

# OREGON STATE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT BOARD (OSLAB) MEETING MINUTES

August 12, 2011

The Association Center, 707 13<sup>th</sup> St. SE, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, "OCAPA" Office Conference Room

## Members Present

David Olsen, RLA, Chair  
Mel Stout, RLA  
John Pellitier, RLA  
Ron Nichols, Public Member

## Members Absent

Tim Van Wormer, RLA, Vice Chair (illness)  
Susan Wright, Public Member (vacation)  
Public Member (vacancy)

## Guests Present:

Jim Hencke, President, OR ASLA  
Nicole Ankeny, Co-Chair, OR ASLA Willamette Section  
Marina Wrensch, Co-Chair, OR ASLA Willamette Section  
Jonathan Dykhuizen, Oral Interview Candidate  
Maria Cahill, Public Visitor

## WORK SESSION

### **Convene Meeting/Agenda Review**

Chair Olsen opened the meeting at 9:05 AM. No changes were made to the agenda. Clarification was provided by the Administrator regarding expected attendance for the OSLAB – OR ASLA work session scheduled for 9:30 AM.

### **Registration by Reciprocity/Related Rule Updates**

Chair Olsen kicked off the discussion by recapping the discussion the Board had in May about requirements for registration by reciprocity, the applications that the Board considered then, and the related issue of whether Oregon should consider some kind of mentorship program. He reminded the Board that the requirement for supervised work experience was one of the problem areas. He summarized his research into mentorship programs stating that only Alaska appears to have one at this time. WA did at one time but ended the program in the late 1990s.

Administrator Valentine explained that the Board had not specifically talked at the May meeting about the reciprocity issues being dealt with through rulemaking. She explained how discussions in the Licensure Review Committee and with the AAG lead to the decision to develop rule revisions. She worked with the Vice Chair Van Wormer to develop the draft rules in the Board meeting packet. Board Member/Rules Committee Chair Nichols is gathering input from the Rules Committee on the proposed rules. She stated that the current rule doesn't offer much flexibility; the proposed rule changes are intended to increase flexibility and better recognize valid work experience that can be documented by applicants. The current rule requires work verification from a supervisor, and this work experience often occurs early in a person's career. She also explained that the current rules do

not give the Board the ability to accept other work experience documentation on a case-by-case. The Board asked if the applications considered at the May meeting were anomalies or is the requirement for supervised work experience a common problem for applicants? The Administrator explained that the registration specialist has a file of applications that could not be approved, and some of these were caught up in the work experience requirement.

The Board was curious about how many other states have less stringent requirements? Administrator Valentine said she would need to research this and may be able to pull this information through CLARB. The Board Chair noted that based on his research Oregon would be alone with AK on having a mentorship program if in fact the Board were to pursue this.

Another question from the Board was does CLARB equalize registration requirements among states? The Administrator stated that CLARB doesn't control state requirements but helps individuals' document education and experience through CLARB record and encourages cross pollination among state boards.

A side conversation was spurred about the CLARB exams and whether there is an issue with obtaining verification of passing exam scores when it comes to reciprocity applications. The Board discussed and clarified that current registration requirements look at exams, education, and work experience. Administrator Valentine explained that receiving verification of exam scores and education is pretty straight forward. The challenges almost always lie with verifying work experience as required by the current rule.

No further comments from the Board were provided, and no action was taken by the Board on the rule. The Rules Committee process will continue and a revised rule will most likely be brought to the Board for further review and possible approval in November.

#### **Invited Guests: ASLA Oregon Chapter**

The Administrator passed out a list of possible discussion topics for the session with OR ASLA and explained that these topics came out of e-mail exchanges with the OR ASLA president and Board Chair.

At 9:30 AM, Chair Olsen welcomed two OR ASLA representatives - Nicole Ankeny and Marina Wrench, co-chairs for the Willamette Valley section. They explained that the Willamette Valley section has about 31 active members. There are more active members in the Mt. Hood section which encompasses Portland and also some in the Bend section. The Crater Lake section is currently inactive. The Administrator opened the teleconference line at this time also; James Hencke joined by phone at around 10:00 AM. No other ASLA representatives were present in person or by phone for this work session discussion.

