BEFORE THE SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL EXAMINERS



ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, October 19, 2011 10:08 a.m. - 12:40 p.m.

The Advisory Council Meeting was held before the South Carolina Board of Landscape Architectural Examiners taken at the Synergy Business Park, Kingstree Building, 110 Centerview Drive, Room 108, Columbia, South Carolina, on the 19th day of October, 2011 before Carla S. Dominick, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of South Carolina.

APPEARANCES:

BOARD MEMBERS:

Parks McLeod, Chairman Barret D. Anderson Laura Dukes

ADVISE COUNSEL:

James O. Saxson, Esquire

ALSO PRESENT:

Sherri Moorer, Program Assistant
Jan Simpson, Administrator
Brock McDaniel, City of Sumter
William Rozier, City of Sumter
John I. Redfern, Jr., Davis & Floyd, Inc.
Yancey M. Robertson, Jr., Davis & Floyd Inc.
Dottie Buchanan, LLR Operations Management

INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	-
Mr. Chairman	
INTRODUCTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS: Mr. Chairman	
APPROVAL OF JULY 20, 2011 MEETING MINUTES: Motion by Ms. Dukes	
Mr. Chairman	

INTRODUCTIONS OF STAFF AND OTHERS:	
Ms. Moorer	. 7
REVISIONS TO AGENDA CONTINUED:	
Motion by Ms. Dukes	. 8
second by Mr. Anderson	Ω
EXECUTIVE SESSION	Я
Motion by Ms. Dukes	. 9
	. 9
APPLICATION HEARINGS:	
Mr. Chairman	. 9
WITNESSES:	
YANCEY M. ROBERTSON, JR	14
JOHN L. REDFERN, JR	14
Motion by Ms. Dukes	1.0
second by Mr. Anderson	1 9
Hearing Concluded	21
<u>NEW BUSINESS</u> :	
Mr. Chairman	21
motion by Ms. Dukes	3.0
Second by Mr. Anderson	31 31
Motion by Mr. Anderson	31
	31
APPLICATION REVIEWS:	
Mr. Chairman	31
BROCK ANDERSON McDANIEL APPLICATION	32
WITNESS:	
BROCK ANDERSON McDANIEL	3 3
WILLIAM ROZIER	40
Motion by Ms. Dukes	ΛΛ
Second by Mr. Anderson	4 4 4 5
Conclusion of Brock Anderson McDaniel's	
Review	45

DARCY ELIZABE	TH LESLIE	APPLICATI	ON	45
Motion by Mr.	Anderson			49
Second by Ms.	Dukes			49
Conclusion of	Darcy Eli	zabeth Le	eslie's F	Review 50
MICHAEL W. KI		TI T ON		
Motion by Ms.	DU REPLICA	TION .	• • • • •	50
Second by Mr.	Anderson	• • • • •	• • • • •	50
Conclusion of	Darcy Fli	· · ·		50
Concrusion of	Darcy Lil	zabeth Te	ssile s k	Review 51
PATRICIA JOAN	NEWSHUTZ	APPLICATI	ON	51
Motion by Mr.	Anderson			51
Second by Ms.	Dukes			51
Conclusion of	Patricia	Joan News	shutz's R	eview 51
DAVID DAVIS P	EARSON APP	LICATION		51
Motion by Ms.	Dukes		· · · ·	51
Second by Mr.	Anderson			51
Conclusion of	David Dav	is Pearso	n's Revi	ew . 52
				. 02
		HED BUSIN		
Mr. Chairman		• • • • •		52
	DD DDDODMO			_
Mr Todd Bond	FF REPORTS	- INVES	rigations	<u>3</u> :
Mr. Todd Bond				5, 3
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms.	 Dukes	• • • • •	• • • •	53
Mr. Todd Bond	 Dukes	• • • • •	• • • •	53
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr.	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. Staff: Ms. Moorer .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT:
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT : 55 55
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 55 55 58
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer Ms. Simpson Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT : 55 58 60
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 58 60
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson . Mr. Anderson .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 58 60
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer Ms. Simpson Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 58 60
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson . Mr. Anderson . Mr. Anderson . Mr. Anderson .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	PORT: 53 53 PORT: 55 58 60 61 66
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson . Mr. Moorer .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 58 60 61 66
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson . Mr. Chairman	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 58 60 60 66 66 67
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS -	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 60 60 66 67 67
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Motion by Mr.	Dukes Anderson REPORTS	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	PORT: 53 53 PORT: 55 55 60 61 67 79
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer .	Dukes Anderson REPORTS	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 60 60 66 67 67
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . UNI Mr. Chairman Ms. Moorer . Motion by Mr. Second by Ms.	Dukes Anderson REPORTS	ADMINISTR	ATIVE RE	PORT: 53 53 PORT: 55 55 60 61 67 79
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Mr. Chairman Ms. Moorer . Motion by Mr. Second by Ms. Mr. Chairman	Dukes Anderson REPORTS	ADMINISTR USINESS C OF OFFIC	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 58 60 61 66 67 67 79 79
Mr. Todd Bond Motion by Ms. Second by Mr. STAFF: Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Simpson . Mr. Anderson Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . Ms. Moorer . UNI Mr. Chairman Ms. Moorer . Motion by Mr. Second by Ms.	Dukes Anderson REPORTS	ADMINISTR USINESS C OF OFFIC	ATIVE RE	53 53 53 PORT: 55 55 58 60 61 66 67 67 79 79 79

5			
PUBLIC COMMENTS:			
Mr. Saxson			
Mr. Chairman			
EXECUTIVE SESSION (if needed): Mr. Chairman			
PUBLIC SESSION AND NOTICE OF NEXT MEETING:			
Mr. Chairman			
ADJOURNMENT:			
Mr. Chairman 86 Motion by Ms. Dukes 86 Second by Mr. Anderson 86			
Certificate			
<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Exhibit Number One			
3) Brian A. Couture at STV/Ralph Whitehead Associates dtd 10/18/11	3		
Exhibit Number Two			

CALL TO ORDER

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Act.

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

18

22

23

24

25

AND STATEMENT OF PUBLIC NOTICE:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're going to call to order the October 19, 2011 South Carolina Board of Landscape Architecture Examiners meeting. Notice of this meeting was properly posted by the South Carolina Board of Landscape Architecture Examiners' office, Synergy Business Park, Kingstree Building and provided all requesting persons, organizations news media in compliance with Section 30-4-80of the South Carolina Freedom of Information

INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Introduce the board members. I am Parks McLeod, a landscape architect.

MS. DUKES: Laura Dukes, landscape architect.

MR. ANDERSON: Barret Anderson, landscape architect.

APPROVAL OF JULY 20, 2011 MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN: The board members have received the MR. meetings from the 2000 July 20. 2011 meeting.

MS. DUKES: Make a motion to approve the minutes of July 20th meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion. Discussion?

MS. BUCHANAN: I'm Dottie Buchanan. I'm operational

MR. ROBERTSON: I'm Yancey Robertson with Davis and Floyd. I'm a landscape architect.

MR. REDFERN: I'm John Redfern with Davis and Floyd.

I'm the Chief Financial Officer.

10 MR. McDANIEL: I'm Brock McDaniel with the City of Sumter.

MR. ROZIER: I'm William Rozier. I'm the City

Engineer with the City of Sumter.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. SAXSON: Now if somebody will make --

REVISIONS TO AGENDA CONTINUED:

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion?

