

OREGON STATE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT BOARD (OSLAB)

MEETING MINUTES

August 24, 2012

Association Center, 707 13th St. SE, 2nd Floor, Conf. Room "A", Salem, OR

Members Present:

Lauri L'Amoreaux, Landscape Architect
David Olsen, Landscape Architect, Chair
Kathleen Olsen, Public Member
John Pellitier, Landscape Architect
Stephen Ray, Landscape Architect
Susan Wright, Public Member

Member Absent:

Ron Nichols, Public Member, Treasurer (Excused)

Staff Present:

Christine Valentine, Administrator

Visitors:

(*as noted in minutes, Public Comment Agenda Item)

*****Convene Work Session**

Chair Olsen convened the Board work session at 9:05 AM.

AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Olsen quickly reviewed the agenda. No changes were made.

Chair Olsen

WELCOME TO NEW BOARD MEMBERS

Chair Olsen welcomed OSLAB's three new board members to their first meeting and introductions were made all around. Chair Olsen explained that due to the change in meeting date from the 10th to the 24th of the month Treasurer Nichols, who also serves as Chair of the Administrative Rules Committee (ARC), could not be present due to a previous commitment. Administrator Valentine stated that Nichols asked her to extend a warm welcome on his behalf to our new members, and he looks forward to meeting all at the November meeting.

Chair Olsen

Each continuing member gave a description of their past work experience, current activities, and tenure with the Board. This was followed by the new members saying a few words about themselves, their work experience, and why they were interested in serving on the Board. Continuing members shared words of advice about board membership with the new members. Chair Olsen and Valentine provided a quick orientation to the new members and then opened the floor for a brief question and answer period about OSLAB operations and meeting protocols.

Chair Olsen mentioned that the Board would be looking at adjustments to officer and committee positions based on the changes in Board membership. He referred the Board to Agenda Item 7 and mentioned that he and Pellitier had discussed taking on the Chair and Vice Chair roles, respectively, as it would be a lot to ask a new member to take this on. Former member Van Wormer was the Vice Chair. Chair Olsen asked that all think about this throughout the day for further discussion in the afternoon. Valentine also handed out a summary list of Board Committee assignments for discussion in the afternoon.

Chair Olsen and Valentine encouraged the new members to take the online training for Boards/Commissions and related training on Executive Session/Public Meetings. Valentine noted that this is the only training currently available through the State of Oregon.

RULEMAKING UPDATE

Nichols/Valentine

In the absence of Nichols, Valentine presented the memorandum on the proposed rule amendments related to LARE changes to the Board. She explained that the intent is to address the change in exam structure and administration without changing Board policy regarding the type of Board approvals required. In the review process, some housekeeping changes and improvements for legal clarity were also identified and are incorporated into the draft rules. She explained that the Board is being asked to consider making two related motions during the meeting. The proposals are to adopt the rule changes as temporary rules and then simultaneously authorize filing of notice for permanent rulemaking hearing.

The Board proceeded to discuss a variety of issues with the proposed rule revisions, the LARE changes to the examination, and how the LARE registration process now will work. The Board also discussed how its role in the examination has been minimized and how the role of the Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) has evolved. It was mentioned that CLARB is ultimately looking to expand the number of exam candidates and will not be policing candidate compliance with Oregon's standards. As a result, OSLAB's rules need to be clear about what standards apply for prior approvals and applications.

Board members expressed concern about how the new provision allowing the Board Administrator to accept prior approval or applications after established deadlines would work and whether specific criteria were needed. Various questions were discussed, such as whether the Board should define just cause similar to how CLARB does for its own consideration of examination fee refunds. The pros and cons of keeping flexibility by not identifying specific criteria were discussed as well as the fact that the exams will now be offered three times a year so that it should be easier for candidates to complete exams without long delays between offerings. Ultimately, the Board did not identify additional changes to make to the draft rule language at this time. There was recognition that this area may need further discussion as the Board considers adoption of permanent rules.

