

Board of Architectural Examiners

Executive Officer: Stephen P. Sands ♦ (916) 445-3393 ♦ Internet: www.cbae.cahwnet.gov



The Board of Architectural Examiners (BAE), created by the legislature in 1901, establishes minimum professional qualifications and performance standards for admission to and practice of the profession of architecture through its administration of the Architects Practice Act, Business and Professions Code section 5500 *et seq.* The Board's regulations are found in Division 2, Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). BAE is a consumer protection agency within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA).

BAE is a ten-member body evenly divided between architects and public members. Three public members and the five architect members are appointed by the Governor; the Senate Rules Committee and the Assembly Speaker each appoint a public member. The Board administers the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), sets standards for the practice of architecture in California, and enforces the Board's statutes and regulations. To become licensed as an architect, a candidate must successfully complete a written and oral examination, and provide evidence of at least eight years of relevant education and experience.

Effective January 1, 1998, BAE is the home of California's regulatory program for landscape architects under Business and Professions Code section 5615 *et seq.* The former Board of Landscape Architects sunsetted on July 1, 1997, and its regulatory program devolved to DCA. However, AB 1546 (Chapter 475, Statutes of 1997) transferred the program to BAE as of January 1, 1998. A new Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC), composed of five landscape architects and no public members, acts in an advisory capacity to BAE. Specifically, the LATC may assist BAE in the examination of candidates for licensure; investigate complaints and make recommendations to BAE regarding disciplinary action against landscape architects; and perform other duties and functions which have been delegated to it by BAE relative to the regulation of landscape architects. The Board's landscape architect regulations are located in Division 26, Title 16 of the CCR.

At its February 5 meeting, BAE welcomed new public member Albert C. Chang, who owns an import-export business and is a real estate broker. Chang's term expires on June 1, 2000.

MAJOR PROJECTS

BAE Overhauls the California Supplemental Examination

In response to 1997 criticism by the Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee (JLSRC), BAE has spent the past

two years engaged in a project to justify its continued requirement of passage of the oral California Supplemental Examination (CSE) prior to licensure. The Board's work has resulted in an overhaul of the exam and the first administration of the "new" CSE in February 1999.

BAE requires passage of NCARB's Architect Registration Examination, a "written" examination which is now administered on computer. In addition, BAE requires passage of the state-specific CSE, an oral examination administered by a three-person panel of expert examiners. Complaints about the exam during the early 1990s led the Board to adopt a policy of tape-recording the oral exam sessions [13:1 CRLR 20] and to establish an appeals process for candidates who fail the exam. [15:2&3 CRLR 39; 15:1 CRLR 40] Nonetheless, the oral exam came under fire during the Board's 1996-97 sunset review. In its final report issued in April 1997, the JLSRC noted that BAE is one of only three DCA boards which require passage of an oral examination in addition to a nationally standardized written exam. According to the JLSRC, "an oral examination is rarely used by boards because of the criticism that it may lead to arbitrary judgments, and that is it not always the most objective and consistent way to test for

BAE has spent the past two years engaged in a project to justify its continued requirement of passage of the oral California Supplemental Examination prior to licensure.

the competence of the professional in a particular occupation." The JLSRC also noted that the Board's oral exam is 33% more expensive to administer than the national written exam, due

largely to the expenses associated with the travel and per diem of the 400 architect consultants who serve as examiners on the Board's three-member examination panels. "In addition to the high cost, it is not clear that an oral examination is still needed....[F]rom a review of the scope of this exam, some areas of the oral exam appear duplicative of the national exam." Backing off on a preliminary recommendation that the oral exam be eliminated, the JLSRC suggested that DCA review the exam to ensure that it does not duplicate what is already tested on the national exam, and determine whether a written exam would be more appropriate and less costly for the testing of competence in this occupation.

Although DCA disagreed with the JLSRC's recommendation ("DCA does not concur that the exam should be eliminated absent evidence of a compelling problem with the exam"), the Board commenced a two-year effort to justify the existence and format of the oral exam. In 1997, BAE formed the California Supplemental Examination Subcommittee, and charged it with three tasks: (1) determine whether there is a need to require a separate California exam to complement the

ARE; (2) if so, determine what content is essential to reflect the current elements of California architectural practice as it relates to public health, safety, and welfare; and (3) determine what format would most effectively and efficiently assess whether a candidate possesses the minimum competence necessary to be licensed to practice architecture in California.

