

MINUTES OF OSLAB SPECIAL TELEPHONE MEETING

March 12, 2008

The telephone meeting was called to order at 12:00 PM by *Chair Timothy Van Wormer*. Oral roll call was taken and the following members were present:

VIA TELEPHONE

Robert Edwards, Public Member
David Olsen, Landscape Architect
John Pellitier, Landscape Architect
Mel Stout, Landscape Architect
Susan Wright, Public Member
Timothy Van Wormer, Landscape Architect, Board Chair

AT THE BOARD OFFICE

Ron Nichols, Public Member
Susanna Knight, Administrator

GUESTS

None present

Van Wormer read through the four agenda items and asked if there were any additions to the agenda. *Stout* moved to approve the agenda. Seconded and passed. *Edwards*, yes; *Nichols*, yes; *Olsen*; yes; *Pellitier*, yes; *Stout*, yes; *Wright*, yes; *Van Wormer*, yes.

1. **DISCUSSION ON EMERITUS REGISTRATION:** *Edwards* reported to the Board on his findings regarding the current registration status Emeritus. Based on reading the current statutes and rules, *Edwards* recommended that the Board not seek a statutory change for purposes of adding Emeritus. The Board is empowered in ORS 671.316(4) to establish an inactive registration, and Emeritus is an inactive status for a Landscape Architect. Additional Administrative Rules need to be crafted to further clarify Emeritus referencing ORS 671.316(4). There is no need to go to the legislature at this time. *Wright* inquired if the word Emeritus would be dropped. *Edwards* responded that Emeritus is a category of inactive licensure. *Olsen* asked what status does it have? *Edwards* offered that it is an honorary title with no authority. *Olsen* stated that previous discussions surrounding Emeritus concluded that there are retired Landscape Architects that wish to continue to be recognized. *Stout* and *Nichols* supported that statement. *Edwards* concluded that a retired Landscape Architect can apply for an Emeritus designation and be titled Emeritus Landscape Architect. *Stout* inquired if there was a time limit on inactive. *Edwards* stated that it is five years now, but a revision to the Rules will acknowledge that Emeritus is not "lapsing". *Edwards* offered that the question for the Board is whether the Board wants to go to the Legislature or if they want to write Administrative Rules to implement Emeritus. *Olsen* supported the proposal of developing Administrative Rules. *Nichols* asked if it would ever be taken to the Legislature. *Edwards* said the Board does not need to go to the Legislature and much of the information is already in the Administrative Rules. *VanWormer* asked if the five-year limit would be effective. *Edwards* offered that an

Emeritus registration would not lapse as they are already paying a \$25.00 annual fee. *VanWormer* requested a motion from the floor.

Edwards moved that the Board not move forward with emeritus legislation but direct the Rules Committee to complete the Administrative Rules for this status of registration. *Seconded and passed. Edwards, yes; Nichols, yes; Olsen, yes; Pellitier, yes; Stout, yes; VanWormer, yes; Wright, yes.*

2. **DETERMINATION OF STATUS OF LAIT REGISTRATION:** Knight summarized for the Board prior discussions about the LAIT status of registration. Because this status is statutorily mandated, the Board previously agreed that if a bill for Emeritus was necessary, then consideration would be given to removing the LAIT status. The previous agenda item concluded that legislation would not be pursued so LAIT registration status will remain. *Van Wormer* state that Rules are needed to implement LAIT duties. *Nichols* responded that the Rules Advisory Committee is working on that.

Pellitier offered that while at the CLARB meeting March 1, 2008, he overheard folks discussing that they liked the LAIT designation and that it was a way to transition toward registration.

3. **REQUEST TO SIT FOR LARE E BY REAPPLICATION:** *Van Wormer* referred the Board to the summary memo dated March 12, 2008, and reported that numerous places in the Administrative Rules state the intent for applicants to verify one year of supervised experience under a Registered Landscape Architect (RLA) for purposes of sitting for Sections C & E. But under the current rules, OAR 804-020-0005 does not require this information for examination retake purposes. That information is provided under OAR 804-020-0003(2)(b). *Pellitier* offered that when he inquired from other CLARB members about the a Board policy regarding multiple retakes, one state uses the revolving five-year period currently followed by the Architect Board. If applied to Landscape Architect examinations, such a policy would require that all five sections be completed within 5 years of one another. *Van Wormer* offered that Administrative Rules must be consistent but Rule revisions required to close this loop hole would be referred to the Rules Advisory Committee (RAC). *Nichols* acknowledged that the RAC would look into the revisions. *Olsen* offered that all applicants on file should be informed of the requirement for one year of RLA supervised experience.

Olsen moved to admit retake candidates without verification of the one year of supervised experience until such time as a revision to the Administrative Rules occurs. *Seconded and passed. Edwards, yes; Nichols, yes; Olsen, yes; Pellitier, yes; Stout, yes; VanWormer, yes; Wright, yes.*

4. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS DUE TO GOVERNOR'S SALARY INCREASE TO MANAGEMENT:** *Knight* referred the Board to two documents presented prior to the meeting: a Press Release dated July 13, 2007 and a document titled 2007-09 Management Compensation Package dated September 24, 2007. Both of these documents were released after the budget of the Board was set. The Board has an Agreement with the Oregon State Board of Geologist

Examiners (OSBGE) in which costs for Personal Services are split by the two Boards. One document outlines the salary increases since the budget was approved. *Van Wormer* stated that since Board employees are State Employees, the increases must be implemented. *Nichols* offered that as a member of the Budget Committee he did not think the budget would have problems with the unbudgeted increase. *VanWormer* stated that the approximately \$24,000 increase in expenditures for the Board's Personal Services for the two years of the biennium would require an amendment to the Agreement between OSBGE and OSLAB, since each Board will be covering half of this increased cost. Since he is the person that signed the Agreement, he would work with the Chair of OSBGE to implement this budget increase.

Nichols moved, per information presented in the 2007-09 Management Compensation Package outlined in a September 24, 2007, to authorize the Board Chair to increase the Agreement for Board Administration by ½ of the total of the increase in the Personal Service expenses for the 2007-09 budget cycle. *Seconded and passed. Edwards, yes; Nichols, yes; Olsen, yes; Pellitier, yes; Stout, yes; VanWormer, yes; Wright, yes.*

Van Wormer asked if there were any additional items for discussion. *Pellitier's* request to present a report on the CLARB Meeting convened in Indianapolis on Saturday, March 1, 2008, was granted. *Pellitier* stated that it was wonderful as a new Board Member to be at the meeting representing the Oregon Board. He met both Landscape Architects and Administrators from all across the country. The Strategic Planning session was very good. He commended Jim Figurski, former member of the Oregon State Landscape Architect Board, for all his fine work with the Council of Landscape Architect Registration Boards (CLARB) and stated that he was impressed with Knight as the Administrator for Oregon and the input she gave to CLARB. In the Strategic Planning discussion, there was agreement that Landscape Architects are slipping on the "green movement". Landscape Architects are not being sought out but rather, a myriad of other folks in the environmental world without registration are positioning themselves into leadership in this area. It was wonderful to be at the meeting and see how Oregon interacts with CLARB. It is important to have Board Members in attendance and all Board members should attend at some time. *Van Wormer* stated that it was worth his time last September to attend the CLARB Fall Meeting convened in Cleveland, Ohio.

Van Wormer adjourned the meeting 1:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susanna R. Knight
Administrator

Minutes of the March 12, 2008, Board meeting were approved as presented at the May 9, 2008, Board Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Susanna R. Knight