*****Convene Quarterly Meeting**

Chair Olsen closed the work session and immediately convened the Quarterly Meeting at 10:25 AM.

COMPLIANCE REPORT (Part I)

The first item on the meeting agenda was the Compliance Report. At 10:27 AM, Chair Olsen announced that the Board would be entering Executive Session for discussion of compliance case investigatory materials and written advice from the AAG in accordance with ORS 671.338 and 192.660.

At 12:30 PM, Chair Olsen announced that the Board was returning to Public Session. No decisions were made in this Executive Session. The Board delayed further discussion on the Compliance Report until later in the meeting. Chair Olsen called for a short break. The Board was joined by several guests during this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Olsen called the meeting back to order at approximately 12:40 PM and welcomed two guests. He stated that the Board would shift its public comment period from the end of the agenda to accommodate the guests. He asked the Board's guests to introduce themselves and share whatever issues or concerns they would like to discuss related to OSLAB. Landscape Designers Izzy Baptista and Janette Gallagher introduced themselves as representatives of the Association of Professional Landscape Designers (APLD) and noted that a third APLD representative would be arriving shortly. They explained that APLD has a certification program for designers. The certification requires multiple years of experience and submittal of at least 3 constructed projects (each must be reviewed at least 3 years after installation). The information is then judged by APLD peers for acceptability. Once the projects have been favorably reviewed, the submitting designer becomes eligible for certification. National, APLD has over 400

members, and the Oregon Chapter has approximately 60 members. APLD has dues that support marketing and lobbying at the national level and promotion for local members.

Board members and guests exchanged information about the role of Landscape Designers. Designers do not specify exact materials, nor do they provide construction level details and specifications. Designers provide a conceptual design with suggestions about plants and materials. They do not address how to build items in the conceptual design. Designers often work with Landscape Contractors (LC) on installation. This can include having an LC involved early on for collaboration on design ideas. The designers stated that nearly all their projects are residential. APLD does have a few LC and RLA members.

Amy Whitworth of APLD arrived at this point and provided a letter dated August 22, 2012 addressed to Valentine and signed by her on behalf of APLD. This letter was entered into the official copy of the Board meeting packet with copies distributed to Board members. The Board took time to review the letter. Whitworth then proceeded to say that designers would like to develop better relationships with RLAs and the Board. She stated that they have not spent enough time working with the LA profession. Board members inquired about the type of relationship the designers would like to see develop with OSLAB. Whitworth said that there are projects where designers need to have the expertise of RLA, for example projects with terrain issues and structures. She expressed that designers in Oregon want to work within the law but have not always been clear on how to avoid issues with LCB and OSLAB. They have tried to maintain an understanding with the two boards about their niche. Olsen talked about the continual evolution of OSLAB and agreed that there needs to be an ongoing relationship. He stated on behalf of the Board that a stronger and more openly acknowledged relationship would be welcomed.

Chair Olsen asked a follow-up question about how designers address responsibility for the vision/design when installation is controlled by another professional (i.e., LC or RLA). Baptista said that the designers cannot do the construction level details so the professional has to agree that designer's vision is acceptable in terms of health, safety and welfare before installation.

Pellitier pointed out that the LCB has its own definition of "plan" which is within the jurisdiction of OLCB. "Plan" within the context of LA is within the purview of OSLAB. He wondered, based on the letter submitted, if the APLD had specific questions around the definition of plan that it wants to present to the Board? Whitworth said APLD does not have specific questions about this, but designers do not want to run into problems with OSLAB. They want to have open communications with the Board about what designers legally can do without registration. Pellitier added that he could not recall a compliance case involving a conflict over work done by a designer, i.e., the Board has not had a homeowner bring a complaint about such work to the Board. He wondered if designers want to be regulated by a board. Whitworth indicated that APLD has not historically been looking to be a regulated profession. APLD would like more regular communications with related boards. She noted how they visit with the LCB much more regularly and how Oregon Landscape Contractors Association also has a legislative advocate that has relationship with APLD and LCB.