The Subcommittee examined both the ARE and the practice of architecture in California in order to determine whether a California-specific examination is necessary. According to the Subcommittee, NCARB admits that no single examination can test for competency in all aspects of architecture, and notes that the ARE is not intended for that purpose. The Subcommittee found that "although the ARE tests discrete knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to provide the various services required in the design and construction of buildings, it does not currently address a candidate's ability to integrate that knowledge into the complex framework of practice that is necessary to be a competent architect in the State of California." According to the Subcommittee, several diverse characteristics of California—including its size, population, varied landscape and climate, high seismicity, legal framework, and economy—combine to present "a complex context for architectural practice that sets it apart from all other states....It follows that broader skills and knowledge are necessary to practice safely and effectively here."

BAE contracted with Professional Management Evaluation Services, Inc. (PMES) to assist it in surveying the state's architects to assess the tasks they perform and the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform those tasks competently and safely. In September 1997, PMES sent a survey to 3,450 California-licensed architects who represent a cross-section of length in service and geographic location. From the data gathered in the survey emerged 33 practice areas which are deemed essential to the practice of architecture in California. PMES also assisted the Board in comparing the ARE with the CSE to identify areas of duplication. Because 11 of the 33 areas identified in PMES' survey were deemed to be adequately tested on the ARE, BAE decided to narrow the focus of the CSE to the remaining 22 areas.

Finally, the Subcommittee (with the assistance of various architect panels) determined that because the ARE does not currently test candidates' ability to integrate factual knowledge into practical problem-solving in the lifecycle of an architectural project, a "real-world, project-based format that allows candidates both to demonstrate their knowledge of California-specific information, as well as to recognize and solve problems" is appropriate. While a series of essay-type questions may theoretically work, the Subcommittee determined that the existing oral format is the most efficient and fair for the candidate because it can be taken in about an hour, with results determined quickly.

Thus, armed with the survey data and its new findings, the Board and PMES overhauled the CSE, and administered the new test for the first time in February in Irvine and South San Francisco. The pass rate for the 111 examinees at the Irvine administration was 49%; the pass rate for 87 candidates in South San Francisco was 52%. These pass rates are down slightly from the historical pass rate of the "old" CSE, found by the JLSRC to consistently hover around 56%.

In conjunction with its work on the CSE, PMES prepared a comprehensive report on the distinct aspects of architectural practice in California. *The Practice of Architecture in California*, available on the Board's website, provides detailed information on the findings of the job analysis survey conducted by PMES for BAE and the resultant test plan for the CSE. At this writing, PMES is also preparing a second report covering the trends in practice data.

Task Force on Post-Licensure Competency

During the fall of 1998, BAE conducted six focus group meetings attended by representatives from various segments of the design and construction industry, including members of the American Institute of Architects, California Council (AIACC), forensic specialists (architects, insurance representatives, and attorneys), institutional clients, contractors and developers, building officials, and associates, interns, and recently licensed architects. The focus groups identified the qualities and skills expected of architects, including communication skills, creative ability, leadership skills, legal and ethical performance, management skills, and technical expertise. Within and across the focus groups, opinion varied on the

extent to which architects generally meet these expectations. However, the groups identified a consistent set of areas in which architects need improvement. Specifically, the focus groups identified weaknesses in the areas of code knowledge, document coordination, constructability, construction management, communications, and management skills. The Board reviewed these identified areas of weakness and attempted to determine which impact public health, safety, and welfare such that they fall within its purview. Thereafter, the Board charged its Professional Qualifications Committee with studying ways in which the Board might better ensure minimum technical competency for those entering the profession (see below), and created a Task Force on Post-Licensure Competency to examine the appropriate role of BAE in ensuring the continued competency of those already licensed as architects in California.

On April 6, the Task Force held its first meeting. A major topic of discussion was whether the Board should pursue legislation requiring architects to satisfy a continuing education (CE) requirement as a condition of biennial license renewal. Board President Marc Sandstrom noted that many other professions require CE, and that—of the 55 member boards in

On April 6, the Task Force held its first meeting. A major topic of discussion was whether the Board should pursue legislation requiring architects to satisfy a continuing education requirement as a condition of biennial license renewal.

NCARB—13 architectural licensing boards will require CE by 2001 and 11 others are authorized to require it.

