

OREGON STATE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT BOARD (OSLAB)
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 13, 2011

Meeting Location: The Association Center, 707 13th St. SE, Conference Room A

Members Present:

Robert Edwards, Public Member
Ron Nichols, Public Member, Treasurer
David Olsen, Landscape Architect, Chair
John Pellitier, Landscape Architect
Mel Stout, Landscape Architect
Timothy Van Wormer, Landscape Architect, Vice Chair**
Susan Wright, Public Member

Staff Present:

Christine Valentine, Administrator

Guests Present for Oral Interviews:

Jeffrey Creel, Candidate
Fouad Elgharabli, Candidate
Patrick Gaynor, Candidate
Eric Parsons, Candidate
Douglas Rooney, Candidate
Jeff Sakacsi, Candidate
Samuel Shearman, Candidate
Marina Wrensch, Candidate

Other Guests:

Dawn Hottenroth, City of Portland – Bureau of Environmental Services.

WORK SESSION

Chair Olsen convened the work session at 9:15 AM

Chair Olsen stated that the Board had a fairly standard agenda for the day. He noted that the primary change is that the Board now has a new administrator. He welcomed the administrator. He provided a brief overview of the interview process that lead up to the selection of the new administrator. He remarked that he hopes the administrator is settling in well. The other Board members also extended a warm welcome to the administrator.

Administrator Report

Chair Olsen informed the other board members that he encouraged the administrator to offer up places that board administrative operations can be improved and the he is open to ideas about how Board meetings are run.

Administrator Valentine provided a brief explanation of her educational and professional background. She then reviewed the administrator report (Appendix I of meeting packet) covering transition work, OSLAB-related meetings, legislative updates, CLARB updates, SIBA, etc. She welcomed feedback regarding content of future reports.

(**Departed at 2:20 PM due to other business commitments)

The Administrator also reviewed several items brought to the meeting for the Boards consideration and appropriate signatures: (1) Rulemaking – Delegation of Authority form and Designation of Rules Coordinator form, (2) Banking – letter to Pioneer Trust requesting administrator be given signature authority for checks of \$500 or less and be able to manage CD accounts on behalf of the Board, (3) Other Investments - letter to Paulson Investments requesting that administrator be given authority to manage this account on behalf of the Board. Chair Olsen noted for the other Board members that the idea behind the letters is to ensure the Administrator has the same signatory authority for checks and CDs that the previous administrator had. No specific concerns were raised by Board members.

The Administrator next lead the Board through a discussion of the 2011 Legislative Session with respect to potential legislation impacting the Board. Most of the discussion focused on two bills mentioned in the Administrator's report – SB 421 and 821. SB 421 would have impacted the Board's authority to pursue certain civil actions, and SB 821 would have amended allowances for calling executive session during public meetings.

SB 821: Vice Chair Van Wormer wondered where the bill came from and whether the proponents were concerned about the Board's use of executive session? He noted that the Board does not often conduct business in executive session. Member Edwards commented that he wasn't sure how folks would know enough about Board operations to even be concerned as there hasn't historically been a lot of outside interest in the Board. Member Nichols asked about how much influence the AAG's advice has on how we run the compliance process and wondered if the legislation is in any way a reaction to executive sessions held to discuss compliance cases. Chair Olsen agreed it was interesting to see this legislation and wondered if there is concern out there about OSLAB not being transparent in the Board operations. The administrator offered that it looks like someone was just going through the existing list of allowable reasons for executive session and proposed deletion of many of those. She stated there is no clear indication that this was really aimed at any past action of the Board. The Board asked the Administrator to follow without Senator Morse's office about why his office elected to sponsor this bill.

Vice Chair Van Wormer commented that he remembered a past bill about having to pursue all contract remedies that was somewhat similar to SB 421. The Administrator explained that the bill was apparently sponsored by the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC). Several Board members were familiar with the ACEC but not with the reasons for the legislation. The Administrator stated that she has not inquired with the ACEC. The Board did not ask for specific follow-up on this bill.