Chair Olsen and Administrator recapped where the discussion items came from and welcomed other discussion topics. The Board and its guests decided to start with the following topics on the prepared list:

*Opportunities for OR ASLA to contribute information for OSLAB quarterly newsletters and for OSLAB to share information with OR ASLA members*

OSLAB stated that it does welcome guest articles or other input that would benefit RLAs for inclusion in its quarterly newsletter. The Board is also interested in volunteers for design help (logo, etc.) to improve the appearance of the newsletter.

The group discussed the idea of whether the OSLAB newsletter should move to only an e-version. The Administrator discussed how the newsletter is largely transitioned to e-format already in that most recipients receive it via e-mail with back up posting of all newsletters on the website. The Board agreed this transition makes sense and may provide more flexibility in what is contained in future newsletters.

The Board encouraged OR ASLA representatives to share information with its members via its outreach efforts, for example if they see something in an OSLAB newsletter or web posting that would be of broad interest. The Board asked if OR ASLA would include information at the request of the OSLAB office. OR ASLA representatives thought this was feasible. OR ASLA will also share its monthly newsletter schedule, and this will give the Board an opportunity to ask for information to be posted.

The discussion also touched on what is role of OSLAB – just to regulate or to regulate but also promote the importance of the profession? Considering this, what is the appropriate level of interaction between OSLAB and OR ASLA and what are the respective roles? The Board suggested that it regulates and helps define the profession while ASLA brands/markets the profession. The group agreed that there should be opportunities to partner in these roles. The group briefly discussed how OSLAB and OR ASLA have traditionally not worked closely on outreach but that an enhanced partnership might be beneficial for both. All seemed to agree that partnering on how to speak about and share information on the importance of landscape architecture could be valuable to registrants. The Board could explain the profession and the value it brings to Oregonians, but OR ASLA is best suited to market and brand the profession.

Board members talked about how there is always work for the Board to do with statutes, rules, bylaws, code of conduct, policies, etc. The profession evolves and the Board needs to react. The Board needs to get feedback from registrants to keep up with the profession. ASLA OR can help as the member organization for RLAs, working in a partnership with the Board to encourage ASLA OR members to share ideas/issues in the field. The Board is small with minimal staffing and likely will benefit from having ASLA assistance in this regard. ASLA members can help the Board understand how practices are evolving and what this might mean for OSLAB regulation of the profession. The group also discussed that for a true partnership to develop, information needs to flow in both directions. An example was presented of when OR ASLA may need to ask for Board assistance; sometimes things come up with local codes where it would be helpful to have the Board weigh in on changes re: what RLAs can and cannot do.

*Need for and possible collaboration on an “Emerging Professionals” email list or related outreach to those aspiring to become RLAs in Oregon.*

The Board asked the OR ALSA representatives to explain the proposal. The OR ASLA has been developing an e-mail list and loosely defines emerging professionals as those with 1 to 5 years work experience. Most would not yet be registered with the Board. OR ASLA is trying to put together an e-mail list so that this group can be provided with newsletters and other pertinent information. As part of this outreach, OR ASLA wants to help the emerging professionals understand how the OSLAB registration process works and what it takes to be registered with the Board. The Board is supportive of making sure this audience receives information about OSLAB.

Chair Olsen asked the Administrator to research whether OSLAB sends its newsletters to universities within 600 mile radius. He suggested that maybe OSLAB should make sure newsletters are going to regional universities.

The Administrator suggested that OR ASLA maintain the emerging professionals e-mail list and then can forward information, including newsletters, to the list. This would be the most streamlined option instead of OSLAB and OR ASLA each trying to maintain this list over time.

*Continuing education/PDH credits – audits, approvals of courses/programs, etc*

The OR ASLA referenced a recently article in the OSLAB newsletter about the issue of carryover credits. OR ASLA received feedback from a number of members. OSLAB also has been receiving feedback. OR ASLA asks the Board to maintain flexibility. For example, the carryover allowance is important to those with sporadic ability to attend workshops and events. Some opportunities are only offered every other year. Sometimes a lot of good opportunities come up in one year but not so much in another year. From a business standpoint, carryover also makes sense – if an RLA is having a busy year, he/she may not have as much time for completing PDH that year. Also, business times are challenging and anything the Board can do to be accommodating of what RLAs are facing is encouraged.

