel, things like that. Those indirect costs are basically what keeps the lights on of which this program funds 2% of that overall cost, so much smaller licensing base means much smaller percentage.

2:27:55.950 --> 2:28:10.20

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And in contrast to that, for example, the real estate program, much larger licensing base takes a lot more to administer that program. They have a much larger piece of that pie. And so just really quickly.

2:28:11.840 --> 2:28:38.200

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I'm giving you a snapshot of just what the current fiscal year allocations look like. The bulk of the budget allocations for this year go toward salaries, followed with benefits. Contracts, goods & services is also a large portion of that. Again, with the Attorney General's office and those other service pieces.

2:28:39.540 --> 2:28:41.40

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Oh, I apologize. Could you...

2:28:42.210 --> 2:28:44.60

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Had a spam number calling me.

2:28:44.570 --> 2:28:57.490

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And travel is a very small piece of that. And then capital outlays, which I don't believe actually had anything in it, but was part of the categories that grabbed this chart.

2:28:58.450 --> 2:29:16.630

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So were there any questions on this? I know this is a really, really high-level overview. We're working on getting you a more detailed report and structure. We're just looking at what that needs to look like to come to the Board in a manageable bite.

2:29:17.920 --> 2:30:49.540

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And, thanks Sydney. What I had in mind, this is good, this is interesting information, was you know we've got as new people come under the Board, it's nice for all of us to be up to speed on just how the Board budget works. You know, that the budget is run by the Department of

Licensing, which collects fees and those fees, go into a pool that this isn't necessarily owned by the Architect Board or the Architect, you know, our division or anything. That sort of thing. And how, you know, how we are able to on occasion provide lapses in hiking of fees for our architects out there in the state. That that sort of thing. Just how, more fundamental overview, of how is budget works and understanding of why. You know on many Boards, you know, there's the treasurer and one of the big duties is to be responsible for the budget, which we're not. So just an educational piece, I guess, is what I was looking at from you.

2:30:50.190 --> 2:30:58.280

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And we are working on creating a little bit more detailed presentation that we'll be bringing back hopefully at the next meeting.

2:30:59.660 --> 2:31:36.200

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And with that in mind, thinking about goals and thinking about a list of things, resources that we have, one of those that comes to my mind is onboarding of new members and, you know, keeping updated on what these pieces are that that a new board member can be introduced to during an onboarding meeting. Or whether there is even an onboarding meeting. I'm not sure if, Erica, if you specifically had an onboarding meeting yourself. Or you, Paul.

2:31:38.250 --> 2:31:38.860

Manley, Roch (Chair)

No.

2:31:40.510 --> 2:31:49.470

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, it's... I did when I joined the Board. I had an onboarding meeting and I thought it was a really good idea.

2:31:50.90 --> 2:31:50.890

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's all I had.

2:32:1.760 --> 2:32:2.250

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah.

2:31:52.620 --> 2:32:2.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And we do have an onboarding process. And I believe the last... I believe Erica was onboarded my first day with Department of Licensing.

2:32:8.940 --> 2:32:9.280

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

2:32:3.890 --> 2:32:9.300

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Yeah. It was a lot about the people that you would talk to, not the process or the background.

2:32:10.290 --> 2:32:34.240

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And we have changed the onboarding process and how that looks and we're continuing to evolve that. So, I will make sure that that's included. And if any Board members who have come on more recently, within the last year or so, would like an additional meeting on that, let me know and we'll set that up separately for you.

2:32:35.120 --> 2:32:35.410

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK.

2:32:34.990 --> 2:32:40.30

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

If it makes you feel any better, my onboarding was 10 minutes before my first Board meeting.

2:32:39.660 --> 2:32:41.90

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, yeah.

2:32:40.370 --> 2:32:43.470

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

"Could you show up 10 minutes early, Sian? And I'll just walk you through everything."

2:32:44.110 --> 2:32:55.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Mine was similar, but it was pretty effective. I mean, I did get a lot of information, but you know, woefully insufficient because I didn't remember any of it.

2:32:57.150 --> 2:33:5.510

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I do appreciate that, Sydney. When you did join, I was on like basically your onboarding too. And everybody was looking around like, "yep, we're all here together. There's a lot of new people."

2:33:6.620 --> 2:33:6.870

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah.

2:33:5.930 --> 2:33:9.240

Manley, Julia (DOL)

You guys don't like trial by fire? I mean, come on.

2:33:11.130 --> 2:33:12.640

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Right, right.

2:33:14.300 --> 2:33:14.950

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Well, good.