Chair Olsen switched gears, asking the Administrator to report on her conversations with lobbyist Mr. Kafoury about his scope of services. The Administrator read aloud the Scope of Work in the existing Board contract with Mr. Kafoury. Mr. Kaufory indicated by phone that his focus was on Section 2.a. of the Scope of Work: prevent the repeal of Oregon statutes regarding semi-independent status. The Administrator had wanted his assistance under Section 2.b. – monitoring other bills that potentially could affect any of the participating boards. Mr. Kafoury didn't concur that his job included monitoring many of the bills

highlighted by the Administrator as potentially affecting OSLAB or possibly other semi-independent boards. The Administrator was asked to follow-up with other SIBA members about their expectations, experiences, and thoughts about renewing this contract for the next biennium and report back at the August meeting. She mentioned that SIBA would be discussing this at the May 17, 2011 meeting. Vice Chair Van Wormer and Chair Olsen agreed that the Board should ask questions about the scope of services and whether there is a need to continue with a lobbyist contract in the next biennium. The Administrator will report back on this at the August meeting.

The Administrator mentioned the need for proctors for the June LARE. Board Member Wright volunteered to proctor on Monday June 13th, Section C Exam. The Board will likely need to have staff proctor the exam on Tuesday June 14th. Chair Olsen said to let him know if that will not work.

Vice Chair Van Wormer asked how much tort liability coverage do we have? And how do we pay for this coverage? What is the coverage for individuals? Administrator Valentine indicated she did not know the answers to these questions and would have to research.

To wrap-up, the Administrator asked the Board for provide feedback on proposed short-term priorities:

Administrative: The Administrator explained that she is working on position descriptions plus learning all existing reporting/filing systems. The Board was very interested in and supportive of the Administrators work on position descriptions for a reclassified position for the registration specialist, using state classifications for Executive Assistant and Accounting Technician III. Several Board Members asked about future training opportunities for the Registration Specialist, especially where this could translate into helping the Board implement enhancements in day-to-day operations. The Administrator remarked that she is also interested in and supportive of the Registration Specialist having opportunities for training and continuing to make contributions to the evolution of Board operations. The Board asked to be kept in the loop on the process of finalizing the position descriptions.

Board Member Nichols also mentioned that the last administrator was a driving force for the administrative rules committee. The committee needs this kind of administrative involvement to consider what would be the best rule changes. The Administrator can help to make sure that rules are clear and needs to be very involved in the development of rule language. The Administrator and Registration Specialist are in the best position to point out recurring problems and then the Rules Committee helps address those problems via rule proposals.

Bylaws: The Administrator explained her proposal to sort through and divide ideas captured in draft bylaws into categories: bylaws, policies, possible rule language, and desk manual/internal procedures. She also mentioned that she is working to inventory existing policies and procedures. The Board agreed to have her prepare recommendations for moving this project forward and asked her to report back at the August meeting.

Committees: The Administrator explained that she is looking at committees in terms of membership, purpose, history, and needs. She referenced AAG-client advice relevant to Board Committees to be considered by the Board later in the meeting. She proposed to prepare recommendations/guidelines for operation of committees, including clear indication of needs for public notice of committee meetings

Modernize Payment System: The Administrator wants to figure out what it will take to accept credit card payments and set up on-line renewals to reduce time spent on paper processing. This would bring OSLAB into line with customer expectations. She is not sure of the potential hurdles but noted that other Boards have been able to achieve this so it must be possible. The Board agreed this would be a good update to pursue.

Notice Lists: The Administrator mentioned that a change of staff is a good time to pursue comprehensive updates involving correspondence to all registrants and known interested parties to confirm interests and ensure we have current contact information. The Administrator believes the Board needs to stress use of e-mail for future notifications. She would also like to create clear, updated documentation about how notice lists were generated, how/when to use various lists, etc. She offered that this is something that needs to be revisited periodically even when an administrator has not changed. The Board agreed this would be a worthwhile endeavor.

Newsletter: The Administrator knows the Board wants to enhance its newsletter. She is researching appropriate software and training investments. Further conversation on this topic was deferred until later as the newsletter is an afternoon agenda item.