Board Member/Continuing Education Committee (CEC) Chair Stout stated that he understands the concerns and generally agrees with the comments. He is OK with the Board keeping the PDH carryover provision. The Board was just kicking around a preliminary idea and the responses received help a lot. Chair Olsen mentioned that the Board may still look at doing away with carryover for those with 25+ years experience since for these RLAs only 4 PDH are required per year.

OR ASLA representatives explained that they get a lot of questions about the OSLAB audits and asked what they can do to help people understand the requirements and process. The Board members briefly discussed the evolution of the audit process. The group brainstormed about possible ways to conduct joint outreach about audits/CEC requirements. OR ASLA representatives mentioned that at one point OSLAB staff came down and explained the process to ASLA members and this could be one option going forward. The group discussed how perhaps there could be a joint effort of some sort to create examples of good documentation for each type of PDH allowed under rule. These examples could then be posted on website. Board staff could also come to ASLA meetings to present, but this may not enough individuals and would be less efficient. The Board was supportive of exploring this idea further, and Chair Olsen charged Board Member/CEC Chair Stout with looking into this further. There would need to be examination of all the types of PDH documentation allowed under the rules to determine what types are most common and thus perhaps in most need of examples.

The Board discussed how OR ASLA might also be able to help explain the need for RLAs to send in consolidated information. RLAs need to understand that their submittals need to be complete but can be concise. The Board members discussed how audit submittals should not require the Board staff or Board members to go look this information up on the internet. The documentation submitted needs to be complete, clear, and germane. The Board members stressed that the key is for people to be upfront and provide credible documentation. There will always be some gray areas, but the Board strives to be reasonable in the audit reviews. The Board and its CEC are not out to get registrants.

OR ASLA then asked to discuss specific questions about PDH credit for teaching. Can a RLA obtain credit for putting together a special session for students? Or how about for those that teach at UO or community colleges? What about ASLA workshops? What about adjunct professors – may work part-time in another job but then working rest of the time as teacher? Board Member/CEC Chair Stout and Board Chair Olsen responded. They explained that OSLAB looks at the appropriateness of the course/topic and whether it was formally organized (i.e., presentation put together, attendance taken, etc.) The Board has drawn a line when teaching is a RLA's full time profession. The Board does not give a RLA credit for just doing his/her teaching day job since other RLAs don't get credit for just doing their regular day jobs. If an RLA does a session or teaches a special course at a conference in a

manner that is outside what is normally his/her job, then the RLA can likely get credit for this. RLAs can also get credit for travel that is related to the profession if the person makes the case. RLAs can also get credit for public outreach work by submitting an essay about what was learned, how the profession benefits, etc.

*Outreach to Oregon Cities and Counties (League of Oregon Cities, Association of Oregon Counties)*

Chair Olsen stated that the Board and OR ASLA do need to remember that not all ASLA members are RLAs, and not all RLAs are members of ASLA. The Board and OR ASLA may need to consider other outreach venues. One opportunity might be to partner in some way at the annual League of Oregon Cities conference. Should ASLA and OSLAB co-sponsor? Board discussed at May meeting but did not make a final decision about participation in or support for ASLA participation in this conference. ASLA Bend has been talking about LOC as an opportunity since the conference is in Bend this year. Can ASLA take the lead and OSLAB provide some support? Administrator Valentine provided background information on the conference to the OR ASLA representatives and explained that the conference does include a “trade show” portion for part of the time. LOC can provide information on obtaining a display space. Chair Olsen asked if OR ASLA has display materials already in its possession that portray the profession. OR ASLA has some from design award programs (i.e., showcases of projects) but may not have other materials that are ready to go. Each section may have items created for other events, for example Willamette Valley has a banner plus some project examples that were used at a local event last year. Chair Olsen said that maybe the Board could come up with a one-page handout about local government use of RLAs. OR ASLA suggested also a Board piece on how to become a RLA. OR ASLA representatives will check with the Executive Board about this idea.

The group discussed another conference that might provide an outreach opportunity - the Oregon Recreation and Parks Association conference. That organization is holding its meeting in Bend this fall also, one week before the LOC conference. There was discussion about participation at ORPA perhaps being less valuable than attendance at LOC.