2:33:16.900 --> 2:33:18.980

Manley, Roch (Chair)

What do we have next? Announcements.

2:33:19.730 --> 2:33:19.960

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Nothing.

2:33:20.40 --> 2:33:21.500

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I think we're at public comment.

2:33:22.150 --> 2:33:23.220

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Public comment.

2:33:24.980 --> 2:33:27.70

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Did I miss..? Oh. OK public comments, yes.

2:33:29.820 --> 2:33:32.370

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So this is where Roch says...

2:33:34.400 --> 2:33:40.240

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Do I have to say this? "The public may address the Board on matters within the Board's jurisdiction..." I think that's just informational for us.

2:33:41.140 --> 2:33:52.590

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So, are there any public comments? Are there any members of the public who have some input? This is the time to come and step forward.

2:33:57.730 --> 2:34:0.820

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Hearing no members of the public stepping forward.

2:34:1.540 --> 2:34:5.510

Manley, Roch (Chair)

It looks like we're moving on to item 9. Conclusion.

2:34:8.170 --> 2:34:19.900

Manley, Roch (Chair)

I think announcements, 9.1 announcements, was here with partially with the thought that maybe Scott would say something, but...

2:34:20.800 --> 2:34:28.360

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Any... Sydney, do you know of any other announcements? Or do any other Board members have any announcements they'd like to share?

2:34:30.240 --> 2:34:52.20

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So I'll just say that this is a new item that will be on the agenda moving forward for the Board to make announcements or do report outs for meetings that maybe aren't related directly to the Board's work but are more related to the architect profession in general. And just to take a brief minute to provide those quick reports.

2:34:52.570 --> 2:35:7.20

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So this could be a point in the meeting when you could report on "oh we attended that NOMA meeting." Or what have you. "I attended an AIA meeting, and we talked about licensing issues."

2:35:7.540 --> 2:35:7.970

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

[background noise]

2:35:8.380 --> 2:35:8.670

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yep.

2:35:8.510 --> 2:35:8.840

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh.

2:35:12.380 --> 2:35:13.820

Manley, Roch (Chair)

There might be a muted mic.

2:35:14.760 --> 2:35:16.640

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I think that was me. Something happened outside my door.

2:35:17.40 --> 2:35:18.390

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Oh, OK, sorry.

2:35:19.270 --> 2:35:26.440

Manley, Roch (Chair)

OK. So I don't think anyone has any other announcements, perhaps.

2:35:27.620 --> 2:35:42.220

Manley, Roch (Chair)

So moving on to 9.2 requests for future agenda items. Are there any additional future agenda items that the Board has not yet discussed that any Board members would like to request for the next meeting?

2:35:47.850 --> 2:35:48.520

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And.

2:35:50.680 --> 2:35:53.850

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, I guess there are none. You know, I might throw one out that would go on the goals.

2:35:54.940 --> 2:36:6.730

Manley, Roch (Chair)

We had an initiative last year, or the previous year, might have been the previous year, to send out letters of congratulations to new licensees.

2:36:7.560 --> 2:36:9.130

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And I thought that was a really good thing.

2:36:9.830 --> 2:36:19.770

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Maybe we can look at that or put it on the agenda or the goals to figure out how we're going to look at that and how we're how we're going to support that effort.

2:36:21.80 --> 2:36:21.650

Manley, Roch (Chair)

That's all I had.

2:36:24.630 --> 2:36:42.820

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Totally agree. We should get back. and we should figure out how to make that an annual thing. It sort of falls off whatever it's to your, I mean, I thought brochures suggestion a while ago was really good. Like, let's look at the annual calendar and make sure we were hitting things every year that we wanna hit and that would definitely be one of them.

2:36:43.270 --> 2:36:46.160

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely.

2:36:46.930 --> 2:36:50.380

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good. Anything else?

2:36:51.490 --> 2:37:0.970

Manley, Roch (Chair)

And if not, looks like Susan. Can you review the action items, list of items for the next meeting?

2:37:1.350 --> 2:37:20.860

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Sure. I just wanted to mention there was an agenda item. And that would be to put the goals on the agenda at the next meeting, the discussion in the adoption. And Sydney or I will send out the PowerPoint that she showed us all today.

2:37:22.590 --> 2:37:44.640

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

So for the action items I got that staff will gather information in regards to the MRA with the UK, that the staff will gather information of the Board's concerns and talk with the DOL and come back to the Board with the information that they received.