Public Records: The Administrator mentioned that she needs to examine the Archives public records retention schedule applicable to the Board to determine if this schedule is adequate or if the Board should seek approval of customized schedule. At some point, staff needs to start going through documents in the office to determine how public records are being maintained, which files need some attention to ensure complete records are gathered, what needs to go to records center, etc. The Board agreed this is important work.

Rules: The Administrator mentioned that she would work with Board Member Nichols on this topic. She wants to examine records from rules committee to determine what might need to be picked back up. She will work with Rules Committee chair to determine needs for action. She also will keep an eye on rules from the “new comer” perspective to see if she has suggestions or sees areas in need of clarification

Invited Guest: Dawn Hottenroth, Environmental Policy Analyst, City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services

At 10:01, Chair Olsen welcomed Dawn Hottenroth to the meeting and called for a round of introductions. Chair Olsen explained that Ms. Hottenroth contacted the Board back in March with some questions about landscape architecture practice; see e-mail exchange in packet. She asked a question of the Board related to practice, and the Chair explained that he thought it would be good idea to have her come and see if any other questions remain.

Ms. Hottenroth provided some handouts and then spoke to the Board about the EcoBiz program at City of Portland. She is the Chair for program in Portland Environmental Services Bureau. Landscape professionals and auto sectors are currently covered in the EcoBiz program - autos since 1995, landscape professionals since 2005. The program is sponsored by 7 local jurisdictions and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The DEQ now implements the auto program statewide. The Landscape Professionals program is not statewide, instead primarily is focused in the Portland Metro region. She explained that the program is trying to address overlapping policies/jurisdictions. The City developed EcoBiz to incent sustainability. Jim Furgurski (former board member) helped build the landscape portion. The City has an oversight committee with public sector and professionals. EcoBiz is a voluntary certification program for businesses. The City uses a checklist that an applicant must fill out for a certification request to be considered. Step 1 –ensure compliance with state and local regulations; OSLAB comes in here. Step 2 look at/fill out the rest of the check list. Step 3 – look at additional voluntary measures that the business can get credit for. Once a business is certified, the City helps market the business to prospective clients. The idea is to help these businesses be recognized. Also, these are sectors that city doesn't have a lot of regulatory authority over so incentives make more sense than trying to regulate.

Chair Olsen asked for clarification about how the certification program works. If a business comes to the city, doesn't it already need to have business and professional licenses to operate? Ms. Hottenroth answered yes and explained that a basic principle is that the business has to be in compliance.

Ms. Hottenroth explained the background regarding a question that first brought OSLAB to her attention regarding a new designer that did some design for a public entity on a public property and how the city thought this might have been landscape architecture work done by someone not registered with OSLAB. The designer was designing siting elements. Board members commented that that type of work requires the person to be a registered engineer or landscape architect...not a landscape contractor. Ms. Hottenroth was asked if the city of Portland has a list of firms/individuals that raise these types of questions? What role could the Board play in helping monitor this type of activity? She answered that the city deals with these matters on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Hottenroth asked the Board about the process for dealing with work done that does not comply with licensure for landscape architecture.. Most designers the city sees are working in private backyards and not siting structural elements or working on public projects. Vice Chair Van Wormer responded that on public property, a person can do conceptual design only, otherwise need to be a registered LA. For anything else, need to determine when work falls within scope of landscape contractors or LAs. Ms. Hottenroth offered that in the case that brought this up, the business has not yet been certified.

Chair Olsen expressed some confusion about the EcoBiz certification process. If I'm a LC and licensed, then why is the city asking some of the questions on the eligibility form? This seems repetitive to basic requirements to becoming a LC. Ms. Hottenroth explained that the city included a member of the LC Board in development of certification program and tried to build criteria that LC Board thought would supplement what is required to get a LC license.

The idea was to have the certification criteria be a step above although there could certainly be some replications. The checklist was designed to address areas where the LC Board felt contractors would benefit from continuing education so worked with them to highlight those areas.