OR ASLA representatives mentioned that the organization has a new public awareness advocate. She is located over in Bend area; they will talk with her about the conferences. Board members inquired about the role of the public awareness advocate. OR ASLA representatives explained that the national organization put this new effort in place as a result of feedback from membership about the need to educate the public about the profession. Every chapter was asked to find a volunteer who would act as an advocate. Robin George Valdy (USFS) was selected to serve in this role. She is not part of ASLA Chapter Executive Committee but is getting training and acting in this capacity for the Oregon Chapter. The first big event is August 17. On that day at noon, members are being asked to hold events over lunch hour to explain what they do. The program is evolving as it is so new. OR ASLA representatives thought it would be important for the public awareness advocate to have some connection to the Board. She could be talking about the regulation of the profession as well as what the profession does. She could also explain that RLAs contribute to HSW. The Board stated that it would welcome this person to attend a future board meeting and generally encouraged cross communication.

The Board Chair asked for any other discussion items. No additional items were identified by OR ASLA representatives or Board members. In closing, Chair Olsen did ask for help in sharing the news about OSLAB public member vacancy.

The Board took a ten minute break at approximately 10:55 AM.

### **Oral Interviews (1)**

Shortly after 11 AM, the Board was joined by oral interview candidate John Dykhuizen. Chair Olsen explained that this is his last step in becoming a RLA and stated that the oral interview is mostly about welcoming you to the profession. The Board members asked a standard batch of questions. The Chair then opened the forum to the Board member questions for the candidate. After this question and answer period that covered topics such as registration and continuing education requirements, statute and rules, role of the Board, etc, the Board took questions from the candidate.

*Chair Olsen moved that the Board approve the candidate for initial registration as a RLA in Oregon. Board Member Pellitier seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote. All approved. The candidate was given his certificate/letter, and Board Members exchanged greetings and congratulations.*

The oral interview ended around 11:30 AM with the Chair presenting the certificate of registration to Mr. Dykhuizen.

The Board took a break to allow Board members and staff to grab lunch and return for a working lunch and the beginning of the quarterly Board meeting.

## **QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING**

At approximately 11:40 AM, Chair Olsen reconvened the Board for the quarterly meeting.

### **MEETING MINUTES:**

Chair Olsen stated that the Board needs to review and act on minutes of the May 13, 2011 Work Session/Meeting. Administrator Valentine confirmed that comments received from Board members are incorporated. She also asked for feedback on the scope of the meeting minutes, as these were her first prepared since starting work as Administrator. The Board indicated that the Administrator needs to meet public records requirements for meetings and beyond that should consider adding as much detail as time allows.

*Board Member Nichols made a motion to accept the draft minutes as written. Board Member Stout seconded the motion. Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

### **COMPLIANCE REPORT**

*Wright*

#### **a. Review/Action on outstanding and new compliance cases**

Administrator Valentine explained that she will go over the compliance cases per the request of Board Member/Compliance Committee Chair Wright, who could not attend the meeting, and Chair Olsen. She referred the Board members to the compliance case information in the meeting packet, including a log of cases and investigatory information organized by case number. Chair Olsen then announced at approximately 12:00 PM that the Board was entering Executive Session to discuss outstanding and new compliance cases. The Board came out of Executive Session at approximately 1:15 PM and made the following decisions regarding open compliance cases.

11-06-019: No Board action. Compliance Committee to continue with investigation.

11-05-018: Board Member Pellitier moved to close the case with a letter to the City acknowledging their response of bringing a RLA on to the project. The motion also called for a letter to the Landscape Contractors Board thanking them for cooperation with the investigation. Board Member Nichols seconded the motion. Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.

11-04-017: No Board action. Compliance Committee to continue with investigation.

11-03-016: Board Member Stout moved to close the case with an outreach letter. The letter will notify the individual that he is responsible if similar advertisements occur in the future and that the Board will take further compliance action if it sees similar advertisements for this business in the future. Board Member Pellitier seconded. Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.

11-02-015: Chair Olsen moved to close the case with an outreach letter. The letter will notify the individual that he is responsible if similar advertisements occur in the future. The letter will explain that the Board will take further compliance action if it sees a similar advertisement in the next phone book. Board Member Nichols seconded. Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.