Board members briefly discussed with the guests whether they have found LCB licenses to allow design only. Whitworth stated that she believes LCB allows design only by its licensees. She also noted that Oregon colleges are telling future designers to get a LCB license. However, Whitworth again mentioned that designers include disclaimers on plans stating that they are conceptual only and to not build without hiring the appropriate professionals. The plans are planting plans without specifications or irrigation details.

Chair Olsen asked if there were any further questions or comments from Board members or the Board's guests. Hearing none, he thanked the guests for joining the Board, and proceeded to open the next agenda item.

MINUTES

Chair Olsen explained the process of reviewing and approving minutes for the new Board members and then asked if there were any requests for changes. Ultimately, there were no changes requested. *Ray moved to approve the minutes of the May 11, 2012 Work Session and Meeting. Wright seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Administrators Report: Valentine was asked to present the Administrator's Report to the Board. She noted that, unless requested otherwise by the Chair, items covered in the Report but to be discussed elsewhere on the agenda will not be discussed at this time. She explained for the benefit of new members that she uses the Administrator's reports as a catch all place to cover updates that she thinks the Board should know about, either in relation to agenda items or otherwise. She spent a few minutes addressing the following topics: vehicle use policy/DAS rules, semi-independence briefing, budget for this biennium, planning for 2013-2015 budget, June 2012 LARE results, and CLARB information about the new exam structure and format.

Valentine also discussed with the Board how staff seems to be hearing more complaints about late fees as registrants deal with the economic downturn. A common complaint is that the renewal letter was not received so the late fee should not apply, as many registrants do not realize the letter is a courtesy reminder only. Board members asked various questions about how renewal letters are generated and sent. Staff also struggles a bit with the reinstatement process as the deadlines are firm, i.e. someone 61 days late must be treated the same as someone 120 days late for example. K. Olsen noted as a new member with familiarity of fees and practices of other licensing boards that she felt OSLAB requirements were reasonable. She mentioned that other boards have steeper fines and require reinstatement immediately, with at least one board she knows of issuing formal reprimands to all licenses that are late with renewals. Chair Olsen noted that mail can get lost within an office if a person has correspondence mailed there, but they have the option of receiving Board correspondence at home. Valentine clarified that staff is not advocating for particular changes but does feel that a reminder in the next newsletter about the importance of renewing on time is in order. Other Board members concurred that the existing requirements are reasonable, as has been reaffirmed in past debates about fees and the reinstatement process.

Budget Updates: Valentine addressed the current and next biennium budgets as part of the Administrator's report. The Board proceeded to review the standard budget documents included with the report. The Board discussed various budget line items in terms of expenses for the current biennium and whether expenses might go up or down for the next biennium. The Board will work to identify any new projects or initiatives that will need to be considered in the next biennium budget as it begins work on that budget. Valentine also noted that the Board should look at determining an appropriate contingency fund going forward. Chair Olsen suggested that K. Olsen may be able to help the Board address this issue given her professional background in accounting.

Approve Quarterly Check Log: The Board reviewed the check log, which Valentine noted also includes debits. *Wright moved to approve Check Log for debits 5/1/12-8/1/12 and checks # 3724-3767 and # 010121-010125. Pellitier seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

Review Updated Renewal History: The Board briefly reviewed the renewal history and noted that registration numbers are stable.

Chair Olsen called for a break at 2:32 PM, reconvening the meeting at 2:47 PM. He then announced that the Board would return to the Compliance Report.

COMPLIANCE REPORT (Part II)

The Board started with discussion of the open complaint cases that had been discussed during the work session and proceeded to make the following decisions.