18 MS. DUKES: I make a motion to enter into executive

session.

6

7

8

9

16

21

24

20 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(Ayes are heard)

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: If y'all will excuse us.

(EXECUTIVE SESSION OFF THE RECORD)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to entertain a motion that

1 we now come out of executive session.

MS. DUKES: I make a motion to return from executive session.

MR. ANDERSON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All in favor?

(Ayes are heard)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'd also like to go on the record that during executive session that no actions or votes were taken by this Board.

APPLICATION HEARINGS:

- MR. CHAIRMAN: At this time we will continue on the agenda, application hearing, Davis and Floyd. We'll call this hearing to order and at this time I'd like to make a statement that at some point in the past I have had employment with Davis and Floyd. I can't tell you how many years ago we've had a project that we worked on with them or what the project was. But I have in the past had to do -- have had that --
- 20 | MS. DUKES: Not employment.
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: Not employment. I have been in -- I had been a landscape architect on Davis and Floyd projects.
 - MR. SAXSON: And Mr. Chair, do you have any -- I mean, do you know Mr. Robinson or Mr. Redfern

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

- or have any relationships with them?
- 2 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I do not.
 - MR. SAXSON: Okay. Do either or you have a problem with him continuing to hear --
- 5 | MR. ROBERTSON: No, not at all.
- 6 MR. REDFERN: No, sir.
- 7 | MR. SAXSON: Okay.

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

- MR. ANDERSON: I also am an employee of Clemson
 University and Davis and Floyd are often hired
 to work with Clemson University. I have no
 personal knowledge or experience with either of
 the two here. But just wanted to state that.
- MR. SAXSON: Do you have any objections to his participation?
- 15 MR. ROBERTSON: None at all.
- 16 MR. REDFERN: No, sir.
 - MS. DUKES: And I as well over 30 years being a landscape architect have come into contact with Davis and Floyd on projects as well. I do not have any personal knowledge of either of you.
- 21 MR. SAXSON: Any objections?
- 22 MR. ROBERTSON: No, sir.
- 23 MR. REDFERN: No, sir.
- 24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. This is a matter of Davis
- and Floyd, Incorporated. The purpose of this

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

hearing is to determine whether a certificate of authorization should be granted to Davis and Floyd Incorporated. Everyone is reminded that these proceedings are being recorded and the witnesses must be sworn before they testify. All remarks should be directed to the Vice Chair and all responses should be verbal. ΜV name is Parks McLeod, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Board of Landscape Architecture Examiners. The attorney assigned us during this hearing is James Saxson, office of General Counsel with Other Board members are Laura Dukes and LLR. Barret Anderson.

- MR. SAXSON: And if I may, forgive for methe interruption but for the court reporter's benefit, I'm the office of Advice Counsel not -- instead of General Counsel.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. This hearing is to be conducted in accordance with the provisions of South Carolina Code Section 40-1-90 of the South Carolina Administrative Procedures Act and the rules and regulations of South Carolina Board of Landscape Architecture Examiners. Ms. Moorer, is the completed application package in our materials.

1 MS. MOORER: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. CHAIRMAN: What questions did the staff have concerning this application.

MS. MOORER: Mr. Vice Chairman and other board members, Mr. Yancey Μ. Robertson, Jr., responsible landscape architect for Davis and Floyd, Inc., indicated on the application that Davis and Floyd, Inc. has offered and provided landscape architectural services in the State South Carolina without a certificate authorization. They state they were unaware of the certificate of authorization requirement in law. Because our of this issue. this application is before you today. Relevant statutes include section 40-28-70(a)which states in part the practice or offer to practice landscape architecture through a firm is permitted only through entities holding a valid certificate of authorization issued by the Board.

- MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the staff appoint anyone here today to answer the questions we might have?
- MS. MOORER: No.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the application -- applicant present?

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

- 1 MS. MOORER: Yes.
- 2 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.
- 3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you represented by counsel?
- 4 MR. ROBERTSON: No.
- 5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robertson, do you have any witnesses that you intend to call to testify on
- 7 your behalf?
- 8 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, I'd like to introduce John
 9 Redfern who is the Chief Financial Officer for
 10 Davis and Floyd.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right, I guess Mr.
 Robertson if you're to show why your license should be granted despite the questions raised by staff.
- MR. SAXSON: You must swear them in first.
- 16 | MS. DUKES: Do number 12.
- 17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, did I skip by one?
- 18 | MS. DUKES: Yes.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: At this time, all persons who may
- 20 testify should stand and please state your name
- 21 for the record.
- 22 | MR. ROBERTSON: Yancey McMillan Robertson, Jr.
- 23 MR. REDFERN: John L. Redfern, Jr.
- 24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Please raise your right-hand to be
- 25 sworn in.

- MR. YANCEY M. ROBERTSON, JR. AND MR. JOHN L.

 REDFERN, JR., having been duly sworn, testified follows:
- MR. ROBERTSON: I do.
- 5 MR. REDFERN: I do.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Now, we have Mr. Robertson. Are you ready to show us why your license should be granted despite the questions raised by staff?
- MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. And I'd like to state we appreciate the opportunity to do this and come before you and introduce ourselves to you. I've been a registered landscape architect for ten years since October 9, 2001 and during that time there have been no complaints against me. I've not been accused of any wrongdoing or had appear we're to in court and voluntarily bringing the matter before you that we do not have a certificate of authorization because we became aware of the fact that we should have one when we were filling out an application at the County of Anderson for for а kavak lodge and one of the questions and items wanted иs to address was to present COA number. And at that time we realized we need

and

yes,

before

to have one. Prior to that point, joining Davis and Floyd about three years ago, was a sole proprietor since my license was granted to me ten years ago and I just operated under my license, under my name and I wasn't aware that incorporated firms had to have a COA. So it was just ignorance on my part that we do not have it. MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the Board? MS. DUKES: I do have a question. Has Davis Floyd ever had a full time landscape architect other than yourself? MR. ROBERTSON: They have not. I'm the first one. MR. CHAIRMAN: And you stated you've been there three years with Davis and Floyd? MR. ROBERTSON: I've been there three years, sir. MR. CHAIRMAN: Ιs there any additional

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- relevant information -- evidence you'd like for us consider?
- MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, I've got ten copies of letters, three -- three letters from clients, positive references of the service that I provided and the service that Davis and Floyd provided them associated with landscape

		ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING 16
1		architecture/engineering firms and duties.
2	MR.	CHAIRMAN: If you'll give me a second to look at
3		these please. These are just letters of
4		reference?
5	MR.	ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. And finally there's a copy
6		of my registration card.
7	MR.	CHAIRMAN: Is that on here as well?
8	MR.	ROBERTSON: It's on the back, the last sheet.
9	MR.	SAXSON: All right. Be with you in just a
10		second. Madam Court Reporter, would you please
11		mark the three letters of reference together as
12		applicant's Exhibit Number One, please.
13	(Ap	plicant's Exhibit Number One was marked for
14	ide	ntification purposes.)
15	MR.	SAXSON: Does the Board have any objection to
16		taking these?
17	MR.	CHAIRMAN: I have none,
18	MR.	SAXSON: And Madam Court Reporter if you'll
19		mark the copy of his registration card as
20		Applicant's two.
21	(App	olicant's Exhibit Number Two was marked for
22	ide	ntification purposes.)
23	MR.	SAXSON: Is that okay with the Board?