10-10-014: No Board action. Compliance Committee to continue with investigation.

09-11-005: No Board action. Compliance Committee to keep Board apprised of developments in the case.

The Board also instructed the Administrator to work with the Compliance Chair to open a new investigation against a landscape contracting company that appears to be offering landscape architecture services. This case is assigned as LACC #11-08-001; it is the first case of the 11-13 biennium.

*b. Compliance Process*

Discussion about the compliance process in general was shelved until the next meeting since Board Member/Compliance Committee Chair Wright could not be present for this meeting and is expected to have valuable contributions to make to this discussion.

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**

*Valentine*

*a. Administrators Report*

The Administrators report included updates on contracts, purchases, reports, office administration, training, etc. The Administrator went over the written report that was included in the Board meeting packet. She asked Board members if they had particular questions or topics they wanted her to address in more detail. In response, she spent some time covering the computer upgrade/contract issues and the financial review contract proposed.

b. Budget Updates: Totals for 2009-11 Biennium, Status for 2011-2013 Biennium

The Board reviewed the information contained in the packet. Chair Olsen is pleased with the changes made to the report as this makes comparisons over time more straightforward. He thanked staff for the amended report form.

c. Approve check log: # 3588 – 3621 and #10099-10105

The Board took a few minutes to review the check log and did not have any questions. *Chair Olsen motioned to approve the log. Board Member Stout seconded the motion. Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

d. Updated Renewal History

The Board reviewed the information contained in the packet and did not have any questions.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

The Board was joined by a public member at approximately 2 PM. Ms. Maria Cahill asked to speak with the Board about her business, a sole proprietorship Green Girl Land Development Solutions. She wanted to assure the Board that she wants to work cooperatively. She explained her professional background and the purpose of her business in providing sustainability information with clients. Her first client was a RLA; see reference in her letter to the Board. GreenGirl serves as a resource on sustainability practices and has worked for RLAs on projects. The GreenGirl business model has two arms: (1) outreach/education/technical assistance on the general topic of sustainability, where work is not project specific and clients include non-profits, OSU extension, local governments, watershed councils, and others and (2) construction related assistance on sustainability, where work involves project based mentoring for construction project teams, providing site specific information for particular projects in support of construction plans and permits. Under (2), she always works with licensed/registered professionals that take her information and apply to final plans/specs as they see fit. GreenGirl often provides a series of ideas/recommendations and then the professionals and project proponents decide on what to select and prepare the final plans and specifications. She takes great pains to make sure others do not think she is a licensed engineer or RLA. In closing, Ms. Cahill thanked the Board for allowing her to explain what she does with her business and how she works with RLAs. She stated that she believes her company and Board have same goals in terms of protecting the public. She also provided an 11X17 copy of the plan that was previously sent to the Board in 8.5 X 11 size.

Chair Olsen and other members of the Board thanked Ms. Cahill for joining the Board. The Chair explained that a complaint has come in and is being processed. The Board has to follow due process. It meets quarterly, with a Compliance Committee that works on investigations in between meetings. Special meetings of the Board can be called if necessary. Ms. Cahill stressed she wants to move forward in a legal manner. She does have a “burning question” about whether she can close a pending contractual relationship with DEQ on the canopy project. This contract is on hold, but she needs to make a decision soon. Project partners would like to build next summer, and she needs to know if she can be part of the project. She briefly explained that the project is a DEQ-funded nonpoint source project to retrofit parking lots with stormwater management and/or tree canopy.

At approximately 2:10 PM, the public visitor left the meeting. The Board then convened into Executive Session to consider information related to a compliance case. The Executive

Session lasted until approximately 2:40 PM. No further action was taken by the Board with regard to compliance cases during Executive Session or upon returning to public session.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

a. ***ADMINISTRATIVE RULES COMMITTEE*** (*Nichols*)

The Administrator explained where comments on various rule ideas were located in the packet. Board Member/Committee Chair Nichols explained that the Rules Committee is currently looking at the reciprocity rule. This rule was discussed in the AM work session, and there is nothing further to report.

b. ***CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE*** (*Stout*)

Board Member/Committee Chair Stout summarized the one page report from CEC. He commented that the audits were rather straightforward this time. The CEC recommends approval of four current audits and two follow-up audits (from May meeting).