LACC#11-08-001: *Wright moved to close the case based on insufficient information to proceed. The Board will send a letter to the respondent saying the case is closed for this reason without making further references about violations. Chair Olsen seconded.* The Board then discussed whether the case should be left open since the information is not conclusive either way. The Board ultimately decided that there was not an advantage to keeping the case open as the Board had no particular reason to think more information would develop soon, and there did not appear to be an immediate health, safety, and welfare issue here. The Board discussed that larger jurisdictional questions raised by this case would be considered outside of this specific case. The Board considered whether more discussion with counsel was needed to allow the Board to make a decision. Valentine noted that if new information comes to the attention of the Board, the Board is not precluded from further investigation. Board members discussed but opted not to send a Letter of Concern. The Chair closed conversation on the case and confirmed that the Board was voting on the initial motion with no changes. *Pellitier seconded (although the motion was previously seconded by Chair Olsen.) Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

LACC#12-03-007: The Board discussed sending a letter to the company saying they are no longer authorized to provide LA services. There was discussion about whether this letter would close the case or be part of continued investigation. The Board determined that the case would not yet be closed. *Wright moved to send a letter to respondent firm indicated that due to failure to submit a statement of responsibility the business is not authorized to offer, solicit or provide LA services. A copy of the letter will be sent to the RLA that previously was designated as in responsible charge of the firms LA work. The Board will also refund the business registration fee. Ray seconded. Hearing no discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

Complaint Process, General: Valentine asked the Board to consider several matters related to OSLAB's complaint process. First, she advised that the Board develop and start using a complaint form, explaining that it is common place for Boards to require use of such a form and that this could help protect the Board by helping to address various statutory requirements related to complaint investigations. She referred Board members to the old OSLAB form and noted that reasons for shelving that form are unclear. She then referred to a two page summary addressing why the Board should use a complaint form and what it would ask of the complainant. The outline was developed based largely on review of other complaint forms in use by Oregon boards but also with consideration of the types of information that might make it easier for the Compliance Committee to review a complaint. She asked for the Board's support to pursue development of a complaint form. The Board concurred but asked that the form be kept as simple as possible, preferable to one page in length.

Second, Valentine expressed her belief that Board members and staff would benefit from having a compliance manual. She explained how the Board currently has a paucity of information written down about the complaint process or its authorities. This makes it challenging for staff or Board members, especially those new to OSLAB, to readily develop an understanding of key aspects of the complaint process. For example, we had nothing that could be included in the training guidebooks for new members that addressed this important area of Board work. We also had nothing concise and comprehensive to provide the contract investigator recently asked to assist with two cases. A manual could also be helpful to future technical reviewers. If the Board is still interested in improvements to its complaint process, a manual could be a good first step to organize information. She shared a proposed table of contents with the Board and stated that this is a starting point. She has started to pull information together as she discovered that very little is memorialized about existing authority and process. It doesn't have to be anything elaborate and would be a work in progress that would need to be updated periodically to address new issues, legal interpretations, etc. Valentine said she is willing to start on this but would ultimately need some review and input from Board members. Some limited pieces may need review and input by Board counsel. The Board concurred and asked Valentine to work on this as time allowed.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES COMMITTEE

Active Rulemaking Efforts: Chair Olsen stated that the Board needed to decide about two motions. *He motioned to adopt the temporary rules as presented in the Board meeting packet. Wright seconded.* Chair Olsen opened discussion on this motion by requesting some clarifications about making additional changes in the permanent rulemaking process. Valentine explained that if additional rules are identified for revision then the Board will need to make sure that these have been identified in a rulemaking filing. He referred the Board to the rule for experience in lieu of education as one example. He said his concern about the application fee was previously addressed in the work session discussion. He asked if other board members had questions. *Hearing none, he called for a vote, and all approved.*

Chair Olsen next moved to initiate the permanent rulemaking process by authorizing the Administrator to file notice of the rule changes as presented in the Board meeting packet. Pellitier seconded. Chair Olsen asked for comments and hearing none called for a vote. All approved.

Other issues: In Nichols absence, Valentine explained that the Committee raised a couple of issues about the existing OSLAB rules when discussing the LARE related rules in early June of this year. Nichols promised to share their ideas and concerns with the full Board. Valentine noted that it is the Board's prerogative to determine whether it will consider rulemaking to address these concerns.

