

OREGON STATE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT BOARD (OSLAB)

MEETING MINUTES QUARTERLY MEETING

May 8, 2014
Conference Room "B", 2nd Floor,
707 13th St. SE, Salem, OR 97301

Board Members Present

Gregg Everhart, RLA
Lauri L'Amoreaux, RLA
Michael O'Brien, RLA, Vice Chair
Kathy Olsen, Public Member, Treasurer
Steve Ray, RLA, Chair
Susan Smith, Public Member
Susan Wright, Public Member

Staff Present:

Christine Valentine, Board Administrator

Other Participants*:

Dale White, Investigator
Kyle Martin, AAG, DOJ
(*as noted in minutes)

OPEN MEETING

Chair Ray opened the meeting at 9:11 AM. He confirmed that all Board members were present and welcomed all to the meeting. Administrator Valentine was also present. There were no guests present.

AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Ray reviewed the agenda with the Board. He noted that there were no oral exams scheduled for this meeting. There were no comments or questions, and no changes were made.

MINUTES

Chair Ray noted that the Board had minutes from two meetings to review and approve. He opened discussion on the minutes for February 20, 2014. Hearing no requests for revisions or other comments, he asked for a motion.

Vice Chair O'Brien moved to approve the February 20, 2014 meeting minutes as presented. Everhart seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion on the motion, Chair Ray called the vote, and all approved.

Chair Ray next opened discussion on the minutes for the April 3, 2014 work session. There were no requests for revisions or comments so again he asked for a motion.

Wright moved to approve the April 3, 2014 meeting minutes as presented. Everhart seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion on the motion, Chair Ray called the vote, and all approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Ray introduced the consent agenda listing licensure review actions from February 1-April 25, 2014. He opened the floor for any discussion or requests to remove items from the consent agenda. There were no such requests made. He then asked if there were any comments or questions on the quarterly check log covering debits February 1 – April 1, 2014 and checks 3979-4013 and 10160-10165. There were no immediate questions or comments.

Valentine explained that there was also one inactive status change that had been pulled from a previous consent agenda. Action was not taken to ratify at the February meeting as the registrant had indicated an interest in returning to active status. The registrant has since decided to remain on inactive status. Therefore, staff is seeking to close the loop on the inactive status change. The Board briefly discussed, and then Chair Ray asked for a motion. *Treasurer Olsen moved to ratify the inactive status for LA355 (Bebb). Vice Chair O'Brien seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion on the matter, Chair Ray called the vote, and all approved.*

Everhart asked about delinquent status for a Landscape Architect in Training (LAIT), noting how this gets listed as informational in the consent agenda. Valentine summarized the history of the LAIT registration and how it currently works. The Board briefly discussed and expressed interest in looking at the LAIT registration further at a future meeting to determine if candidates find sufficient value in this optional registration type and if not, what this means for Board resources related to this registration type. O'Brien suggested that the LAIT registration might be looked at in conjunction with review of the rules related to the Landscape Architect Registration Exam (LARE). Valentine suggested that the Board could also inquire with more recent registrants about the perceived value of the LAIT as part of other outreach the Board might pursue with that segment of the registrant pool.

Chair Ray noted that the Board still needed to approve the consent agenda and check log. *L'Amoreaux moved to approve consent agenda and the quarterly payment log. Wright seconded the motion. Chair Ray asked if there were further comments. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.*

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Administrator's Narrative Report: Valentine asked if there were any questions on the narrative report. Chair Ray inquired about the biennial report. Valentine said the report was submitted timely and that she doesn't expect to receive specific feedback on the report contents until sometime in late summer or early fall.

Wright spoke to the Board recruitment summary in the narrative report. She informed the Board that she could not guarantee participation in future meetings despite the Governor's Office being amenable to this. She explained that her time is limited, and after 8 years she also feels it is just time to move on. She encouraged the Board to find a replacement public member as soon as possible. The Board discussed and decided to: (1) send an email to registrants with a request for assistance in finding a replacement, (2) send a copy of that request to the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) Oregon Chapter and request their assistance in distributing, (3) ask former board members in central Oregon if they know of any possible public member candidates as a way to possibly increase geographic diversity on the Board.