 $\mathbf{MR}\,.$ $\mathbf{CHAIRMAN}\colon$ I have no problem with it. Is that, I

24

25

guess, that wraps up your presentation to this

Board? Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROBERTSON: Can I introduce John Redfern?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON: If he'd care to say something?

REDFERN: Mr. Vice-Chairman and other members of the Board, want we to thank you for the opportunity to allow us to be here today. I'm embarrassed to say that we are here because of a violation. Let me tell you a little bit about Davis and Floyd as a background so that you can understand the company. We had been since 1954. around We were found in South Carolina. About two-thirds of our work governmental agencies. The South Carolina Department of Transportation is a large client as well as Dorchester County. ours other third is private industry of what we do. We are primarily civil engineers and a third of our work is civil engineering. A third of our work has been inspection on the highway projects that the South Carolina Department of Transportation and Dorchester County have been performing over the last several years. And the other third of our work is laboratory testing and surveying. So our core clearly is

civil engineering and until we hired Yancey, we did not have a landscape architect on staff, we always contracted that out to someone else. Part of ΜV job is to make sure the wе registered and certified where we need to and there are about 82 returns every year that file, all the way from certificates authorization to business personal property returns to annual reports. We certainly are a company that wants to be a good citizen wants to do what's right. And sending in the application, the question obviously could answered a different way, but we chose to honest because that's the type of citizen that we want to be. And we're here in front of you this morning to ask that you approve that application and that we would certainly be citizen going forward following all the rules that you put for us. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- MR. SAXSON: You need to ask questions of him if you would like to do that.
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions? Thank you.

 At this time --
 - MS. DUKES: I don't think we need to do it.

- 1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me?
- 2 MS. DUKES: I don't think we need to do it. We can
- 3 just make a motion --

6

7

8

9

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We can do that if you want.
 - MS. DUKES: -- just do that to approve the application.
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Your case has been submitted and the Board is ready to make a decision.
- MS. DUKES: At this time I'd like to make a motion to approve the application for certificate of authorization for Davis and Floyd, Inc.
- 13 | MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion, do we have a second?
- 14 MR. ANDERSON: Second.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Time for a vote, all in favor?

(Ayes are heard)

- 18 | MR. CHAIRMAN: The ayes have it unanimously.
- 19 | MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you very much.
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: The decision was announced today expresses our basic elements of our ruling in this case. Counsel, staff and the board will prepare a document that is more fully express our conclusions in the appropriate language and format οf the Board that the Board has

1

5

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21 22

23

24 25

traditionally used and will be the final order of this matter. Mr. Robertson, thank you for your presentation and attendance here. members, thank you for attention and thoughtful proliferation. This concludes this hearing. Thank you.

MR. SAXSON: I'll correct one thing. Because your application was approved, you don't get order from my office, you'll get something from the administrators. That's the only difference.

MR. ROBERTSON: Can I ask you a question? How do we move forward in paying the fees and getting the number --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sherri will be handling all that.

MR. SAXSON: If you want to talk to Ms. Moorer at another time, she'll be glad to explain it you.

MS. MOORER: It will issued because your -- the fee that you paid with the application actually covers your first renewal licensure cycle. will be issued today or tomorrow probably depending on when I can get back upstairs and entered into the database. aet January 31, 2013 will be the expiration date. And Ι

LARE

CLARB

to

do

in

usually enclose a letter with a certificate to 1 2 give you the details on it. 3 MR. REDFERN: Thank you very much. MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your time. 4 5 (The hearing was concluded) 6 **NEW BUSINESS:** 7 We'll continue on with our agenda. MR. CHAIRMAN: 8 Seven, new business, review of 9 candidates. You have the paperwork 10 folders. Sherri, you want to expound on this? MS. MOORER: I'd like for Jan to 11 actually be here 12 too because this is something that came up at the CLARB national meeting. To give you -- are 13 14 you ready? 15 SIMPSON: I thought you were MS. going 16 applications. 17 18 roll up to the decisions that they made. 19 20 MS. SIMPSON: Right. And 21 because he was there also. 22 discussion, actually it was 23

24

25

 ${\tt MS.}$ ${\tt MOORER:}$ We wanted to this prior to applications to make sure that any reviews they did would Barrett can chime in When we were in a a n original meeting, it came to light that the statute does not really require that they complete education before they take the exam. So, have a look at CREEL COURT REPORTING, INC. 1230 Richland Street / Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 252-3445 / (800) 822-0896

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MOORER: Yeah.

MR. ANDERSON: There was a discussion also about are there portions of the exam that --

MS. SIMPSON: That should be --

ANDERSON: An individual and a student status MR. could qualify to take in advance. And the thought there being that if they begin that examination process at least in part, that they would be more apt to follow through and take the rest of the examination and ultimately become a licensed professional as a result of That was part of the discussion around that. that subject also --

- MR. CHAIRMAN: The plan is to allow them to take -to begin taking the exam prior to --
- MR. ANDERSON: Graduation.
- MS. MOORER: I think the core issue -- the core question is under our old law you did have to pre-register candidates to take the LARE. It looks like since our legislative changes went through, that language was not carried over and the exam is transitioning to a new format about a year from now, in September of 2012.

MS. DUKES: I would like that the appropriate for the

аt

а

different

we have

session

just

for us to discuss this further would be in 1 2 an executive 3 because we have not -- I mean, 4 recently gotten the new law, the regs we have just recently written those and those have not passed. And we still have not written a policy statement, so I think those are possibly some things that should be clarified in a policy statement versus --

MR. ANDERSON: I agree.

SIMPSON: Policy has no force of law, that the MS. problem with policy. So, if you want something to be -- if you want to be able to enforce something, its going to have to be the statutes and regs --

SAXSON: It's going to have to be the statutes and regs.

MS. DUKES: So then --

MS. SIMPSON: And what it is and Barrett and I were both just frantically searching through because we thought it said that but it really does not. What 40-28-30 says is in order to licensed as a landscape architect, it does not say in order to be able to take the test, to be eligible to take the test. Ιt says bе

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

licensed you have to have passed the test other qualifications. Be a graduate of an accredited program, two years of experience under supervision and satisfactory pass written examination administered by the CLARB or an equivalent examination.

MOORER: If y'all feel you need to adjourn to MS. executive session to speak

MS. SIMPSON: Right. That's fine.

-- to advice counsel about this to get MS. MOORER: some more clarification on this, feel free.

SAXSON: I think right now we're okay, if y'all MR. are.

MS. DUKES: Ι quess I would have to review the wording of it. I -- I feel very strongly that the examination should be after the education process and whether or not its implied from the order of the items. In that section B we've got an order of one, two, three and four. don't know how that would be legally --

SIMPSON: It does not say that though. Let me see if I can get to the regs.

MR. SAXSON: I have them here Jan if you want them in a hard copy.

MS. SIMPSON: And these are proposed regs. They have

not been finalized, but there is --1 2 MS. MOORER: Approve --MS. SIMPSON: -- they're all but final, so --3 4 MR. SAXSON: Yeah. MS. SIMPSON: Yeah. I mean to change them, we have to 5 6 start over. ${\tt MR.}$ SAXSON: And the statutory change would be even -7 8 MS. DUKES: Where are you referring to in the regs? 9 10 Section 76-7? 11 MS. MOORER: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN: Jan, how does this compare to other MR. 13 Did y'all -- do you have any idea? states? 14 MS. SIMPSON: lot of states, well, over half I Α 15 think in that room, that day, the southern 16 region said that their statute is written such 17 that they could approve somebody taking the --18 part of the exam before they complete 19 education. Barrett --20 ANDERSON: That's right. MR. That's right. And 21 that's why I alluded to the point I made --22 made previously about providing incentive to 23 follow through.