Task Force members split on the value of CE. Some members noted that most CE courses are of dubious value because they require no test or other assessment at the end of the course to determine whether the course participant learned anything that would enhance his/her professional competence. Other members favored a CE requirement focused on the identified areas of weakness with an open-book test at the end. The group discussed the fact that the American Institute of Architects (AIA) requires CE for its membership; some members opined that AIA's CE program covers the areas of weakness identified by the focus groups. Following extensive discussion, the Task Force decided to further study several critical issues, including the specific areas of competency which should be covered by a CE requirement, who should accredit CE providers and courses, who should keep records of CE satisfaction, how a mandatory CE requirement in California would affect reciprocity, and the relationship of CE to the "larger picture" of competency assurance (including professional education, a structured internship experience (see below), entrance examinations, and professional practice).

Internship Development Program Update

Like all architectural licensing boards, BAE requires at least three years of supervised architectural experience prior to licensure. However, the experience gained by BAE licensure candidates through this requirement is not uniform, and the Board is concerned about the minimum level of competency of its candidates as derived through the experience requirement. For several years, BAE members have been considering a proposal to require licensure candidates to complete a structured internship program prior to being licensed in California. Although the Board examined NCARB's Intern Development Program (IDP) as a model for the proposed internship requirement, several aspects of NCARB's IDP concerned some Board members, and discussion of the use of the IDP as a model for any California-required internship program was tabled in September 1995. [15:4 CRLR 53; 15:2&3 CRLR 38]

However, by 2001, 46 jurisdictions will require completion of NCARB's IDP as a prerequisite to licensure. Thus, BAE has concluded that it should reevaluate whether to require completion of a structured internship, both to improve the competency of entry-level architects and to facilitate the ease with which California architects may achieve reciprocity licensure in other states. Recently, the Board's Professional Qualifications Committee (PQC) has resumed discussion of the general goals and purposes of an acceptable structured internship requirement in general, and followed an ongoing debate within NCARB about that organization's IDP. [16:1 CRLR 99]

BAE has concluded that it should reevaluate whether to require completion of a structured internship, both to improve the competency of entry-level architects and to facilitate the ease with which California architects may achieve reciprocity licensure in other states.

On April 10–12, NCARB sponsored a Summit on Internships in response to criticisms of its IDP. The Board sent PQC Chair Ed Oremen to the Summit to provide input regarding California's concerns and to try to influence change in the IDP. At the Board's April 15 meeting, Oremen gave a brief summary of the results of the Summit. Participants agreed that the IDP's strict standards should be more flexible and more qualitative, and that it should permit alternative paths to practical experience because of changes that are taking place within the profession. The group also noted the need to incorporate more practical experience into the required educational curriculum and, conversely, more education into the internship experience and professional practice. Fulfillment of this goal would require true mentoring by the supervising architect, and would convey the approach that the practice of architecture involves a lifelong learning process—not cramming for a single examination or doing just enough to satisfy the technical requirements of a structured internship. Oremen noted that NCARB intends to publish data from the summit and from its recent survey on internships and to convene a steering committee to develop an action plan for further study and implementation. Oremen recommended that these data be analyzed before reaching a final consensus on the IDP.

The PQC is responsible both for studying the IDP and for formulating BAE's educational requirements for licensure. Because education and the internship experience are interwoven, the Board will host an October 1999 conference to discuss education, internship, and practice issues. Invitees will include representatives of all accredited architecture schools in California, as well as the primary community college feeders to the five- and six-year programs, and representatives from NCARB, AIA, AIACC, the National Architectural Accrediting Board, the American Institute of Architecture Students, and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. Participants will discuss *The Practice of Architecture in California*, PMES' findings about the state of the practice of architecture in California (see above), the

information gained from the six focus groups, the results of NCARB's internship survey, and other studies related to architect education and competency.

BAE Drops Proposed Warning Requirement Regulation

AB 2171 (Davis) (Chapter 321, Statutes of 1996) authorized BAE to adopt rules of professional conduct to govern architects; in early 1998, the Board adopted these rules in section 160, Title 16 of the CCR. At its December 1998 meeting, BAE decided to amend section 160 to add two new rules of professional conduct regarding conflict of interest and copyright infringement. Specifically, BAE added subsection 160(c)(4), which prohibits an architect from acting in a dual

capacity as (1) a person involved in a governmental (regulatory) agency as either an official, employee, appointee, or agent, and (2) as a person in a business or activity where such business or activity may later be subject, directly or indirectly, to any regulatory or enforcement action by the architect in his/her government agency capacity. BAE also added new subsection 160(e), which makes an architect's having been found by a court to have infringed upon the copyrighted works of other architects or design professionals a basis for discipline. [16:1 CRLR 97-98] At this writing, these regulatory changes are pending approval by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL).