Ms. Hottenroth further explained that the program relies on other groups/boards certifications and tests to set the baseline. Then the applicant requests a site visit (to 3 work sites usually), usually with DEQ and city staff along to see what they are doing well/not. If opportunity arises, they even ask the landowner about how the contractor performed on site. Chair Olsen asked about the city process if on site visits result in finding lots of problems yet the firm/individual is duly licensed. What does the city do? Ms. Hottenroth responded that the city provides guidance to them about improving performance. Most of the time the problems are not necessarily related to their contractors license but instead to local water quality or zoning concerns. Then give them a list of corrections and do a second site visit if they still want to pursue certification. At second visit, if they have not fixed, then moves into enforcement issue.

Board Member Pellitier asked how much marketing is done by the city? Ms. Hottenroth explained that the EcoBiz businesses get a lot of free press (e.g. Chinook Books, tables at events, etc.) Firms also market directly using the certification.

Board Member Pellitier next asked how does the City keep tabs on certified firms? Ms. Hottenroth explained that certification is good for 3 years. To recertify, need to meet most current checklist and have site visit again.

Board Member Pellitier inquired if the City is happy with the EcoBiz program results? Response was that the landscape professionals side is a mixed bag to date due in large part to a slow education process and limits on resources. He then asked a follow-up question - can folks get continuing education (CE) credits for any part of this? The city does not provide for CE credit at this time but is considering whether there might be future opportunities for this.

Board Member Nichols asked for a reminder about the geographic extent of participating jurisdictions? For Landscape program, Ms. Hottenroth said is the Portland Metro region. Exception is that DEQ is involved and do have a DEQ staff person working in the Willamette valley that is involved so possible to have application elsewhere in the valley. Also she noted that some firms have work going on in Portland plus other places. One example (Bend) applied because jurisdiction asked to be part of program. Nichols asked a follow-up question about whether anything is in the works to expand the program? Response was that there has been lots of discussion but only way to do that would be with DEQ \$/staff. DEQ has budget problems that preclude this at this time. The city is also focused right now on retraining to address recent turnover with DEQ staff.

Board Member Pellitier asked if the city has ever presented the EcoBiz program to the ASLA Oregon Chapter? Ms. Hottenroth said it has been a very long time, and she would consider this idea.

The Board asked if there were any closing questions and no specifics were identified. With that, Chair Olsen thanked Ms. Hottenroth for her interest in the profession of landscape architecture and for joining the Board today. He then closed this portion of the work session.

Oral Interviews

The Board was joined by 8 candidates. Chair Olsen had the candidates introduce themselves and address where they received their educations and where they work/hope to work. Then the Board members introduced themselves and explained their roles on the Board. After that, again Chair Olsen welcomed them all again and explained the Board’s approach to oral interviews. The Chair continued by welcoming them to the profession, reminded them of professional responsibilities, and stated that the Board needs their help in educating the public in importance of what LAs do. The Chair then opened the forum to the Board member questions for the candidates. A question and answer period followed. Discussion items included: roles of ASLA vs. OSLAB, registration and continuing education requirements, statute and rules, role of the Board, etc. The Board then took questions from the candidates. The one question most discussed by the Board and candidates was what is the definition of LA in comparison to other related professions and how is overlap in professions addressed. Board Members offered various perspectives on how these issues can arise and be addressed.

Vice Chair Van Wormer moved that the Board approve the 8 candidates for initial registration as LAs in Oregon. Board Member Wright seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote. All Board members voted in favor. The 8 candidates were given certificates and letters, and Board Members exchanged greetings and congratulations.

Chair Olsen adjourned the Work Session at 11:20 AM and noted that the Board would reconvene at noon for the quarterly Board meeting.

.....
QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING

At 12:05 PM, Chair Olsen reconvened the Board for the quarterly meeting.

MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Edwards moved to accept the Feb. 4, 2011 meeting minutes. Board Member Nichols seconded. Chair Olsen, hearing no further comments, called for a vote. All members voted to approve the minutes.

AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Olsen asked if there were any changes to the agenda. The following agenda amendments were discussed:

- New Items: Several Board members asked to talk about the work session about the EcoBiz program under the Agenda Item - New Business.

- Old Business: Chair Olsen mentioned that the Board needs to discuss the OSBGE & OSLAB agreement.
- The Administrator clarified that correspondence LAC 11-04-007 would be specifically addressed as part of the Agenda Item - Licensure Review Committee.
- Chair Olsen shared a new course offered in the Bend area by Mr. Fergosi, RLA.
- Board Member Pellitier asked to talk about OSLAB office space.