Hearing no further comments on the report, Valentine directed the Board's attention to a request for proposals issued by the Council of Landscape Architectural Boards (CLARB).

CLARB is looking for a state board and local chapter of the ASLA interested in participating in a pilot project on public welfare. She addressed the link to a public welfare study CLARB issued several years ago. The Board discussed and determined that the timing was not right for the Board to consider participating in the pilot. The Board will monitor whatever pilot project CLARB moves forward with and may consider future opportunities to collaborate with CLARB or others on public welfare issues as related to regulation of the profession.

Valentine next explained the history behind the Board's 2011 comments to the Oregon Board of Architect Examiners (ORBAE) and Oregon Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (OSBEELS) regarding the next update of the *Manual for Building Officials*. She noted that OSLAB's suggested language has been incorporated into the draft update of the manual. The Board determined that the language would benefit from modest revision regarding the types of projects RLAs work on as related to the permitting process. For example, the Board identified urban planning, stormwater and drainage, and erosion control as areas of practice that should be mentioned. Vice Chair O'Brien volunteered to work with Valentine to refine the language. Valentine requested that this work be completed within the month so as to not unduly hold up the manual revision.

In closing, Valentine recommended that the Board start thinking about participation in the annual CLARB meeting scheduled for September. She was concerned that waiting until the mid-August meeting could complicate travel arrangements. She noted that she had information on the meeting to share under the New Business agenda item.

Policy updates: Valentine stated that the only policy updates would be presented under the Budget/Investment Committee report. She informed the Board of two procedural updates staff has recently been investigating: (1) feasibility of switching OSLAB to state payroll services to address cost and quality of service issues and (2) exploring new options for offering online payment functionality and even possibly online submittal of renewals. On item (2), the Board discussed issues related to fees associated with online payments and would like staff to address the possible impact and mitigation of such fees as part of the investigation of (2).

Budget updates: Valentine summarized staff efforts to track individual and business renewals as the Board's primary revenue sources. Staff anticipates that individual renewal income will not hit the budget target, which accounted for modest growth. Individual renewal income is projecting close to the prior year. May is a big renewal month for OSLAB so staff will be closely watching those renewals. In addition, there are some delinquent registrations that still may be restored and additional reciprocity applications could be received before the end of the fiscal year. Staff anticipates that business renewal income for the year will be lower than the previous year and will be monitoring through the end of the fiscal year. Staff will look closer into the reasons for the business registration decline but thinks it could be related to sole proprietors closing businesses. The Board expressed interest in having the staff start to track business registrations similar to the way individual registrations are tracked.

On the expenditure side, Valentine noted that the Board is on track to spend less in the fiscal year on numerous line items. The most notably savings are appearing in travel, stipend, newsletter, financial review, legal services, records management, and professional services. The Board is on track to over spend on a few line items: office supplies/services depending on the timing of order for new filing cabinets which is an expense not anticipated when the budget was developed, payroll services due to increasing vendor costs, and database contract

due to work that was needed to address a malfunction of the status conversions and related reports. Valentine also noted that CLARB membership dues went up from the year 1 projection, but CLARB recently announced a 3 year freeze on dues so this should help the Board. She also pointed out that although the line item for DAS Risk Charge is higher than the year 1 projection, this is due to DAS billing for the whole biennium at once instead of on an annual basis.

Renewal History: Valentine presented the updated renewal history. The Board reviewed and did not have any questions about the individual renewal data but again expressed interest in having staff track business registrations. Everhart wondered if staff had looked at the trends in business registrations. Valentine said that staff has done so only on a very limited, sporadic basis and has not generated any charts similar to the renewal history chart for individual registrations. As part of this discussion, the Board briefly talked about issues of sole proprietor's vs. larger businesses.

Chair Ray called for a break at 10:28 AM. He reconvened the Board at 10:40 AM.