However, the Board withdrew from the rulemaking package the proposed addition of subsection 160(d)(3). Under that provision, an architect who, in the course of his/her work on a project, obtains specific knowledge of an action taken by his/her employer or client which violates applicable building laws or regulations which will cause imminent risk of serious injury to any person or persons, would have been required to (1) warn the identifiable person(s) at risk or report the action to the local building inspector or other public official charged with the enforcement of the applicable law, and (2) refuse to consent to the action. BAE withdrew this proposal from the regulatory package at the request of AIACC, which argued that the requirement would impede progress in situations where an architect disagrees with his/her employer about code interpretation; may be abused by disgruntled employees; and would potentially increase liabilities, affecting insurance rates. AIACC also argued that the language of the proposed section was unclear in several respects. Following discussion at its December 1998 meeting, the Board decided to further study the proposed warning requirement.

At its March 23 meeting, the Board's Regulatory and Enforcement Committee discussed a March 3 legal memorandum by DCA legal counsel Don Chang. The opinion alerted BAE to DCA's concerns about proposed subsection 160(d)(3). Chang argued that the proposed amendment is "unnecessary under current civil and administrative law and that the adoption of a regulation imposing this specific duty may impose a serious burden on the Board's resources and subject it to civil litigation." Specifically, Chang cited a 1985 California Attorney General's Opinion which found that a registered engineer who inspects the integrity of a building and determines that there is an imminent risk of serious injury to the occupants has a duty to warn the identifiable occupants or, if not feasible, to notify the local building officials or other appropriate authority of such a determination. The duty to warn is based upon civil tort liability owed by an actor who stands in some "special relationship" to a dangerous person or situation or to the foreseeable victim, under *Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California*, 17 Cal. 3d 425 (1976). Although the Attorney General's Opinion is confined to engineers, Chang opined that a special relationship would also be found to exist between an architect and a project's owner/client, thus requiring the architect to warn of foreseeable peril created by the owner/client.

In other words, an architect already has a duty to warn, grounded in civil tort liability. Chang opposed placing this requirement as grounds for discipline in the Board's regulations because BAE would receive many inquiries about specific fact situations and whether they give rise to the duty to warn. "As a specific ground for discipline, it would be difficult for the Board to refuse to give guidance to a licensee who seeks advice as to whether the duty to warn exists in a given set of facts.... Since an inquiry would relate to whether an imminent risk of harm exists, the Board's review and response to such questions would have to be expedited. These factors could severely tax the Board's resources." In addition, Chang noted that the Board could be subject to civil liability for giving the wrong advice. "In the event that the advice given by the Board is alleged to have been incorrect, it is very possible that the Board could be named in a lawsuit by an injured party or by the architect who relied upon the Board's advice and was subsequently sued for allegedly failing to warn."

Based on Chang's advice, the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee recommended that the Board delete proposed subsection 160(d)(3) from the regulation package permanently. The Board approved the Committee's recommendation at its April 15 meeting.

Update on Other Board Rulemaking

The following is an update on recent BAE rulemaking proceedings described in detail in Volume 16, No. 1 (Winter 1999) of the *California Regulatory Law Reporter*:

◆ Board Amends Disciplinary Guidelines Regulation.

On February 26, OAL approved BAE's amendment to section 154, Title 16 of the CCR, which now requires the Board—in deciding disciplinary cases—to consider the 1998 version of its disciplinary guidelines. [16:1 CRLR 98]

◆ Changes to Examination Eligibility Procedures.

On February 25, OAL approved BAE's amendments to sections 109, 117, and 144, Title 16 of the CCR, pertaining to its administration of the ARE for licensure purposes. The Board's changes to section 109 permit candidates to file a one-time-only application for ARE eligibility, and establish implementation procedures for the new eligibility review process and fee which become effective on July 1, 1999. The Board's changes to section 117 define an inactive candidate and clarify the purge process for inactive candidate files. The amendment to section 144 changes the eligibility review fee to \$100 effective July 1, 1999. [16:1 CRLR 98-99]

Recent BAE Rulemaking for the Landscape Architects' Program

The following is a summary of recent rulemaking activities initiated by LATC and approved by BAE. These proceedings were covered in more detail in Volume 16, No. 1 of the *California Regulatory Law Reporter*:

◆ Transition Plan to Accommodate Modified LARE.