MS. SIMPSON: So, that the thought is that if you get them started taking the exam, they pass one or

24

1 two sections, they are more likely to 2 and become licensed then if they have to wait 3 until after they have finished the education. More than likely, from what I understood, there 4 5 are sections that lend themselves more taking while they're in college. Its more --6 7 its more education oriented, more academic than 8 practice related and so the practice related 9 divisions would be more than likely taken after 10 they graduate and have some experience. 11

- MS. DUKES: Can this conversation not also be applied to the apprenticeship?
- MS. SIMPSON: It's up to y'all.
- MS. DUKES: I mean, if you're opening that for the order, I know Georgia has a definite order of education, apprenticeship, examination. And we have always --
- MS. SIMPSON: That's entirely --
- 19 MS. DUKES: -- invoked that as well.
 - MS. SIMPSON: I can give you an example from another profession, the architects nationally are -- the architects take the national exam just as the CLARB, it's -- it's the same thing.
- 24 MS. DUKES: Right.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

MS. SIMPSON: They have seven divisions. They can

in any order but the South Carolina it Board does not allow them to start taking it until they have completed their education. The South Carolina Board allows them aet experience prior to finishing the degree. So its up to y'all and it's the way the State writes the statute and regs as to you think is the best order or if you wanted to open up the exam --

- MS. DUKES: Well, having --
- MS. SIMPSON: -- while they're in college but make them wait to count experience until after they finished -- I mean, that's -- that's your call.
- MR. ANDERSON: Laura, let me ask one question.
- 15 MS. DUKES: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. ANDERSON: How is this discussion bearing on our agenda item for application review, for the sake of staying on the agenda, do we need to table this discussion until after we review candidates. I'm not real clear on why we're having this discussion now.
- MS. SIMPSON: Because it could affect some of your decisions. And I --
- MS. DUKES: Well, how we legally review the law and the regs having personally served on this Board

several terms and having personally written the 1 2 exam as well as graded the exam and served CLARB national board, the way that we have been 3 4 approving applications is the way the State of 5 South Carolina should continue to review them. If we do need to review our law and regs, then 6 we should strongly review that. 7 CLARB has --8 MS. SIMPSON: approved them under this statute 9 currently in effect. MS. DUKES: I'm not -- I'm not following that y'all 10 11 were legally interpreting that in that manner. 12 If we do need legal counsel on that --13 MS. SIMPSON: Absolutely. MS. DUKES: -- then I think we do need to table the 14 15 discussion to review that. SIMPSON: I mean -- that -- if 16 MS. you want to do 17 executive session for this noworlater, 18 whatever. I'm just --MR. SAXSON: Jan, correct me if I'm wrong, but y'all 19 20 studied this shows that the way the Board has traditionally done this is not covered in the 21 22 statute. 23 MS. SIMPSON: Right. MS. MOORER: Not with language as specific as was in

our previous statute and regulations, which are

24

12

13

14

15

22

23

24

25

1

2

longer in effect. And that's a concern as no had very explicit language before, and its not explicit any more and we just want to make sure that we're complying with the law that we If CLARB is asking us can students take have. this while they're still enrolled in college, we just need to make sure that whether we say yes or whether we say no, we've got the law to We don't -- if somebody comes back back it up. to us and says why did y'all make this decision, we want to be able to clearly say because --

- MR. CHAIRMAN: At this point in time, all we can make our decision on is the --
- MS. MOORER: Current law and I put the Code --
- 16 MR. SAXSON: And its section 30 right? 28 section 30 17 -- 40-28-30?
- 18 MS. SIMPSON: I'm sorry. Yeah, 40-28-30.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: And for us to make any change on this,
 we will basically begin the process over.
- 21 | MR. SAXSON: Right.
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: After the process is completed, what is involved in changing if we elect to --
 - MS. SIMPSON: If you want to change the statute to say you can't take the exam until after --

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: The time frame, right.

MS. SIMPSON: Okay. You would go back at that point, when its passed by the Legislator -Legislature to go -- to do that same process you were using in the past. But under this it does not specify that. And I understand that's how its always been done, but the language does not --

- MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time until we have -- I know we're starting the whole clock over and the whole process. What's -- when is this to be legislated?
- MS. SIMPSON: We can get it before the Legislature in 2012. I don't know what we do -- I don't know the logistics of what we do with the regs. If there's no conflict, we don't have to fix the regs. If the regs then have -- I don't know if it even addresses it.
- MS. MOORER: The way the regs are very --
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it sounds to me it sounds to me like we need to move forward --
- MS. DUKES: I'd like to make a motion that we go into executive session and discuss with -- with legal counsel how we can review these applications that are presented for us today.

2.3

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

with Mr. McDaniels since he's here.

(BROCK ANDERSON McDANIEL'S APPLICATION REVIEW)

MS. DUKES: Sherri, do you have his packet?

MR. SAXSON: Did we lose the public member.

MS. SIMPSON: She really needed be in a real estate meeting.

MR. SAXSON: Oh, okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MOORER: The applications are there and like I said before I hesitate to -- I usually only bring one copy of those to the meetings because there's so much personal information and I don't want --

MR. SAXSON: And I have --

MS. MOORER: -- copies floating around.

MR. SAXSON: I have --

MS. MOORER: And you have --

MR. SAXSON: I have it if anybody needs to discuss anything.

MS. DUKES: In reviewing Mr. McDaniel's packet, I see that has a degree in a related field and has -- he's saying he's verifying a total of six years and five months experience.

MR. SAXSON: I have six years and six months. Did I have that down wrong?

MS. DUKES: I had a different in some of that too.

1 Ba
2 MR. SA
3 Mc
4 hi
5 at
6 BROCK A

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Basically the law says five years so we --

MR. SAXSON: We may have some questions for Mr. McDaniels. So why don't we go ahead and swear him in, just in case. Would you draw your attention to the court reporter.

BROCK ANDERSON McDANIEL, having been duly sworn, testified follows:

MR. McDANIEL: Yes.

(Off the Record Discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Laura, are you ready?

MS. DUKES: I had a question on any direct supervision under landscape architect, which I'm not finding in the -- maybe if you would just like to brief us on your experience.

MR. McDANIEL: Okay. In 2000 I was worked for landscape architect in the state of Tennessee. His name was David Adams. I did just mainly installs for him. I worked with him, you know, during the planning, and w e built arbors, fences, different planning projects. Primarily led crews for him and I worked with him from -about --Ι quess from May until December working with him. And then I also worked for a gentleman by the name of Jake Morello who his a -- oh, and to go back, David is no longer a

registered landscape architect. Не his 2 license lapse. MR. SAXSON: But he was licenses during your time? 3 4 MR. McDANIEL: He was when I worked --5 MR. SAXSON: The entire time? 6 MR. McDANIEL: Uh-huh (affirmative response). 7 MS. DUKES: And you worked for him in Tennessee under 8 his Tennessee license? 9 MR. McDANIEL: Yes, ma'am. 10 MS. DUKES: Have we verified his license? Because --11 that was some of the question that I had. MS. MOORER: I verified what was on the application. 12 13 believe that Jake Morello did provide 14 reference. 15 MS. DUKES: Well, I'm talking about David Adams, I'm 16 sorry, which is the only landscape architect, 17 correct? 18 MR. McDANIEL: No, I worked for Jake Morello 19 actually, I think its Morello and Associates. 20 MS. DUKES: Okav. MR. McDANIEL: And I worked with him doing -- doing 21 22 plans for him, design and install and 23 maintenance maintaining the and landscape. 24 Helping him with doing respective sketches, 25 doing base plans, doing renderings for him and

then I worked also with leading crews doing installs and then maintaining the landscape for him as well.