The first issue is about the business registration fees and whether the Board should have a sliding scale, with sole proprietors having a lower fee than other businesses. The Board discussed, with Chair Olsen, Pellitier, and Wright recalling that the Board debated that very issue in the past. The Board previously came to the conclusion that the administrative work required to process the business registration is the same and thus a sliding scale was not appropriate. The Board did not see a reason to revisit that discussion at this time.

The second issue was about possibly opening the continuing education rule that defines what is acceptable for PDH. At least one Committee member is interested in seeing the limitation on credit for teaching a class only once changed to allow credit for each time taught and for the Board to grant credit to for development of DVDs or other media instead of just peer reviewed articles. Valentine offered that Nichols may have discussed these issues directly with the individual Committee member in more detail and thus may have more to add at the next Board meeting. Chair Olsen noted that continuing education issues like this were addressed in the past, and he sees a benefit to registrants in maintaining consistency. The Board did not see a reason to revisit this.

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Audit Report for January – March 2012: Valentine handed out the quarterly audit report for the period of January – March 2012 to the Board. She explained that outgoing Board Member Mel Stout completed the audit reviews for the Board this one last time. There were 4 audits conducted, and the Committee finding is that 3 of 4 candidates passed as described in the report. Additional document would be requested from the 4th candidate.

Chair Olsen moved for the Board to approve the 3 audits and request additional documentation for the 4th audit for the period of January – March 2012. Wright seconded the motion. Chair Olsen clarified with the Administrator that the one individual that needs additional documentation would be contacted by letter. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.

Drawing of Names for April – June 2012: The random drawing of names was completed using standard protocols and the selected slips returned to the Administrator.

Inquiries related to Continuing Education: (Addressed under Administrative Rules Committee report.)

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

In Nichols absence, Valentine explained that several CDs rolled over during the quarter. Interest rates continue to be low. No other changes since the last report when the Treasurer stated he was pleased to see Board accounts remain steady despite the slow economy.

LICENSURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Report: Chair Olsen directed the Board to the Committee report in the meeting packet. The Board briefly discussed items i. – iv. Chair Olsen requested that the business registration information be further expanded to include the RLA's work city and not just state.

Requests for Reinstatement: Valentine directed the Board's attention to two reinstatement requests for individuals. In each case, the registration lapsed beyond 60 days triggering a letter from the Board and the process outlined in OAR 804-022-0020. She explained that, per discussion with the Vice Chair in the Chair's absence earlier this month, a decision was made that an exam would not be required and that the individuals would not be required to attend the meeting. Valentine also wanted the Board to be aware that the husband of one of the individuals also claims to have not received his business registration renewal sent to the same mailing address on the same day. This information was shared to ensure the Board was aware that something would appear to have happened to both letters in the mailing process in this case. Valentine noted that business reinstatement requests are addressed in OAR 804-035-0035 and have generally not gone to the full Board like individual requests under OAR 804-022-0020. She further stated that staff reviewed the PDH logs for both individuals and believes they have the qualifying PDH. The renewal and late fee was received from one LA and the renewal fee only from the other individual. Everything required has been received for the business reinstatement mentioned.

Chair Olsen motioned to reinstate the 3 licenses (2 individual, 1 business) but with payment of the late fee required first for the individual listed first on the report. Wright seconded. The Board briefly discussed and suggested that staff send a letter to the first individual listed since she has raised various issues in the letter to the Board. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.

OTHER:

Report from Liaison to Oregon Board of Architect Examiners: Chair Olsen stated that he has not attended any meetings. He generally reviews newsletters from this board. He noted that they also seem to spend a lot of time on compliance issues.

Report from Liaison to Oregon Landscape Contractors Board: Pellitier stated that he did not have a lot to report. He mentioned that this board is in the rulemaking process to increase compliance fees, as part of what seems to be a continual process of updating its rules.