GOALS/STRATEGIES CHECK-IN

Chair Ray noted the Board's April 3, 2014 work session and his interest in hearing from Board members on the outcomes. He then opened with discussion about ongoing work to look at the path to licensure, which was one of the goals identified at the work session. He stated that his research on mentorship programs revealed that Alaska remains the only state west of the Mississippi with such a program. He mentioned ongoing work to understand landscape architecture scope of practice and update the definition of direct supervision and consideration of whether a future mentoring program could be accommodated.

Vice Chair O'Brien noted that regarding mentorship the question has come up as to what the problem really is and whether the Board should invest a lot of time and resources into developing a mentorship program if it would only benefit one or two individuals every few years. Everhart thought it was still worth pursuing to address the problems individuals located in rural areas of the state may encounter getting supervised work experience. Smith wondered if the Board could develop a waiver or exception process of some type instead of a mentorship program.

The Board had a good discussion about a wide range of issues associated with direct supervision for qualifying work experience. Chair Ray and Vice Chair O'Brien mentioned that the Board could also look at requirements to sit for exam, specifically whether 1 year of work experience under a RLA should be required to sit for any of the exam sections. Everhart suggested that the Board could look at whether other design professionals could be acceptable supervisors. Vice Chair O'Brien noted that the Board already accepts such experience for two of three years of work experience required for registration. Chair Ray noted that some of these issues would be discussed further in relation to the rules committee report.

Valentine asked the Board for feedback on the one-page strategic plan summary included in the meeting packet. This was prepared by L'Amoreaux and reviewed by Valentine based on the outcomes of the Board's April 3, 2014 work session. The Board members were largely satisfied that this draft accurately captured the outcomes of the work session. Chair Ray asked that any additional feedback from individual members be provided to Valentine within the next few weeks. Valentine inquired about the Board's intent to obtain input on the draft from registrants. The Board would like to include the draft in a future newsletter or other

notice to registrants. L'Amoreaux suggested that the Board not ask for input on the mission statement since the Board has not finished work on this. The other members agreed.

The Board did not specifically speak to or review other documents that were in the meeting packet. Chair Ray wrapped up the discussion as Kyle Martin, AAG, arrived and shifted the Board to the next agenda item.

PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW TRAINING

Chair Ray opened discussion saying that the Board was interested in hearing pointers for Board members. He asked if Martin or Valentine had a formal presentation. They said this was designed as a more dynamic refresher on key points of public meetings law with respect to meetings, committees, retreats, etc. Valentine referred the Board to her memo in the packet and associated background documents, which she summarized as follows: (a) two recent news articles about public meetings law issues to illustrate how issues surrounding the law continue to arise, (2) a relatively recent (2011) Oregon circuit court decision addressing public meetings law violations, and (3) a document containing some key excerpts from the *Oregon Attorney General's Public Records and Public Meetings Manual* (Jan. 2011).

Martin provided an overview of how the Public Meetings Law applies to Board meetings and can apply to Board committees under certain circumstances. Martin clarified, when asked, that a committee of one would not trigger the law. However, he advised that the use of the term committee could confuse the public and recommended that the Board consider having coordinators instead of one-person committees. The Board was amenable to this change. Valentine said her understanding is that the Board called everything a committee because the statutes talk about Board committees. She said it is good to know that the Board could update its operational policies to change the names from committee to coordinators.

Martin explained that a quorum of the Board is four members but that a committee of two board members could also trigger the law if the committee is charged with making recommendations or decisions on behalf of the Board. He was asked to clarify what a recommendation entailed, and Martin stated that he believes it is difficult to not have committees make recommendations for action but that it depends on how the committee works and what the Board charges it to do. Valentine noted that a committee could be charged with fact finding.