3

MR. SAXSON: Can you give us some dates?

5

6

7

4

MR. McDANIEL: Yes. I worked for him pretty much on three separate occasions. I worked for him in '03 from March until November in '03. And then in '04 I worked with him May until August.

8

And then in '06 --

9

MR. SAXSON: That was '04?

11

MR. McDANIEL: '04.

12

MR. SAXSON: Okay. Sorry.

1314

MR. McDANIEL: And then in '06, I worked for him from May until September. And that was -- you know I was in school when I was doing that. And I was working with him on different projects and

16

15

he had projects that were working with him.

17 18

And then in '07 to '08, I worked for a company

19

called Valley Crest Landscape out of Destin,

2021

Florida, actually Santa Rosa Beach, Florida.

22

And while I was there, I was -- I did design, sell and install with our various clients

23

pretty much from Pensacola to Panama City Beach

24

is our area that we covered. And -- but a lot

had on staff landscape

25

οf

our

clients -- we

22

23

24

25

architects. They were a different division but they would draw designs and we would do the -my department would do the install and a lot of our clients would also hire landscape architects that design landscapes for them and we would do the install and I would work with the architects, you know, they don't see they'd come out -- like we'd lay install, all the plants and they'd come out and, know, inspect everything we plant. Also, when we run into problems we'd work with architects on site, kind of working through the problems and figuring out solutions on how we can make stuff work, but --

- MR. ANDERSON: During that period, would you say that you were directly supervised by a licensed landscape architect?
- MR. McDANIEL: Yes, sir. On those projects, yes, sir.
- MR. ANDERSON: During that -- from '07 to '08?
- MR. McDANIEL: From '07 to '0 -- not like -- I mean I had various projects. Like we probably did, you know, three projects a year that involved, you know, a landscape architect. But most of the time I was designing and installing,

1

scheduling, bidding work for my crew but, you know, we did some pretty major projects where landscape architects were involved and it took, you know, I know its almost, you know, each project was over a month long, you know, and we were given grading work, and we'd come in and do the irrigation and we would do, you know, the planting. You know, work through everything and the architect was on site during all those projects.

12 13 14

15

16

9

10

11

MR. DUKES: So the -- even though Valley Crest has had landscape architects working for them, you have a Stephen Bracken that substantiated that experience. He is not a landscape architect, is that correct?

25

MR. McDANIEL: No. And he was my -- like I worked for -- the development division is the one who landscape architects worked the for. And worked for the maintenance division. So he was the maintenance branch manager and that's who he'll bе called. I worked (inaudible). Currently I work for the City of Sumter. And my title is I'm the horticulturist. it involves a wide variety of things that a lot of -- I design, install and maintenance I do

24

25

on city projects and I work with the planning commission with reviewing designs by landscape architects. Working with them on the planning stages, reviewing their designs. And then once they're installed, I work with them, you know, approving all of the contractors who are doing And I work with the engineering the install. department doing plans for the engineering department as well that require that landscaping, grading.

- MS. DUKES: Who's your direct supervisor with the City?
- MR. McDANIEL: My direct supervisor is Ray Goodman who is the Director of Public Services.
- MS. DUKES: That was one of my questions because you have in your experience Mr. Rozier as substantiating the experience. However he does state on his form that you were not under --
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Direct supervision.
- MS. DUKES: -- under his direct supervision.

 However, it sounds like you've been performing experience -- I don't know if anyone's been checking over your work during that time frame or if Mr. Rozier has been checking over your work during that time frame.

on this reference form.

- MR. CHAIRMAN: I got two years -- I got 26 months under direct supervision of a landscape architect.
- MS. DUKES: Not necessarily --
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: Between Adams and Morello. Am I right?
- MR. SAXSON: He is indicating one year, 13 months.
- MS. DUKES: Yeah, two years and a month under a landscape architect.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
 - MS. DUKES: And since he has a degree in a related field the requirements are five years, if you had the other one year and nine months from Valley Crest and then I guess my only question is the work currently with the City of Sumter. Because we really don't have an employment verification for the City of Sumter. According to what Mr. Rozier stated on his thing, he's not -- he's not under his direct supervision. And I don't know -- was there another --
 - MS. SIMPSON: Is he in the same department or?
 - MR. ROZIER: We're in -- we're in public services. I haven't been sworn in, is that okay if I --
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you need to be sworn.

MR. WILLIAM ROZIER, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. ROZIER: Yes, ma'am, I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT REPORTER: Please state and spell your name for
 the record.

MR. ROZIER: My name is William E. Rozier. It's R-O-Z-I-E-R. We both work under public services. lot of times my group is called on to do various designs. Wе don't have anybody who does landscape work in engineering so I rely on Mr. McDaniels to do all our landscape work. Не and I have worked together for three years. I can as direct supervisor, but -- not verify that he does work for the City of Sumter as a full time employee. I do review all of his work. I'm basically the engineer of record, so any projects that go out under engineering that have to go under my seal. I don't seal landscaping because we're also the owners so its -- the way we look at it, it's kind of like we're depending on him to tell us what type of plants and all that we want. But I've turned over several grading projects to Mr. McDaniels and basically I reviewed everything and, you know, we basically worked on the storm water

1

4

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

plans together so I -- I mean, he's done very good work for us and, you know, I really appreciated the work he's done and I feel like he'd be a big asset to the landscape architect folks, so if that bears any weight.

- MS. DUKES: So what I finding is he's got three years ten months substantiated and during the three years time frame that the two of y'all have worked together, to meet the five vear requirement, he needs another 14 months. Would you say that roughly 14 months of the time that the two of y'all have worked together has been considered appropriate landscape architectural experience?
- MR. ROZIER: Yes ma'am. We've done quite а few projects through many, many parks, changes the parks and we recently headed added on to Riley Ballpark, which is one of our baseball facilities. Mr. McDaniels was responsible for a lot of that design work. Its hard for me to tell you exactly how many months, but I would say together we've worked on probably an equal amount of project time together face to working together.

MS. DUKES: Okay.

- 42 MR. CHAIRMAN: And your direct supervisor is just an 1 2 administrator? 3 MR. ROZIER: My direct --4 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. McDaniels. 5 McDANIEL: My -- my direct supervisor is MR. 6 director of public services and he's 7 parks, gardens, sanitation. He over the public 8 services department. MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. So he's -- just a -- he's an 9 10 administrator basically what he --11 MS. SIMPSON: Is he licensed at all? 12 MR. McDANIEL: No, ma'am. 13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Then you would like that applicant 14 revise -- to basically -- I mean, because if 15 he's saying that he's not been under direct, 16 from Mr. Richard, that he's been under direct 17 supervision, if he would qualify that with a period of time that would substantiate the five 18 19 years of --20 MS. DUKES: Which I think his -- his testimony here 21 could --22 CHAIRMAN: MR. that sufficient under Ιs the 23 application --
- 24 MS. DUKES: -- to verify amount of 14 months.
- 25 MR. SAXSON: That's up to the Board.