Chair Olsen motioned to approve the agenda with the changes and clarifications noted above. Board Member Wright seconded. There was no further discussion. All members voted to approve.

COMPLIANCE REPORT

The Board went into Executive Session at 12:17 PM to hear the Compliance Report. The Compliance Report addressed outstanding and new compliance cases. The Board also discussed two items of written advice from the AAG while in Executive Session. The Board did not make any decisions in Executive Session. The Compliance Committee was asked to keep investigating the open cases, taking necessary actions to gather information to support future Board decision-making and to report back with newly developed information at the next quarterly meeting. The Board came out of Executive Session at 12:45 PM to cover the rest of the agenda.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Budget Updates for 2009-11 Biennium. The Administrator went over budget to date and explained the addition of the last column showing balances as of end of April (since near the end of the biennium thought this would be helpful to the Board). One item under revenues show a large negative in revenue, but the Board discussed this at a previous meeting. Everything else continues to track as expected.

Chair Olsen asked if the budget information on the balance and revenue/expense sheets could show how the balances have changed since the last meeting or since the last month. The Administrator will work with the Registration Specialist on this for the next board meeting.

B. Adopt Final Budget Rule (2011-2013)

The Administrator presented the Hearings Officer report on the Budget Rule explaining that no comments were received during the comment period and that no one attended the budget hearing. She pointed the Board to the meeting packet for a copy of the final budget rule and asked for the Board to give final approval to the rule.

Vice Chair Van Wormer motioned to approve the final rule, with a 11-13 budget of \$341,035. Board Member Edwards seconded the motion. The Chair, hearing no further comments, called for a vote. All Members voted to approve the final rule as presented by the Administrator. The Administrator will attend to the rule filing process.

C. Board Member Terms/Exec. Appointments Process

Vice Chair Van Wormer mentioned that he and Board Member Stout each have one more year after this Nov. and will then have completed 2 four year terms. He asked why is this on the agenda?

Chair Olsen then gave the floor to Board Member Edwards. Edwards explained that he will not be asking for reappointment for personal reasons. The Board Members expressed their appreciation for his service and noted that he will be missed. Edwards asked what is the process when not seeking reappointment? A letter to the executive appointments office would be helpful although not mandatory. The Administrator noted that she would send Governor's Office contact information to him. After some discussion, the Board decided that it would be best if this was Edwards last meeting although he could have possibly made the August meeting. Member Edwards concurred that he was resigning as of the close of the meeting today.

The Administrator then explained the process for new appointments. She suggested that the Board start thinking about possible candidates for the now vacant public member position. She can help by providing information about the process to interested candidates and connecting them up with Governor's Office. The Governor's Office ultimately decides on the new member.

Approve Check Log: # 3553-3587 and 10092-10098

The Board reviewed the check log. Chair Olsen motioned to approve the check log with no changes. Members Edwards and Stout seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, the Chair called for a vote. All members voted to approve the check log.

Chair Olsen again clarified that he just signed letters giving the Administrator authority to sign checks up to specified limit and help manage the Board investments with Pioneer Trust and Paulson.

Note: Moved Licensure Committee Report up as Committee Chair Van Wormer had to leave at 2 PM.

LICENSURE REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Vice Chair/Committee Chair Van Wormer walked the Board through review of the standard list showing:

- Initial Registration by Examination
- Approved for LA Registration by Reciprocity (See Appendix II)
- Business Registration Update (See Appendix II)
- Inactive Registrants (See Appendix II)

The Board's attention was then drawn to issues with recent Reciprocity Applications – specifically challenges relating to qualifying work experience in terms of type of experience and timing of experience. The Board's existing rules set restrictions on what is acceptable. Vice Chair Van Wormer and the Administrator explained the issues and how the issues relate to existing rule language.