In response to questions from the Chair, Martin next shared information about email communications. Board members need to avoid having a quorum discussing issues by email or creating any meeting like conversation via email. Chair Ray asked how this relates to willful intent to violate the law. Martin explained that DOJ will represent individual Board members were issues arise related to carrying out Board business. However, if individual board members do something intentionally outside of that role or knowingly try to circumvent the public meetings law, then DOJ likely will not represent those individuals. He again stressed that Board members be cognizant of the nature of email communications and avoid starting conversations. Valentine noted that when she sends out emails to all members, it is generally something that either does not require response or asks for individual responses back to her. She noted that sometimes she needs to have two officers, for example the Chair and Vice Chair, involved in management of Board business so will email both on a subject. Martin agreed that this is sometimes going to be necessary for the officers to carry out their assigned work.

Martin noted that questions about the Public Meetings Law generally only come up when someone has a problem with the agency. The Public Meetings Law then can become a potential tool to go after the agency in question. He also explained the role of the Oregon Government Ethics Commission and its authority to levy penalties of \$1000 per violation.

Martin briefly discussed public records law in relation to questions from Board members about emails or other documents. Martin recommended that Board members always copy the Board Administrator on any emails so staff can maintain the public record copy. He also covered when copies of official public records might become subject to retention. Valentine noted that management of drafts can be challenging but that the final copy is always maintained. She reminded Board members that OSLAB has a records policy and spoke briefly to some of the complexities surrounding management of public records.

Board members asked about social media use. Martin provided some cautions about use of social media and the associated management of public records. He concurred with staff's previous analysis that use of social media would be very time consuming from a records management perspective. He also noted that the Board could not selectively remove comments posted on a Face Book page, such as from individuals disgruntled with the Board for whatever reason. In response to a question, he also recommended that Board members not get involved in blogs as it is too easy to end up with a quorum or conversations via such media.

At 12:05 PM, Chair Ray thanked counsel for assistance in the training and stated that it was very valuable for Board members. He adjourned the Board for a lunch break.

Chair Ray reconvened the Board at 12:30 PM. He noted that the Compliance Report was next.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

COMPLIANCE

Valentine stated that the Board has three open complaint investigations. Two were opened in February, and the third was opened in April in response to an individual filing a complaint with the Board. She reminded the Board that complaint case details are confidential.

Chair Ray announced at 12:32 PM that the Board was entering executive session to discuss documents exempt from disclosure pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(l) and (f). He read the script regarding participation in the executive session. At 1:49 PM, Chair Ray announced that the Board was returning to public session. No final decisions were made in Executive Session. He asked for motions related to cases discussed.

Wright moved to close LACC 14-02-001 with a letter of concern cautioning about use of title. Everhart seconded the motion. Chair Ray asked if there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all voted in favor.

Wright noted that the Board would take no action on LACC 14-02-002 and that the Board directed staff to pursue settlement negotiations.

Wright noted that the Board would take no action on LACC 14-04-003 as the investigation is ongoing.

Chair Ray asked if that concluded the compliance report. Valentine said she wanted to briefly report on work she and White are doing on a complaint case manual. They have a draft that will be presented to Wright and Smith for review. Their individual feedback would be helpful to her and White as they work to determine what else needs to be added or where information can be better clarified. The goal is to create a document that will be an aid to future board members and staff.

White departed the meeting at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Landscape Architect Registration Exam (LARE) Rules: Chair Ray asked Vice Chair O'Brien and Valentine to update the Board on rules work. The first item discussed was draft rule revisions related to Board procedures for the LARE. Vice Chair O'Brien and Valentine explained that the draft revisions were prepared per Board direction to streamline the exam application process by reducing the number of times a candidate had to obtain Board approval. The draft revisions were presented to the Administrative Rules Committee with this in mind. The Committee did not have any objections to the revisions. The idea of changing prerequisites for Sections 1 and 2 vs. Sections 3 and 4 came up in the Committee's discussion. Vice Chair O'Brien explained that the Committee felt having a pre-approval step was important as this is the only early contact between candidates and the Board. Committee members were not, however, necessarily convinced that there was a compelling reason to have different prerequisites for Sections 1 and 2 vs. Sections 3 and 4. The Committee discussed the Board perhaps allowing candidates to take any and all sections after completing their degrees. Valentine noted that the Committee met on April 29 so there has not been time to revise the rules in this manner, plus it was important to find out if the Board wanted to pursue this additional change.