MS.	, SIMPSON: The record that we keep will be of the
	application, so it wouldn't hurt at all to
	actually have the language on that application.
	This transcript will be separate from that.
MR.	
	resubmitted revised and pending that
MS.	DUKES: Or since he's here today he could
	probably modify it
MR.	CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm just saying
MS.	SIMPSON: Do you have a legal problem with that?
1	SAXSON: No, I do not.
MS.	SIMPSON: So, if Mr. Rozier can
MR.	SAXSON: Resubmit.
MS.	SIMPSON: Right. A revised statement today.
	CHAIRMAN: Are you comfortable with that Mr.
	Rozier that if?
MS.	DUKES: He can even add
MR.	ROZIER: Yes. Yes, sir. I think what I was
	trying to say in my letter is that I'm not his
	direct supervisor administratively.
MR.	CHAIRMAN: But if he were directly under you for
	that period of time while in the employment of
	another yes. I think that's that's what
	we're looking
	MR. MS. MR. MS. MR. MS. MR.

ROZIER: And that's what I'm saying today and

25

MR.

25

yes, sir, I'd be glad to revise my letter to reflect that, if that --

- MS. DUKES: I think you can just add it on the back page under your comments.
- MS. MOORER: Yeah, that's the -- so even if he wants to go ahead and make a notation, I can put that in our system.
- MR. SAXSON: He can do that now.
- MS. MOORER: I don't see no reason to hold it --
- MR. SAXSON: Can we go off the record for a moment to allow him to do that.

(Off the Record)

- MR. CHAIRMAN: Back on the record.
- COURT REPORTER: On the record. Okay.
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: Ι'd just like to state Mr. Rozier modified his additional comments on the application stating that Mr. McDaniels has been under his direct supervisor for greater than 18 months and approximately -- greater than months and approximately 18 months which will Mr. McDaniels the five years need to sit for the exam. Do we have any other questions? Let's take -- call the vote on this individual if you would like to.
 - MS. DUKES: I make a motion to approve Mr. McDaniel.

MR. SAXSON: Bring her back. Great. 1 2 SIMPSON: And bring her back. MS. 3 MR. SAXSON: Got it. 4 MOORER: So, I do make them aware if they are MS. 5 notified of the meeting and they indicate that they will not attend, I do make them aware that 6 7 if there are any questions it could delay --8 SAXSON: It is certainly not required that they MR. 9 I just -- I have one board that attend. 10 they don't attend they don't take action until 11 they do. So, I just ask. 12 DUKES: Oh yeah, that's what somebody said. MS. Ιf 13 they don't show up then --14 SAXSON: That's rare though. MR. 15 DUKES: The question that I had concern on Ms. MS. 16 Leslie's application was -- she has completed 17 the necessary education requirements. She's 18 been working roughly two years and one month 19 under an engineer and then has some 20 unsubstantiated experience under Todd Stedman, 21 whose his note on there --. Read what he says 22 on there. 23

MR. CHAIRMAN: Over the past several years I've worked with Darcy on and off advancing the mission of the Department of Juvenile Justice

24

1

7

10

9

11 12

14

13

1516

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

in Columbia. I witnessed her participation and consensus building design and implementation of several design projects. She's conducted herself in а professional manner and shows tremendous personal integrity, deep understanding of profession, the good ambassador and in the profession recommend her as candidate without reservation.

- MS. MOORER: That experience at DJJ is volunteer work. But because she listed it on the application, I did ask that a form be submitted to substantiate it.
- MS. DUKES: The way the law reads is that to have had years of varied landscape architecture experience under the supervision of a landscape architect licensed under this chapter or other qualified person. Previously we haven't deemed that two years under an engineer substantiated was equivalent to two vears under landscape architect. If Mr. Stedman could give us a little bit more information of the exact time frame, I would be willing to re-review her application. But without any time frames, that could be one month, two months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MS. DUKES: Two years.

1

4

5

6

17

18

19

23

24

- 2 ${\tt MR.}$ SAXSON: So y'all -- does that mean y'all want to 3 table this one?
 - MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to see some more information on that. I mean, she's got a date of 2000 --August, 2006 to August, 2009, three years.
- 7 MS. DUKES: Oh, for DJJ?
- 8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
- 9 MS. DUKES: Yeah.
- 10 SAXSON: Well, she got her Bachelor of Arts in MR. 11 2009 with a major in landscape architecture. 12 Am I wrong, Sherri?
- 13 MS. DUKES: Yes, I saw that too. Yeah.
- 14 MS. SIMPSON: I was talking to her, I'm sorry say it 15 again?
- 16 MR. CHAIRMAN: She got her BAfrom Clemson in landscape architecture in 2009. So that 2006 to 2009 would have been while she was а student? Right.
- 20 MS. DUKES: We can either table it or disapprove it, 21 unless -- you know. I mean, based on as 22 submitted, I wouldn't approve it.
 - MR. SAXSON: Ιf all you need is additional information, it'd be easier to table it then to just go ahead and deny it or -- and that's also

1 easier accepting than it on condition 2 provide so and so. Since she's not here, I 3 would recommend just tabling it until she can provide additional information and come answer any questions that you might have. Ιf that suits y'all.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I'd table --

4

5

6

8

9

16

17

- MR. ANDERSON: Chair, can I make a motion or chair should?
- 10 MS. DUKES: You can, I've been too vocal.
- 11 MR. CHAIRMAN: You want to make а motion for 12 substantiation of enough hours.
- 13 MR. ANDERSON: I would move that we table the review 14 of this application until further information 15 is provided regarding experience.
 - SAXSON: And would that motion MR. also include giving her an opportunity to come in and answer questions?
- 19 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, we'll extend that invitation for 20 her to attend.
- 21 MR. CHAIRMAN: So we have a motion.
- 22 MS. DUKES: Second.
- 23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion?
- 24 MR. ANDERSON: None.
- 25 MR. CHAIRMAN: None being, call for the vote. All in

1 favor of postponing or tabling? 2 MR. ANDERSON: Tabling. 3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Tabling this motion? 4 (Ayes are heard) MR. CHAIRMAN: The ayes have it. Thank you. 5 (CONCLUSION OF DARCY ELIZABETH LESLIE'S REVIEW) 6 7 MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We have three more; 8 Michael Kidd, Newshutz, and Pearson. Are there 9 any conflicts that the Board sees with any of 10 these individuals? 11 MS. DUKES: I don't see any. 12 MR. ANDERSON: I don't see any. MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I have a motion? 13 14 SAXSON: Could we do a motion for MR. each one 15 individually? 16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Each one? Yes. 17 (MICHAEL W. KIDD'S APPLICATION REVIEW) 18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like a motion for Michael W. 19 Kidd? 20 MS. DUKES: Make a motion to approve Mr. Kidd's 21 application? 22 MR. ANDERSON: I second that motion. 23 MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a second, any discussion? All 24 in favor?