The Board reviewed correspondence from two reciprocity applicants. One applicant sent a letter specifically requesting Board review and interpretation of statute relative to registration by reciprocity. The other applicant asked via e-mail for special consideration of her request. The Board and staff discussed how credit is determined for work experience when the person is working as principal or lead LA. Also discussed was rule language that refers to experience needing to be accrued after or while sitting for the exams. Board members expressed confusion about how the rules look at reciprocity, why the standards in the rules were developed in the manner currently existing, and what standards should be for this. The Board wants to further discuss in a future work session how individuals can show they have valid experience.

For the individual that sent the subject correspondence to the Board asking for a direct statutory interpretation, the Chair wondered if the Administrator and Committee could relook at whether some option for getting his application approved had been overlooked or if there was any other way to interpret the rule to give credit for his 17 years of work as a registered LA in WA. Could we accept under the current rule work experience signed off on by a partner or colleague instead of as a supervisor? What type of alternative documentation can the Board review and accept?

For the individual that e-mailed the Board and had an issue with the timing of her work experience, the Board members were concerned about not being able to deem her work experience as sufficient. The Board wondered what the exact issue was with her credentials. The issue boiled down to one of what can the Board allow under the current rule. The rule calls for a particular sequencing of education/exams/experience.

The Board discussed that maybe stand alone requirements for reciprocity are in order instead of using the system currently set in rule that relies on requirements for initial registration. The Board believes that rule changes are likely needed to ensure the rules reflect the sensibilities of the current and future Boards.

Vice Chair Van Wormer proposed to the Board that he and the staff look at the issues again in a one hour conference call to walk back through these cases and then make a decision based on the Board input. He expressed that they would again try to find a path to making these applications work under the rules considering the candidates backgrounds. The Administrator will share and discuss findings with the Chair. As a general matter, the Board wants to better understand how the credit is given for work experience so the Committee will report back in August.

During the proposed conference call, we will also work on how to cover the approval of registration requests while Van Wormer is in China through July 5, 2011.

The Chair called for a break at 2:20 PM. Vice Chair Van Wormer had to leave the meeting at this time. The Chair reconvened the meeting at 2:30 PM, and the Board returned back to agenda as originally set forth.

Updated Renewal History

The Administrator handed out the updated renewal report (colored). The Board proceeded to discuss the data. Member Stout referenced the letter to a long-time registrant regarding his license renewal being 60 days delinquent. He thinks the Board should specially recognizing people with registration #s of 50 or less. He wants to take an extra effort to say that if they are hanging up registration, then thank you for years of service. If not, then the Board should ask if the registrant needs assistance in some way with the renewal process. After some discussion, the consensus was that this type of letter would be a good addition to practice and that the letter would be sent when a registrant with # of 50 or less has not responded to the renewal. This letter would go out as a modified 60 day letter. Chair Olsen asked the Administrator to draft a form letter for Board Chair to review. He further clarified that these letters would be signed by the Board chair when sent.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES COMMITTEE:

Member/Treasurer Nichols reported that no action is currently being considered. He has been waiting to hear more about mentorship and whether this would be an action for the rules committee to work on. (Also see discussion under licensure review committee about reciprocity.)

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

Member Stout provided a copy of the CEC report. He acknowledged that the process for presenting the report to the Board may be revised as the Committee works with the Administrator on committee procedures. For this quarterly report, a number of candidates did not meet the CE requirements. Each case and the associated Committee findings were discussed by the Board.

Member Stout moved that the report be approved as written. Chair Olsen seconded the motion. Hearing no comments, the Chair called for a vote. All members voted in favor of approving the report as written. Staff is directed to follow-up accordingly with the audited registrants.

Member Stout mentioned that this time when reviewing, the issue of CE carry over credits came up. The Board strives to be consistent from time to time and follow all rules. The rules say that a maximum of 12 PDH can be carried forward into next period if requirements of rule are met. This means an individual cannot carry more than 12 credits forward. A challenge is that people identify CE hours well beyond what is needed for the year but still can only carry over 12 to the next year.

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE:

Member/Treasurer Nichols stated there are no significant changes in the investments. He wanted to remind the Board of its \$51,000+ liability with DAS that relates to the previous, now-resolved embezzlement situation. This amount covers the 2nd & 3rd biennial payments due. He thought the amounts due might have been combined due to the 2nd payment being somehow overlooked and not made timely but would confirm with staff. He stated that the total bill to DAS was around \$75,000. The relation of this to the Investment Committee is

only to say that while investments have only been bringing in modest interest, the Board has sufficient funds in the bank to pay for this obligation.