At its December 1998 meeting, BAE approved LATC's

recommendation to amend section 2614, Title 16 of the CCR, to provide a transition plan from the old version of the Landscape Architects Registration Examination (LARE) of the national Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) to the new version which becomes effective on June 1, 1999. [16:1 CRLR 100-01] The changes will enable candidates who have passed some parts of the LARE to receive credit for those sections when they retake the new LARE in 1999. OAL approved these changes on January 26.

♦ **Landscape Architect Examination Fees.** Also at its December 1998 meeting, BAE approved LATC's recommendation to amend section 2649, Title 16 of the CCR, which contains the structure LATC uses to assess fees for the landscape architect examinations. SB 2238 (Committee on Business and Professions) (Chapter 879, Statutes of 1998) now authorizes BAE and LATC to charge an exam fee and a "per section" fee [16:1 CRLR 101], and the amendments to section 2649 establish a fee for each examination section for which a candidate is registered. The fee is based on the cost to LATC to purchase and administer the examination. OAL approved these changes on February 3.

♦ **Rules of Professional Conduct.** SB 2238 also authorized BAE to adopt rules of professional conduct to govern landscape architects. On April 21, OAL approved BAE's amendments to section 2670, Title 16 of the CCR, which adds to existing professional conduct regulations provisions applicable to landscape architects in the areas of conflict of interest and copyright infringement. [16:1 CRLR 101]

Board Committee to Review Advertising Regulations

At the Regulatory and Enforcement Committee's March 23 meeting, AIACC Vice-President Paul Welch suggested that BAE review section 134, Title 16 of the CCR, its current regulation which requires all architect advertising to include the name of a licensed architect and the fact that he/she is a licensed architect. Instead, AIACC believes the Board should register architectural firms (in addition to individual architects) offering services in California, and permit firms to advertise using their Board-approved names (without including the name of an individual licensed architect). Welch argued that noncompliance with existing section 134 is widespread, and that a large number of complaints concerning improper advertising is generated by Board staff when processing documents or investigating unrelated complaints.

Board Executive Officer Steve Sands explained that section 134 was adopted in order to make unlicensed practice easy to identify. Committee members Merlyn Isaak and Robert DePietro agreed, and opined that amendment or repeal of section 134 would be a step backward. Nevertheless, the

Committee agreed to include AIACC's suggestion in its action plan. At its April 15 meeting, the Board charged the Committee with evaluating the existing advertising requirements.

LEGISLATION

AB 1678 (Davis), as amended on April 27, would amend Business and Professions Code section 5536.25 to provide that a licensed architect who signs and stamps plans, specifications, reports, or documents is not responsible for damage caused by subsequent changes to or uses of those plans, specifications, reports, or documents, where the subsequent changes or uses, including changes or uses made by state or local governmental agencies, are not authorized or approved in writing by the licensed architect who originally signed the plans, specifications, reports, or documents, provided that the architectural service rendered by the architect who signed and stamped the plans, specifications, reports, or documents was not also a proximate cause of the damage. AB 1678 would also amend section 5536.1 to repeal an existing requirement that architects affix their stamp to contract documents.

AB 1678 is sponsored by the AIACC. At its April 15 meeting, BAE voted to support the bill. [A. Appr]

AB 1096 (Romero), as amended April 27, would create a Board of Interior Design within DCA and establish a registration program for interior designers. The regulatory scheme would replace the existing state-sanctioned private certification program with respect to interior designers, whereby only practitioners who meet specified education and experience standards may use the designation "certified interior designer." Under AB 1096 (which is intended to be a title act to protect the use of the term "registered interior designer"), an interior designer must satisfy certain education, experience, and examination requirements and be registered by the Board in order to advertise or otherwise hold him/herself out as a "registered interior designer."

The California Council for Interior Design Certification (CCIDC) is sponsoring the bill in response to proposed changes to the International Building Code ("IBC 2000"), which interior designers argue would preclude "unregistered" interior design professionals from submitting interior design plans to building officials. CCIDC believes that California's recognition of "certified interior designers" does not meet IBC 2000 requirements. CCIDC is also concerned about the market advantages held by licensed design professionals, such as architects and engineers. At its April 15 meeting, BAE took an oppose position on the bill, noting that it has historically opposed any legislation that opens the services of architects and engineers to others in the design and construction industry (whether licensed, certified, or unlicensed). BAE also disputes whether the proposed