(Ayes are heard)

25

(803) 252-3445 / (800) 822-0896

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING 52 1 Thank you. 2 (Conclusion of David Davis Pearson's Application 3 Review) 4 UNFINISHED BUSINESS 5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Item nine, unfinished Board business, 6 Board perimeters. 7 MS. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. 9 MS. SIMPSON: Excuse me, we have Todd Bond with us, 10 if y'all would entertain a move or out of order 11 on the agenda to let him -- he is Chief 12 Investigator. Is that acceptable to you? MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no problem with him. Let's see 13 14 if any one else does. 15 MR. SAXSON: No. 16 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. 17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this 11-B? I'm sorry. MR. SAXSON: It would be the LLB meeting. 18 19 ${\tt MS.}$ ${\tt MOORER:}$ Its got to be the 11-A and B. 20 MR. SAXSON: Oh, got it. 21 MS. MOORER: They kind of -- they kind οf 22 together for the purposes οf what 23 proposed.

MR. SAXSON: That's all of them right?

25 MR. MOORER: Yes.

STAFF REPORTS

2

Investigations

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TODD BOND: The first meeting of the landscape architecture, I've seen on August 17th. We had one case, it was recommended that the respondent in this case be given a letter of caution. The original complaint was that their -- the firm was un-licensed. But under the laws they weren't quite required be licensed. It's my understanding that they now That part of the case was dismissed. have one. today of, I actually recommended a letter of caution, recommending that they be mindful of conflict of interest in business dealings. so And that's for y'all's approval.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So do we have one?

MS. DUKES: make a Ι motion to approve the recommendation.

MR. ANDERSON: I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion? None. All in favor?

(Ayes are heard)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Its unanimous.

BOND: Thank you. And the final thing that we MR. normally do is give a report of what's going on

		OSONOTH PERING 54
1		in LARE with landscape architecture. There
2		were two cases, one of which y'all had just
3		approved for closure letter of caution and
4	-	closure. There is one active currently being
5		investigated.
6	MR.	CHAIRMAN: Okay.
7	MR.	BOND: That's all there is.
8	MR.	CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
9	MR.	BOND. All right. Thank you very much.
10	MR.	CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your time.
11	MS.	DUKES: Thank you.
12	MR.	BOND: Y'all take care. I didn't know I was
13		going to be appearing for y'all appearing
14		before y'all until about
15	MS.	DUKES: Two minutes ago.
16	MR.	BOND: Five or ten until ten this morning.
17		So I apologize.
18	MR.	CHAIRMAN: You did well.
19	MR.	BOND: Thank you.
20	MS.	DUKES: Perfect timing.
21	MS.	SIMPSON: Thank you.
22	MR.	CHAIRMAN: Okay. Should we
23	MR.	ANDERSON: Do we expect any one from General
24		Counsel's office?

MS. MOORER: No, -- have any issues.

1 MR. SAXSON: I wouldn't think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead and finish up 11. Should be go ahead -- let's probably finish up staff reports.

MS. MOORER: If you want to finish up staff --

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have no one from General Counsel is coming, so I see -- no, all right. Jan and Sherri administrator's report.

Administrative Report

- MS. MOORER: I believe -- was there anything from the CLARB meeting that has to be presented. If you want to go ahead and do them. Mine's basic.
- MS. really enjoyed the CLARB meeting. SIMPSON: Ι Barrett and John were there, of course, as you know. And lot of а people asked about Laura, even though we knew you weren't coming. LLR has since -- since that meeting, has issued a travel policy, which you've been sent, the first one went out and then a revised one But then, at the orientation meeting went out. for Board members, last Tuesday, Director Templeton stated a different police than what had been sent in writing. And the difference is that what she said was that if the national organization will fund two people, then LLR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

also fund two people. Ιf the national association -- I'm sorry, will pay for one, then LLR will pay for two. So, it -- it's a difference in what was written and I don't know if they're going to issue a clarification or not, but that's good news because before it was limited to two total plus the administrator. So, this will allow the possibility of four to attend, which is an improvement, I think. I it when a Board can be there like and represented and have a voice and bring what you've learned and everything. So I do think that's an improvement in the policy. John will be funded, I think, by CLARB will he not as director.

MR. ANDERSON: He was voted in.

SIMPSON: So, that was good news. MR. Sherri has taken it under consideration with somewhat of positive leaning that she will meetings as approved by LLR. We're going to address those issues with the director or who ever she would like for us to address with. And the reason I want her to go is that she has much more knowledge than I do. You know I enjoyed and I learned a lot but it would

have been more beneficial to you as a Board had she been there. So, then I saw that -- well, The other issue I want to address with LLR is a reimbursement because a lot of times there's a difference in cost versus what you are reimbursed, as you know. So I'm trying to work those issues out with LLR. But, I'm constantly amazed at Sherri's abilities and her organizational skills. I mean I knew it, every day she just demonstrates something else that she's really, really good at.

- MR. CHAIRMAN: We've been blessed for sure.
- MR. ANDERSON: We've been beneficiaries of that for years.
- 15 | MS. SIMPSON: I know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- 16 | MS. MOORER: Thank you.
- 17 | MR. ANDERSON: Glad she came with us.
- MS. SIMPSON: But just wow. Its very -- very beneficial to y'all and to me and the other staff members with whom she works and OGC.
 - MR. SAXSON: And a pleasure.
- MS. DUKES: Don't tell anybody else other than her bosses. Don't let any of the other departments know.
- 25 | MR. ANDERSON: Amen.

Ι

2

1

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MS. DUKES: That's great.

MR. ANDERSON: I got a lot out of the orientation.

SIMPSON: Any questions that y'all have and then MS. Sherri can give you some. She has statistical information in her report. So, that's --

MR. ANDERSON: I would like to speak just briefly to the experience I had since I was representing group going. You know, I had a general idea of CLARB and the role that they play and knew that is was significant. But having the opportunity to attend that meeting really gave me a unique perspective coming back. Having a deeper understanding of what other groups are doing, other states are doing and coming back and having that knowledge nowwas is tremendous to me and I enjoyed my time there. It was a lot of -- was the discussions about CLARB and how they're organized, things that they're facing in the future, things that they anticipate. Ιt just kind οf deepened understanding, I think and I hope that Ι bring that understanding to bear, you know, serving on this board. I learned a lot. Ι think they did a very good job orienting me as a first time attendee.

didn't know if I was a CLARB member or there's another designation. I stepped into the first meeting and just so happened to meet the president of CLARB and he said are you a member or are you just a -- what was the -- or a --

MS. SIMPSON: Member board?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDERSON: Board executive. I don't know, I hope learn that, which one I am in the first session. Sure enough, I did. Ι understood what the roles are and how my role fit in to the greater scheme. So, they did a very good job with orientation I thought. Ιn your report Jan, I don't know if we got into a lot of detail about the schedule for the LARE and the reorganization of that. But they gave -- a few dates of when that might few rolled out. And I took a few notes on that but know if you want to go into those details now or not.

MS. SIMPSON: Are you talking about when it converts over to the computer based and how they're going to do it?

MR. ANDERSON: Right.

MS. SIMPSON: Yeah. That was a really good -- in fact, I can -- do we have that on our website?

MS. MOORER: We do have a link to that on our website

I just linked it with the CLARB website

1

I remember --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so that if they make any changes, we don't have to make our people go back and do it.

MS. SIMPSON: Right. They did a good job on that.

The only thing that I wondered about with the

The only thing that I wondered about with the transition was that they are delaying -- giving out a lot of information about the new -- the new test as it will be when it's converted because they don't want to confuse the current candidates. In the past I found that that can be a mistake, but I think what they want is -and I'm not saying they're doing it wrong, I'm just saying I think it's a little different approach and maybe that's -- that will work just fine. But they want to make sure people who are in the pipeline are notified that its getting ready to change so if you don't want to deal with the change, you better finish up now. Which is -- that's always a good thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could this breaking into different -the same number of sections are not holding
true moving forward, correct?