CORRESPONDENCE

LAIT Renewals/Question of Direct Supervision vs. Mentoring: Valentine directed the Board's attention to the e-mail exchange included in the packet. She reminded the Board about the requirement in the rule for LAIT's to have their renewals signed by the supervising RLA. The Board added the requirement for LAITs to work under a RLA to the rule in 2008 and then further amended the rule effective in early 2012 to require the signature on the renewal form. This new requirement was overlooked for LAIT renewals sent out in 2011, but staff corrected this with the 2012 renewals. The inquiry received raises questions about what is meant by direct supervision and whether the nature of oversight being provided in this case qualifies. The RLA did sign the renewal form for the LAIT.

Valentine mentioned how staff has received several related inquiries from other individuals, not necessarily limited to supervision of LAITs but raising questions about what the Board means by direct supervision and what types of situations the Board deems permissible. Some individuals are still looking for a mentoring mechanism. Others have asked about supervision relying on use of technology when the RLA is not in the same office as the individual being supervised. Staff needs some direction from the Board as to how to pursue more clarity about the meaning of direct supervision.

The Board ultimately concluded that additional information was needed in relation to the specific LAIT request. Members discussed how the LAIT would have obtained the LA work described if she was not soliciting for LA services. Should the supervising RLA have asked why the LAIT was getting this work? Did he sign the plans and specifications? The Board discussed whether there could be a compliance issue here.

Valentine mentioned some advice from counsel on the term “direct supervision” back in 2007, apparently provided in relation to work on the LAIT rule. This suggested that the term, under ordinary and customary definitions, would equate to working for an RLA who first hand oversaw or regulated the candidate’s work. However, counsel suggested that a definition for OSLAB purposes could be crafted by the Board to take into account how persons learning the profession are generally supervised. Presumably, this would be the same type of supervision the Board deems necessary to meet registration requirements. In 2011, the Board received further advice that it has the authority under statute to broaden the nature and type of work experience that qualifies.

The Board directed the Administrator to refund the LAIT’s renewal fee and write a letter requesting additional information about the specific park project mentioned by the LAIT that involved the RLA. The Board concluded that it needs to understand how the LAIT became involved and more about the role of the RLA included whether he stamped and signed the work products. A letter to both individuals will let them know that there may be a larger issue here. Valentine said she would prepare the letter but needed to confer with counsel about possible unintended consequences of refunding the renewal fee.

Valentine asked for confirmation that the Board has been interpreting “direct supervision” in a very traditional manner. The Board confirmed this and discussed that there may be a need to rethink this based on changes in technology, etc. While the Board appreciated that there is a need to look at “direct supervision”, it decided that this topic should be referred to the Administrative Rules Committee for their input on what might be a reasonable interpretation considering evolving work environments. The Board would then discuss “direct supervision” after receiving feedback from the Committee on this.

Irrigation Association Inquiry: Chair Olsen stated that this was the next item of significance for the Board to address under Correspondence. Valentine noted that the Board has counsel advice to consider regarding a possible response. At 4:04 PM, Chair Olsen announced that the Board would be entering **Executive Session** for discussion of written advice from the AAG in accordance with ORS 192.660.

The Board returned to Public Session at approximately 4:25 PM. No decisions were made in Executive Session. The Board Chair asked for all members to provide final comments on the draft response to the Irrigation Association to the Administrator by August 28, 2012. The Board directed that the Administrator work with the Chair to finalize the response to the Irrigation Association and also send a copy to LCB. The Board further decided that Chair Olsen and Pellitier would be the designated representatives of the Board for any future meetings as may be appropriate or requested with LCB or IA.

OLD BUSINESS

Due to time constraints, Chair Olsen asked for an expeditious review of agenda items under Old Business.