The Board briefly again looked at the Balance Sheets. Chair Olsen again brought up that he would like a reference to how have the balances changed, either since the last meeting or since the last month. The idea is to have a quick reference showing how the finances are doing on a month-to-month basis.

OTHER:

1. Report from Liaison to Oregon Board Architect Examiners

Chair Olsen reminded the Board that they had discussed the Architects - OSBEELS taskforce. See notes from Wilson in last meeting notes. Chair will follow up with the OSBEELS to make sure OSLAB is included in the process to prepare the next round of updates to the Reference Manual for Building Officials.

2. Report from Liaison to Oregon Landscape Contractors Board

Member Pellitier stated that he is amazed at how much work they are doing on rules and statutory issues. The LC board seems to constantly be updating definitions and other aspects of the rules. He is constantly deluged with information to review. He would appreciate having the Administrator also tracking the rule and statutory issues.

Members discussed what might be driving all this work. Member Pellitier said there appears to just be a constant list of emerging issues and input from their registrants resulting in a reiterating and revising rules. But in all this, he is not seeing them doing work around “planning” and issues of professional overlap between contractors and LAs.

Member Pellitier also pointed out that the LC Board was even seeking multiple changes in statute, and the Board members discussed the pros and cons of trying to address statutory changes for OSLAB. Vice Chair Van Wormer referred to the 1982 sun-setting of OSLAB. After that, the LC authority changed from plant and install to plan and install. Everyone says this language was inadvertently changed from plant and install to plan and install, but the revised language which suggests a broader scope of practice remains what the LC Board works from. The Board concluded that it was not ready to pursue any legislative initiatives. The Board is interested in looking for outreach events to share information about the landscape architect profession, such as the Day at the Capitol mentioned by Chair Olsen.

CORRESPONDENCE

LAC 11 03 034, Oregon Board Architect Examiners 3/7/2011 Letter

(re: naming of businesses registering with OSLAB). The Board briefly discussed this letter and directed the Administrator to send a letter on behalf of the Board. The letter should indicate that OSLAB will look at its policy and processes regarding business registration for opportunities to better coordinate with and consider the concerns of OBAE. Chair Olsen noted that he was surprised to see that a LA would name their business in the manner described.

OLD BUSINESS

Action List

The Chair briefly went through the updated action list. This was previously distributed to all.

The Chair will work on tracking the update process for the Building Officials guide, as indicated previously.

The newsletter is back on track with the Administrator post filled. Ideas for newsletter articles were solicited. Chair Olsen stated that the idea of adding an exam about local plant knowledge would be put on the August agenda as a discussion item. That discussion may ultimately lead to an article for a future newsletter. Member Wright reminded the Board about the Compliance Update piece she prepared for use in future newsletters or for posting on the website.

Chair Olsen attended the CLARB meeting in Denver and while there met with the AK about their mentoring program. AK has a mentoring program that require 4 years of quarterly face-to-face meetings with LA, keeping forms that the LA must complete and sign, etc. The Chair is also going to look into WA's mentoring program. One key question is how do you give credit for mentoring work products without violating the ORS addressing working without registration? There are still many questions. The Administrator reported that only one comment came in from the registrant community based on the recent newsletter article about the Board considering a mentoring program. The Board still cannot answer the question of whether to develop a mentoring program. Further research and discussion will be required. This will be added as a discussion item for the August meeting.

Invitation to ASLA Section Chair. Chair Olsen indicated he did not get to this. The Administrator reported that she recently sent an inquiry to the ASLA OR Chapter President, incoming president, and past president per the Chair's request to invite ASLA to an upcoming meeting. The Administrator also discussed this idea with Andy Lesinger, RLA and ASLA OR representative to OSLAB. He mentioned that the ASLA folks would discuss at the May 9 ASLA Executive Committee meeting. If possible, we will set up an outreach event as part of the August or November 2011 work session.