2:37:45.520 --> 2:38:1.410

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Reach out to WABO for Board Members Benner, for questions for a better path for apprenticeship, and Board Member Paul who said the long lead times.

2:38:3.360 --> 2:38:15.990

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

And then another action item is what group is advocating and how is the selection happening for the ICOR committee, the NCARB Committee.

2:38:16.970 --> 2:38:28.100

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

ListServ notifications to be sent out to Board Member Loynd for the NCARB events that she's possibly missing.

2:38:29.360 --> 2:38:36.570

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

And then also possible, general reminders from Sydney or I about NCARB's, events that are coming up to our Board members.

2:38:42.200 --> 2:38:52.770

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Get the board staff updates and current overview for program funding structure. That's from the master action item list.

2:38:55.140 --> 2:39:1.520

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Discuss the statistics from the law exam and how it's been performing.

2:39:2.430 --> 2:39:5.780

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Sydney will have a discussion with Elizabeth about the Green Book.

2:39:7.850 --> 2:39:13.560

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

And Sydney will also look into: Can public members take complaint cases?

2:39:20.550 --> 2:39:25.230

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Thank you, Susan. I think that's more than adequate.

2:39:26.880 --> 2:39:27.650

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Did you have?

2:39:26.950 --> 2:39:41.480

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Could I just add that, we are going to need another Model Law committee meeting. I don't know who sets those up, but I would like to ask request that that meeting get set up, next one.

2:39:42.360 --> 2:39:49.220

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Sure. I do have a reminder on my calendar to kind of check the status of where you guys are all at on your different sections.

2:39:52.540 --> 2:39:52.810

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good.

2:39:52.170 --> 2:39:53.210

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Deadlines always help.

2:39:54.280 --> 2:39:55.760

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Very good, very good.

2:39:58.840 --> 2:40:2.190

Manley, Roch (Chair)

If nothing else and action items...

2:40:1.260 --> 2:40:3.790

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

I had one question about the agenda items.

2:40:4.40 --> 2:40:4.610

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Yes.

2:40:5.80 --> 2:40:29.860

Loynd, Erica (Board Member)

Because the goals is so important, is it possible as things populate, if the meeting needs to get extended, because... Like to provide at least a minimum of 45 minutes or an hour to talk about the goals and go through that all. I don't know if there's a way to kind of put timelines to things. But just to ensure that if the meeting needs to run long, we don't feel rushed, but it's blocked out. Is that possible because it's a larger action item?

2:40:31.170 --> 2:40:37.70

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, I'll make sure that the agenda is structured to make sure we allow for plenty of time for that next go round.

2:40:37.650 --> 2:40:38.30
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
OK.

2:40:38.790 --> 2:40:41.410
Manley, Roch (Chair)
I think that's a good point, Erica.

2:40:41.710 --> 2:40:57.870
Manley, Roch (Chair)
This meeting ran a bit long. It was a very full agenda. There was a lot to bite off, especially throwing in the goals issue, you know, which is worthy of a meeting in and of itself.

2:40:59.490 --> 2:41:14.470
Manley, Roch (Chair)
But, we'll... The request to look at how that's managed the best by, you know, maybe having larger time, swaths cut out for that. But it is a good idea.

2:41:16.320 --> 2:41:16.700
Manley, Roch (Chair)
So.

2:41:18.410 --> 2:41:24.960
Manley, Roch (Chair)
Any other comments on agenda items and so forth?

2:41:26.650 --> 2:41:42.740
Manley, Roch (Chair)
If not, it looks like we've reached that time we're at 12, must be 12:50 almost. Time is now 12:50 and this meeting is adjourned.

2:41:45.730 --> 2:41:46.600
Loynd, Erica (Board Member)
Thank you very much, everyone.

2:41:45.790 --> 2:41:46.680
Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
Thank you everyone.

2:41:47.520 --> 2:41:47.870
Wu, Paul (Board Member)
Bye.

2:41:47.790 --> 2:41:48.70

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Good.

2:41:46.820 --> 2:41:49.970

Roberts, Sian (Board Member)

Alright. Bye everyone. Thanks. Thank you.

2:41:50.50 --> 2:41:50.500

Manley, Julia (DOL)

Bye.

2:41:50.820 --> 2:41:51.190

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Bye.

2:41:50.760 --> 2:41:51.510

Allen-Ba, Debra (DOL)

Thanks.

2:41:53.140 --> 2:41:53.550

Manley, Roch (Chair)

Bye bye.

2:41:54.90 --> 2:41:54.380

Wu, Paul (Board Member)

Bye.