Everhart noted that the Board could give recommendations about type of experience needed for various sections and that this may be as or more useful than requiring one year of work experience for Sections 3 and 4. She supported changing the rules further to not preclude anyone from taking any and all exams based on the education prerequisite. She thought this would simplify the exam process with CLARB but added that the Board would have to emphasize with exam candidates the need for work experience before registration. Valentine agreed that candidates must realize that they need that work experience even if they have passed all sections of the LARE. The Board discussed how this change would help those located in rural areas as they could get through the exam without having to document one year of work experience and then would only need to get work experience for registration purposes. Board members were in agreement on this direction as a means to give each candidate the flexibility to determine his or her best approach to completing the exam. Treasurer Olsen thought it was a good sign that the committee is interested in supporting the Board's work to modernize the path to licensure.

Vice Chair O'Brien noted that committee members provided unsolicited comments on the oral exam requirement. They want to see the Board continue with the oral exam process and suggested that the Board include in the oral exam discussion an explanation of the roles of the Board, CLARB, and ASLA. Vice Chair O'Brien briefed the committee on work the Board has been doing recently to enhance the oral exam process.

Direct Supervision Project Update: Vice Chair O'Brien opened by asking the Board to consider the draft definitions for direct supervision. Valentine briefly spoke to the purpose of the associated matrix as capturing ideas and issues coming up in brainstorming on the issue

of direct supervision and qualifying work experience. Vice Chair O'Brien noted that definition "option 2" was most preferred by committee members although he also likes language in definition "option 1" about the RLA having control over work. He noted that both options allow for modernization in how supervision is provided and the use of current technology. He explained how the committee members discussed whether there should be a requirement for a minimum amount of face-to-face supervision. Valentine noted that 50% was used in the matrix as an easy figure to work with but did not represent a Committee recommendation.

The Board discussed the proposed definitions in the context of possible mentoring program. Everhart was concerned about how the Board would define the role of the mentoring RLA. Chair Ray wants to see the Board define direct supervision such that it does not preclude the possibility of accepting contract or mentorship based experience. He thought "option 2" was the best choice as it would offer more flexibility.

Valentine suggested that the Board consider an interim approach to address new supervision tools and then keep working on the idea of project based work experience either by contract or mentorship. Vice Chair O'Brien agreed that it will be much more complicated to put those programs in place, and he did not want to see all revisions held up.

The Board discussed a variety of issues related to gaining diverse experience in landscape architecture such as: (a) the role of the RLA in the range of supervision scenarios being discussed, (b) whether a candidate can gain sufficient experience without at least one year under a RLA, (c) responsibilities for stamping and signing, (d) whether another design professional (i.e., architect, engineer) could stamp and sign work prepared by a candidate and mentored by a RLA, and (e) how much personal contact and guidance would be required from the RLA mentoring the candidate. Chair Ray said he is concerned about new graduates not being able to find entry-level positions in Oregon firms. While acknowledging this concern, O'Brien and L'Amoreaux were uncomfortable with the idea of not requiring any supervision under a RLA or not somehow having the mentoring RLA responsible for the work. The Board discussed whether concerns with non-RLA supervision could be addressed by requiring substantial documentation of a RLA mentor's oversight or increasing the amount of time that it takes to get the equivalent of one year of work experience under a RLA. Valentine noted that the Board may need to explore whether mentoring would even be something RLAs would agree to do if it requires a lot of work to document or raises questions about liabilities for project work. The Board did not make any final decisions on these matters.

Chair Ray suggested that the Board ask Martin for his reactions to the discussion and then let him depart from the meeting. Martin said that the Board was discussing primarily policy issues regarding what is acceptable work experience. He is available to assist with rule language once the policy direction is determined. He did caution that the Board should look at whether the phrase direct supervision means the same thing as used in various Board rules.