*Chair Olsen made a motion to approve the CEC report. Board Member Nichols seconded the motion. Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

Board Member/Committee Chair Stout then explained how the committee process has been under discussion. We have been looking at changing the committee to be a committee of one. The CEC makes recommendations on behalf of the Board, and a committee of two raises concerns that it could be a “governing” body and thus subject to public notice, etc. under the Public Meetings Law. All agreed to changing the Committee to have one Board member. That member, for now, will be Stout.

c. ***INVESTMENT COMMITTEE*** (*Nichols*)

Board Member/Committee Chair Nichols reminded the Board that a CD will be cashed out soon to pay the next installment of DAS risk management bill. The Administrator confirmed that this will happen in September.

The Board also briefly discussed the status of its CDs with Pioneer Trust Bank. The Administrator confirmed that CDs + interest are automatically reinvested into new 18 month CDs when they come to maturation.

d. ***LICENSURE REVIEW COMMITTEE*** (*Van Wormer*)

- i. Initial Registration by Examination
- ii. Approved for LA Registration by Reciprocity (See Appendix II )
- iii. Business Registration Update (See Appendix II)
- iv. Inactive Registrants (See Appendix II)
- v. Issues with Reciprocity Applications – Work Experience Type/Timing

Vice Chair/Committee Chair Van Wormer was not in attendance and therefore Chair Olsen and Administrator Valentine presented the information. The Board went over the report, including two requests for Board review - one application for reciprocity and one regarding inactive/retirement status. These requests were addressed under correspondence (see below).

e. **OTHER:**

**vi. Report from Liaison to Oregon Board Architect Examiners (Olsen)**

Chair Olsen reported that he had nothing new to share with the Board.

**vii. Report from Liaison to Oregon Landscape Contractors Board (Pellitier)**

Board Member Pellitier reported that he had nothing new to share with the Board. He noted that OLCB always seem to be working on rules.

## CORRESPONDENCE

a. Request for "Retirement" List

The Board reviewed the request. The Administrator explained that this RLA has been notified of the steps necessary to be placed on the inactive list. He wants to be on an inactive or "retirement" list but does not want to pay the fees as outlined by staff. The Board directed staff to stay within the rules. The Board does not have a "retirement" list, only the inactive list. Staff has already explained how this RLA can get on the inactive list.

b. Response to LAC 11 03 034, Oregon Board Architect Examiners 3/7/2011 Letter

The Administrator pointed the Board to the copy of the letter in the packet and reminded the Board about the request from OBAE that was discussed in May. This is the letter that the Board directed the Administrator to prepare. Chair Olsen assisted by reviewing the draft letter and discussing the issues with the Administrator. The Administrator explained that OBAE has provided some information about the OBAE business registration requirements, i.e. statutory language, rules, and policies.

c. Form Letter – Delinquent Registration for RLA #<50

The Administrator presented the form letter and reminded the Board that this letter was crafted based on a request made of staff at the May meeting. The letter has not been used as of yet. Board member comments are welcome. None were offered at this time.

d. Reciprocity Application – Request to Use W-2s as Work Verification

The Board reviewed the information contained in the meeting packet about this application, including the request from the applicant to use W2s in lieu of signed employment verification from an RLA supervisor. The applicant is unable to obtain the signed verification due to the refusal of her last RLA supervisor to sign the form.

The Board was unclear about whether this individual had enough supervised work experience to meet the requirements and asked for staff to re-evaluate. The Administrator stated that she was confident the registration specialist and Licensure Review Committee Chair had calculated correctly but could not explain all the notes on the application summary form so agreed that a double check was prudent. The Board Chair also asked staff to check the Florida law to see what was required for this applicant to take the exam and become registered in that state. If in the end the applicant does not have enough supervised work experience, then the Board decided that it would not accept W-2s in lieu of signed work verification.