Policies-Procedures Update:

- **Contracting/Procurement Policy** - Valentine recommended the Board adopt the policy, which has been updated based on comments received from Board members. The Board needs to ensure it has an updated policy in place ASAP. The policy can be updated as needed if experience shows this to be necessary. Once adopted, the policy will be provided to DAS for its review. The Board discussed and agreed to make one change to the policy, as specified in its motion. *Chair Olsen moved to adopt the draft policy for contracting and procurement as presented in the packet, with any contracts over \$50,000 treated as a large procurement where a more formal request for proposals process will be followed. Wright seconded. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved.*

- **Records Management Policy** – Valentine presented the draft policy and explained that she believes the policy is ready for review by the State Archivist. This review must occur before final adoption by the Board. However, she wanted to find out if the Board members had questions or concerns about the policy as this is the first time the draft has been before the Board. The Board felt that obtaining feedback from the State Archivist sooner vs. later was best and asked Valentine to initiate that review process.

CLARB Letter/Issues: Chair Olsen stated that this agenda item would not be discussed due to time constraints. He also noted that the Board should give its new members time to develop an understanding of CLARB.

Practitioner of the Year Award: Chair Olsen stated that this agenda item would not be discussed at this time.

OSLAB Newsletter: Valentine stated that she has several article topics for the fall newsletter, as described in the Administrator’s report: introduce new members, business registration requirements per discussion at the May 11, 2012 meeting, renewal notices as courtesy reminders, and possibly something about the Board’s thinking regarding compliance and statutory review. She noted how this would be more than enough to fill the newsletter.

Updated Action List: The Board elected to not review the action list due to time constraints.

NEW BUSINESS

Board Elections/Committee Assignments:

“The Board may elect a Chair, Vice Chair, and Treasurer once a year at the first Board meeting held after July 1. The new Chair, Vice Chair, and Treasurer terms will begin at the end of the meeting at which they are elected.”
OAR 804-001-0015.

Chair Olsen revisited the proposal he shared in the work session, where he would remain the Chair for one more year and Pellitier would serve as Vice Chair for one year. Next year, someone else would be asked to take on the roles of Chair and Vice Chair. The current Treasurer is willing to serve another term so no change is proposed for that position at this time.

Wright nominated current Chair Olsen for another 1 year term as Chair. Ray seconded. Hearing no comments, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved. Olsen recused himself from the vote.

Chair Olsen nominated Pellitier as Vice Chair for a 1 year term. Ray seconded. Hearing no comments, Chair Olsen called for a vote, and all approved. Pellitier recused himself from the vote.

Chair Olsen and Valentine noted that the Board also needs to make assignments to address the committee work previously done by former members Stout and Van Wormer for the Licensure Review and Continuing Education Committees, respectively. The Board referred to the list of committee assignments prepared by Valentine. The Board proceeded to make the following decisions about committee assignments:

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Assignment</u>
Compliance	No Change	Wright
Administrative Rules	No Change	Nichols
Continuing Education	New Member	Ray
Licensure Review	New Member	L’Amoreaux
Investment	No Change	Nichols
Budget	Transition	K. Olsen/either Nichols or Olsen**
Architects	New Member	Ray
Land. Contractors	No Change	Pellitier

**K.Olsen indicated her interest in transitioning into this Committee so that she can share her professional experience in accounting with the Board. The Board was supportive of this request. Either Nichols or Olsen will remain as the second member. The Administrator will discuss further with Nichols and Olsen outside of the meeting.

OSLAB attendance at CLARB Annual Mtg.: Chair Olsen stated that it looks like no one will be able to attend. He also noted that it may be best for the Board to not be spending resources on out-of-state travel at this time. Ray pointed out there is an opportunity to attend remote sessions.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Office Closed – Sept. 3 (Labor Day)
- CLARB Annual Mtg. Sept. 6-8
- Staff @ OSBGE Mtg. – Sept. 14 (changed since OSLAB meeting to Sept. 21)
- LARE Section 1 & 2 Exams, Sept. 10-22
- Next Work Session/Meeting – Friday Nov. 9
- Other

Chair Olsen adjourned the meeting at 5:03 PM.

+++++

The minutes of the August 24, 2012 work session and quarterly meeting were approved as presented at the November 9, 2012 Board meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Valentine,
Administrator