Vice Chair O'Brien asked for Board agreement on generally moving forward with definition "option 2" as a basis for adding flexibility to the work experience qualifications. He said this could include looking at requiring an extended period of work experience if the candidate has only non-RLA supervisors. He recommended also tabling the mentorship idea due to its complexities and questions about need for this. There was generally agreement to continue forward based on the "option 2" definition but no clear consensus on how much additional effort to put into the mentorship concept.

Other Planning/Research: Chair Ray noted the rules project list in the meeting packet. Vice Chair O'Brien and Valentine explained how they are using this tool to track project work. The Board did not have time to review all the projects on the list.

Chair Ray called for a break at 3:00 PM. He reconvened the Board at 3:11 PM.

BUDGET & INVESTMENT

Chair Ray asked Treasurer Olsen and Valentine to present the report. Valentine started with the memorandum outlining the idea of adding a money market account as a financial management tool and then addressed how this linked directly to the proposed revisions to the Financial Management and Investment Policy and indirectly to the proposed new Financial Reserves policy. Treasurer Olsen and Valentine explained how the policies could help the Board with financial management of Board assets. Board members discussed the policies.

Chair Ray moved to adopt the Financial Management and Investment policy as presented to the Board. Everhart seconded the motion. Chair Ray asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved. With this change, the Board also acknowledged that Treasurer Olsen and Valentine could move forward with opening a money market account as outlined in their memorandum dated April 28, 2014 and included in the meeting packet.

Valentine addressed the history of reserves policy. Treasurer Olsen explained what is meant by reserve funds and how the policy is intended as a management tool and should be supportive of the Board's future consideration of financial management options. In response to questions, they clarified the difference between operating and designated reserves.

Wright moved to adopt the Financial Reserves policy. Vice Chair O'Brien seconded the motion. Chair Ray asked if there was further discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

LICENSURE REVIEW

L'Amoreaux and Valentine explained that this agenda item was a placeholder. They were anticipating an issue to discuss with the Board related to alternative supervision. This did not materialize.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

October – December 2013 Audits/Audit Process: Everhart opened with some general comments about the audit process. She stated that for the Oct. – Dec. 2013 audit period, there were 9 audits plus 1 request to return to active practice that required review of continuing education. She has been talking with staff about how best to present the quarterly reports to the Board. Her goal is to get the correct level of information to the Board in the report with additional supporting information provided to staff for the registrant files. She shared two formats – one narrative and one tabular. The report recommended the following:

- Control #14-003, Approve, with notification that 4 hours of student critique were credited as 4 professional development hours (PDH) not 8, no carryover;
- Control #14-004, Approve, with carryover of 2 other PDH;
- Control #14-005, Approve, with carryover of 12 health, safety, welfare (HSW) PDH;
- Control #14-006, Approve, with carryover of 3 HSW PDH and 4 other PDH;

- Control #14-007, Approve, with carryover of 7.5 HSW PDH and recommend future documentation of specific sessions attended during a training or a summary of this.
- Control #14-008, Approve, with carryover of 1.5 HSW PDH and 1 other PDH, with notification that participation in one design panel was credited with 4 PDH – 1 PDH under 804-025-0020(3)(H) and 1 PDH for "education" credited for others.
- Control #14-009, Approve, with carryover of 4 HSW PDH and 8 other PDH;
- Control #14-010, Approve, with carryover of 3.75 HSW PDH
- Control #14-011, Approve, with carryover of 3 HSW PDH and 9 PDH, with notification that it would be ideal if registration or other materials documenting event time span and/or official certificates of attendance were secured in lieu of other documentation; and
- Control #14-013, Approve, with carryover of 12 HSW PDH.

Everhart said she believes the Board may eventually want to look at how Board rule awards PDH for certain activities. For example, the Board rule limits registrants to 1 PDH per renewal period for giving presentations no matter how different the presentations might be. She also suggested that the Board might clarify the credit for teaching, noting some confusion evidenced in certificates given out by the University of Oregon (UO) for design critiques.