## OLD BUSINESS

a. Action List Updates

Van Wormer

The Administrator addressed this agenda item, explaining that she failed to update the action list but will take ownership of this for future meetings. She has discussed this with Vice Chair Van Wormer. She will likely change the format a bit compared to the last action list created.

b. Board Member Terms/Exec. Appointments Process

Valentine

The Board discussed the need to find potential applicants and encourage them to get applications into the Governor's Office. The Board briefly discussed what characteristics might make someone a good fit for the public member of this Board. All Board members agreed about the importance of working to find people that might be interested in serving. The Administrator stated that she is happy to follow-up with anyone that a Board Member thinks might be a good candidate.

c. Bylaws/Policies-Procedures Update

Valentine

The Administrator presented the draft bylaws contained in the meeting packet and summarized the types of changes made to the document. Her focus has been on creating a document that will be a good primer for Board members and outside interested parties as to how the Board functions. When the Board public member position is filled, this will present a good test case to see if the bylaws are helpful. She suggested that the bylaws be considered a working document so the Board could continue to evolve the document to address experience using the bylaws.

The Administrator also provided an update on her work to inventory, examine, and assess Board policies and procedures. She explained that this project has turned out to be more time intensive than she had anticipated. She suggested the following priorities for development/refinement of policies and procedures and indicated that she would keep plugging away at this process:

- Financial system/processes
- Rulemaking
- Contracting
- Purchasing
- Records Retention
- Compliance
- Registration Processing

d. Materials Addressing Pending Changes to LARE

Valentine

The Board reviewed the CLARB information contained in the packet. Staff will include an article on the LARE changes in the next OSLAB newsletter.

e. Exam for Local Plant Knowledge

Chair Olsen

Chair Olsen stated that he has nothing to present at this time. He asked that this agenda item be carried over to the next meeting.

f. Mentoring Programs: Alaska, Washington, etc. *Chair Olsen*  
Chair Olsen referred to the overview provided in AM as part of the work session on rules. He recapped that Alaska has a mentoring program, Washington had but did away with its program, and that he has not found this type of program in any other state.

g. REACH Code/Construction Industry Energy Board Update *Valentine*  
The Administrator summarized what she knows about the adoption of the voluntary REACH code. The provisions that the Building Codes division staff highlighted as of possible interest to OSLAB appear to have so far not been adopted as part of the REACH code. The Administrator will continue to track this project.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

a. Building Officials Guide – OSLAB Input *Chair Olsen*  
Chair Olsen led a discussion about whether OSLAB should ask for OBAE and OSBEELS to include information about landscape architecture in the next edition of the guide. The Board was interested in seeing information included so the conversation switched to what should OSLAB propose for the guide? The Administrator mentioned her first attempt at writing up an explanation of landscape architecture, i.e. the draft in the Board meeting packet. Chair Olsen explained that he would like to see something more extensive and offered to take a second swing at this. He will send what he drafts to Board Member Pellitier for his critique. They will loop back to Administrator so that she can package the proposal for OBAE. The Administrator explained to the Board that the deadline given to us by OBAE is two weeks before its Oct. 28<sup>th</sup> board meeting (i.e., Oct. 14). This means that the work of Chair Olsen and Member Pellitier needs to be to the Administrator around to the beginning of October.

b. Election of Board Officers *Chair Olsen*  
Administrator Valentine put this on the agenda after noticing language in the administrative rules stating that the Board may elect officers the first meeting after July 1 of any given year. The Board discussed whether any change in officers is prudent or necessary at this time. The Board is not going to make any changes now.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Chair Olsen/All*

- SIBA Meeting on Sept. 20, hosted by OSLAB/OSBGE  
The Administrator informed the Board that she would be hosting the next meeting on behalf of OSLAB/OSBGE. No further discussion about this occurred.
- OSLAB Newsletter, Summer Issue Out/Fall Issue Pending (Ideas? Assignments?)  
Board noted but did not discuss.
- CLARB Annual Meeting Set: Sept. 15-17 in Chicago (Attendance?)  
The Board encouraged the Administrator to attend given that she is new to the Board and LA profession. Chair Olsen also has some interest in the meeting. He asked the Administrator to send an e-mail out next week to the 4 RLAs on the Board to confirm who is and isn't interested in attending the meeting.

- Next OSLAB Board Meeting, **November 18, 2011**  
Board noted but did not discuss.

**Chair Olsen adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:35 PM.**

+++++

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Christine Valentine,  
Administrator**

The minutes of the August 12, 2011 work session and quarterly meeting were approved as presented at the November 18, 2011 Board meeting.

Christine Valentine,  
Administrator