Rules The Board confirmed that new ideas for rules related to reciprocity are in order based on the discussion about reciprocity applications earlier in the meeting. Still too premature to develop rules on mentoring. Other rules on action list have been completed.

Biennial Report - not discussed

Bylaws - discussed earlier in work session. Proposal for how to move this forward will be presented by the Administrator at the August meeting. As discussed during work session, the administrator will bring a list of options back and have the Board consider what the priorities are for first action.

Future of the OSLAB Newsletter & Associated Training

The Board discussed how to improve the newsletter. The Board is supportive of new software and training. All discussed various possibilities and the Administrator was given

support for trying the Microsoft Publisher/Adobe Acrobat Professional approach, i.e. purchase software, obtain training, use tools and techniques obtained to redesign/revamp the newsletter. The Administrator asked about what the Board wants as the masthead/logo? Members then discussed how the Board would like to better reflect the design side of the profession. Member Wright suggested a newsletter article asking for design input. Chair Olsen suggested that maybe OSLAB should run a design competition to create a masthead and logo. Member Stout mentioned that the ASLA Oregon Chapter has a good looking newsletter. He will forward a recent e-mail with link to the Administrator. He wondered if we could get graphics from national ASLA.

NEW BUSINESS

LARE Changes: The Administrator reviewed information from CLARB about potential changes to Section C & E Exams. She will keep the Board updated as information develops.

Board Participation at LOC/AOC Conferences (Attendance?)

Should the Board have any attendance? Member Wright offered that she had attended for OSLAB before. Her view is that for the amount of time spent, not a lot of people were reached. She was available to talk with locals in a roundtable format but overall was left with the impression that this event was more something for ASLA Chapter Chairs instead of OSLAB. Chair Olsen asked if OSLAB could set up a kiosk? She said yes this is an option but would need to develop materials to be handed out and that it might be better for ASLA to be there to talk about the profession. The Board considered options for participating and in the end was leaning away from attending either LOC or AOC but did not take a formal vote.

Update on REACH Code/Construction Industry Energy Board

Chair Olsen decided to hold any detailed discussion until the next meeting. The Administrator just gave a brief overview, explaining that Building Codes Division staff wants to make sure Board is aware of the proposed REACH code. The Board asked the Administrator to keep getting information on this from BCD and to report back to the Board at the next meeting.

New Items Added

Office Space: Member Pellitier shared that he is concerned about getting office space that has windows. If something opens up in the building, see if the office can be moved. He encouraged the Administrator to ask about other space in the building.

Agreement with OSBGE for Interagency Services:

Chair Olsen stated that the March 1 deadline to extend via verbal agreement between the Chairs of OSLAB and OSBGE was met. OSLAB was concerned about how the recruitment process went but is OK with the end results so perhaps best to just leave this issue aside. Chair Olsen asked the Administrator to check in with OSBGE Chair Taylor to see if we need a new agreement. He asked to have Chair Taylor contact him.

Portland EcoBiz:

The Board had a brief follow-up discussion regarding the morning work session. The Board decided to not pursue further outreach with this program at this time.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

LARE Section C & E, June 13, 14 respectively (Need proctors!)
Member Wright for 13th. Members Stout and Olsen as maybes for 14th.

SIBA Meetings: May 17, 2011, July 19, 2011, Sept. 20, 2011
(Sept. hosted by OSLAB) - Just informational

2011 Legislative Session Deadlines: (May 23/June 1/160 Days) - just information

OSLAB Newsletter, June 30 (Assignments?) – only article discussed was design contest idea plus adding in the new compliance chart prepared by Member Wright

Next OSLAB Board Meeting, August 12, 2011 (Member Wright reported that she will likely be on vacation but will submit the Compliance Report. Member Edwards has resigned and thus will not be present. If all others attend, the Board will still have a quorum.)

CLARB Annual Meeting: Sept. 15-17 in Chicago (Attendance?) – Did not discuss/will take up in August.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Olsen at 4:05 PM.

+++++

Respectfully Submitted,
Christine Valentine, Administrator



The minutes of the May 13, 2011 work session and quarterly meeting were approved as presented (i.e., without revisions) at the August 12, 2011 Board meeting.
Christine Valentine, Administrator