The Board wanted to hear more about the UO situation. Everhart explained that UO gave letters awarding the RLA participants a set amount of PDH. Board members agreed that the UO should not be determining the PDH awarded as this is subject to Board rule and interpretation. The Board would like to see Everhart and staff follow-up with a guidance letter to UO about this situation. Wright suggested putting something in the newsletter about this. Chair Ray noted that the rule requirements were covered in a recent newsletter. Valentine said that staff routinely includes articles offering guidance on various aspects of continuing education.

Smith said she was surprised that the Board does not pre-approve continuing education courses. Treasurer Olsen agreed, stating that other boards pre-approve. Valentine noted that OSLAB has only pre-approved the “LACES” courses offered via ASLA. OSLAB has not invested the resources in pre-approving other courses and leaves it up to the registrant to make a case for any particular continuing education pursued. Everhart reminded all that the OSLAB continuing education program is not that old, having started in 2005.

Everhart next shared draft revisions to the PDH log that she and staff have been discussing. The Board liked the changes and asked that the form be finalized and shared with registrants.

Everhart returned to her recommendations for the ten reviews completed for the quarter. She pointed out where there were some disparities between PDH reported and accepted but that her recommendation was that all should be passed. For the next meeting, she confirmed that Board members did not have a strong preference regarding whether she provided a text or tabular report. L’Amoreaux did ask for the continued inclusion of notes on key issues or lessons learned as information that is helpful to the Board.

Everhart and Valentine briefly mentioned their interest in creating a mock log with associated mock certificates and other supporting documents. These would then be used as outreach tools to help explain how continuing education needs to be documented by a registrant. This is a project that will be worked on as time allows.

Chair Ray moved for Board approval of audits for October – December 2013 and approval of the request to return to active practice as recommended in Everhart’s report. L’Amoreaux seconded the motion. Chair Ray asked if there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

Drawing of Names: Jan. – March 2014: Smith randomly pulled four slips for the next audit period. The names pulled were kept confidential by Valentine.

Other Updates: Everhart suggested that the Board might want to look into how the audit names are drawn to assess whether there are ways to better balance the chances of selection. She noted how registrants are grouped by renewal date in quarters (e.g., Oct-Dec. or Jan.-March). Some quarters having much fewer registrants renewing than others. She wondered what this meant for statistical chance of being selected for audit. Valentine summarized how the selection process is currently handled. She indicated that staff was open to looking at other approaches and did not immediately have a proposal to offer.

OTHER:

Liaison report - Oregon Board of Architect Examiners: L’Amoreaux gave a brief summary of the issues before this board based on her review of their meeting notes. She would like to attend a future meeting to learn more about this board.

Liaison report- Oregon Landscape Contractors Board: Valentine reminded the Board that the idea of a meeting of OSLAB and OLCB representatives remains on the table. Chair Ray and Vice Chair O’Brien were previously designated as the Board representatives for any such meeting. They agreed that this meeting could be scheduled between now and next quarterly meeting. Valentine agreed to find a mutually acceptable date and Portland area location for the meeting.

Liaison report: ASLA: Chair Ray reported that for the last several months, the ASLA Oregon chapter has been working on its annual symposium, and this seems to have taken all their time and effort. Everhart asked if ASLA has agreed to participate in the Oregon Design Professionals group. Chair Ray agreed to follow-up on this again.

CORRESPONDENCE (placeholder)

Valentine noted that this was a placeholder and that there was no correspondence for the Board’s consideration this meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Ray noted that no members of the public were present.

NEW BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Valentine distributed information on the CLARB annual meeting. Board members discussed attendance. No final decision was made about a Board member attending the meeting. The Board was supportive of having both staff attend the meeting. The Registration Specialist was to be invited to attend given the unique training opportunities offered by the meeting location near CLARB and training related to CLARB processes.

ADJOURNMENT (4:00 PM*)

Chair Ray adjourned the Board at 4:35 PM.

+++++

The minutes of the May 8, 2014 meeting were approved as presented at the August 14, 2014 Board meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Valentine,
Administrator