AIACC Vice-President Paul Welch suggested that BAE review section 134, Title 16 of the CCR, its current regulation which requires all architect advertising to include the name of a licensed architect and the fact that he/she is a licensed architect.

changes to IBC 2000 would in fact preclude interior designers from submitting interior design plans to building officials. [A. Appr]

AB 229 (Baldwin). The Beverly-Killea Limited Liability Company Act, Corporations Code section 17000 *et seq.*, allows certain business interests to operate a limited liability company (LLC), whereby the members of the LLC may not be held personally liable for the debts of the LLC except in those circumstances where a shareholder of a corporation could be held liable for the debts of the corporation. Under the Act, most providers of professional services are prohibited from operating as LLCs. As amended March 25, AB 229 would permit certain providers of professional services (such as general contractors, subcontractors, real estate agents and brokers, aircraft repair dealers, private detectives, bail bondspersons, restaurants, and approximately fifty others) to form LLCs, but would prohibit other professionals, including architects and landscape architects, from operating as LLCs.

AB 229 failed passage in the Assembly Judiciary Committee on April 27, but was granted reconsideration. Supporters argue that the bill would be a boon to business by providing the liability shield to more types of businesses. Opponents argue that allowing professionals to escape personal liability for the harm they cause could place the public at risk. [A. Jud]

AB 540 (Machado). Code of Civil Procedure section 411.35 requires a plaintiff's attorney, before filing an action for professional negligence against an architect, engineer, or land surveyor, to file a certificate of merit with the court. The certificate of merit must declare either that (a) the attorney has consulted with and received an opinion from at least one licensed architect, professional engineer, or land surveyor reasonably believed to be knowledgeable in the relevant issues and, based on that consultation, the attorney has concluded that there is reasonable and meritorious cause for the filing of the action; or (b) the attorney made three separate good faith attempts with three separate architects, professional engineers, or land surveyors to obtain the required consultation, but none would agree to the consultation. As introduced February 18, AB 540 would require the plaintiff's attorney to serve on the other party the certificate of merit which is required to be filed with the court. Additionally, the bill would specify that the expert giving the consultation must be licensed by this state or a state that has reciprocity for California-licensed architects, professional engineers, or land surveyors; and would require that the expert giving the consultation, or refusing to give a consultation, be named in the certificate. [A. Jud]

AB 1626 (Migden), as amended April 21, would require the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) to base the state's Building Standards Code on the Uniform Mechanical Code promulgated by the International

Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials and the Western Fire Chiefs' Association Uniform Fire Code. Currently, the CBSC bases the state's building standards (upon which local building codes are based) on model codes promulgated by private nonprofit organizations, but enjoys wide discretion to choose among them and amend them as deemed necessary. This discretion was upheld in *International Association of Plumbing Mechanical Officials v. California Building Standards Commission*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 245 (1997). AB 1626 would effectively reverse that decision, and confine the BSC to a list of legislatively approved model codes. Supporters of the bill argue that the statutory list recognizes the most professional publishers of model code. Opponents, including AIAACC, argue that more frequently updated codes better serve the public by staying more modern and being more in accord with national construction standards. Opponents also fear that out-of-state material manufacturers, constructors, and designers may be discouraged from doing business in California because local codes will not be like those elsewhere in the nation. This interstate code disparity is a substantial reason cited by BAE to justify its California Supplemental Exam for architects (see MAJOR PROJECTS). [A. Appr]

RECENT MEETINGS

BAE devoted its February 5-6 meeting to a two-day facilitated session at which it amended its 1999 Strategic Plan. The plan, which was ultimately approved by the Board at its April 15 meeting, sets forth BAE's mission statement, goals, and objectives, and identifies several key issues facing the Board at this time: internship, education, continuing competency, enforcement, technology, and NCARB relations (see MAJOR PROJECTS).

At its February meeting, BAE resumed discussion of whether it should pursue a legislative amendment changing the name of the Board to the "California Architects Board." [16:1 CRLR 103] The Board has noted that its current name gives the impression that it is responsible only for examining architects, when it is also responsible for setting standards for architectural practice in California and enforcing those standards through its disciplinary program. However, members do not want the Board's name confused with any architects' trade associations. Following discussion, the Board voted 10-0 to pursue the name change. At this writing, Board staff is attempting to persuade Assemblymember Susan Davis to include this change in her bill AB 1678 (see LEGISLATION).

FUTURE MEETINGS

- June 11, 1999 in Sacramento.
- October 14, 1999 in La Jolla.
- December 3, 1999 in San Francisco.