MS. SIMPSON: Its -- it's still four, isn't it?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. ANDERSON: It currently is five and they're merging two sections into one, so there will be a total of four sections.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: So if you've not completed, then you're either going to repeat or --
- MS. SIMPSON: Uh-huh (affirmative response).
- ANDERSON: Uh-huh (affirmative response). MR. Right now, they're in what they call usability а testing phase. Laura, you may know more about what that entails, but some of the questions that they're trying to understand more deeply, are we testing what we think we are with the material and how it is re-formatted. And all candidates would go through the CLARB website to register for the exam. That was a point that they made. They'll be delivering the test through upgraded testing centers. And they're saying that through the way that they're delivering this test, there'll be greater opportunity to test individuals and greater -broader range οf choices of when you can schedule your exam and quicker score results were some of the benefits that they --
- MR. CHAIRMAN: So is it not going to be a set day.

 It'll be when your time -- when you're prepared

1

to take it, you'll take it?

2

3

MS. DUKES: It'll be more options which is going to probably affect us as far as timing

4

approving candidates.

5

MS. SIMPSON: It won't be deadlines for them either.

6

7

MS. MOORER: I'm not sure if there end goal have a continuous like -- do the architects

8

have continuous testing now?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SIMPSON: Architects do. Engineers are moving to that in 2014 and they're going to do two months of testing with a following month off. Two -two on, one off. Two on, one off.

MS. MOORER: And I'm not sure if they're looking at those to see how they go to decide how they are to implement in the future, but mу understanding is they will still have, I believe, four administrations a year. I don't know if their end goal is to have it continuous have like the engineers going to several ormonths on, one month off. I have not heard what their end goal is. Of course, they don't usually, you know, tell you that, because they're researching it, SO it's а moving target.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this goes live, when?

- MS. MOORER: September, 2012 is when the new exame goes live.

 MR. ANDERSON: That's the -- that's for sections one
 - MR. ANDERSON: That's the -- that's for sections one and two, I think. And sections three and four goes live December.
 - MS. MOORER: Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. CHAIRMAN: So its right -- its right on us. Good.
- MR. ANDERSON: December, 2012.
- 10 | MS. DUKES: Yeah, not this coming --
- 11 | MR. CHAIRMAN: But September --
- 12 | MR. SAXSON: Yes.
- 13 | MR. CHAIRMAN: I mean its right on us.
 - MR. ANDERSON: I think their correspondence to go out to notify folks is going to be done in May of 2012. So we're going to see a lot of letters and notifications coming out from CLARB around that time period.
 - MS. SIMPSON: The other thing that they discussed that I thought was really interesting was that they determinants of success and they -- they did analysis of test takers who had finished -- finished their education in some field and those who had not. And they did not find that -- or, let me put it this way -- they found

1 that people who were more successful at passing 2 certain divisions were still in school or just So I think that also drives -- I mean, I can see where they want to up their numbers of people taking the exam. Just purely business model.

- MR. ANDERSON: And they're -- and they're trying to improve on the success rate.
- MS. SIMPSON: Right. And that -- yeah, exactly. So if we can show -if they can show bу statistics that those candidates taking certain sections while they're in school or just after are more likely to pass, then that gives you information as to whether you want other change as a state or not.
- MS. DUKES: Well, and some of that is it knowledge too that needs to be retained not just fresh knowledge, you know, that's --
- MR. ANDERSON: True.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MS. DUKES: -- driven into you for four years. Is it knowledge that should be retained over two, which hopefully they're kind of factoring that in.
- MS. SIMPSON: It was interesting. Is it Prometric -isn't it Prometric that they use Prometric test

MS. DUKES: They have in the past. I don't know who their new contract is.

MS. SIMPSON: There's one right over here, this building, adjacent to us.

MS. DUKES: Oh, perfect.

sites?

MS. SIMPSON: I went over there the other day, I was out walking at lunch and the door was locked. It was Monday and there was nobody in there. So, I'm wondering if maybe they close on Monday or just didn't have anything scheduled for that day. But its right there and they really have a very -- it's the largest network of test centers of anybody in America. And they're adding more because the engineers.

MS. DUKES: Perfect.

MS. SIMPSON: So, any way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sherri --

MS. MOORER: -- they're using them, I don't know if they are considering them for the future administration for the new format. I believe they put out an open call for that to see who can best serve their needs. I've not heard that they made a selection, but I believe they would stay with Prometric if they could meet

1

their needs.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SIMPSON: Right. And I've got architects MS. and engineers running around in my head too, so I may be wrong about that specific information.

MR. SAXSON: Sherri, anything else to add?

MS. MOORER: I have some basic information I give at every meeting. I don't really have anything to add at this point in time. Its been fairly quiet with our programs. We currently have 783 active people in the program. We have 48 active exam candidates, 117 active firms and 618 active landscape architects. We're getting more applications in. I think that's a good thing. I'm seeing -- I am seeing the numbers increasing and I put a list out there on the secure website and y'all might have to of people who were licensed based on parameters since the last meeting. It looks like there were about ten of them. It was a split between the firms and CLARB certified. We're seeing a lot of CLARB certified people coming through. CLARB has been a little bit slow in getting those records to us for those certified people, but I believe it is because they have updating their website recently. That update was

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recently completed so I think they're going to start coming in more regularly now. And I also financial information since our last meeting. I believe that includes -- actually June because we were in close out at our last meeting so they didn't have the June reports. We got the September report yesterday and it looks like Wе currently have balance \$256,118.53 cash balance in the program as of September 30th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

MS. MOORER: And that's all that I have is basic information. The Legislature isn't in session so there is no legislative report and things have been pretty quiet.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS CONTINUED

- MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you. All right. Let's move back up to board parameters under nine unfinished business. I think you got it in your packet under agenda item nine A. Sherri do you want to expound on that?
- MS. MOORER: Yes, the board parameters. And I believe that I put in your packets a list of the parameters that we currently have that we voted on at previous meetings. And its really

-	L
2	2
3	3
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

its coming along really well. I believe that this gives us a good sense of direction. There are а few things that we established parameters for and what the parameters are for is to give staff instructions on how to handle certain types of situations as they come up. We've discussed this at previous meetings. What I did, just went through -- I looked at what we had and what we still need to get and it looks like for licensure issues, we have not established parameters for applications that come in for -that apply by reciprocity. They don't have a CLARB record or anything, they're just applying for reciprocity. And we don't have parameter for people who are re-applying for licensure. Now, what that means is our law was changed for reinstatement was only allowed for a period of two years. So, if somebody's license lapses more than two years, they have to reapply. think that would be very similar to applying for reciprocity. Basically, the information's in the database they've just timed out. application that we just approved for Patricia Newshutz -- it would be the one with the tricky

1	.
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

last name. She actually had a license with us previously, it lapsed in the mid 90's. Because of the time frame she had to reapply. And she has been working since then, we verified her experience, it was just a procedural matter of to get another license active. Because of our law she had to reapply. And we like to have parameters at least to cover all situations just so staff is explicitly clear whenever an application comes in on how to handle it. Everybody who applies for reciprocity or who reapplies for licensure currently does have to come before the Board for a n application hearing. really hate to Wе keep dragging people in for hearings, especially if their application is fairly clear and it doesn't warrant discussion. It would be nice to know with say somebody called me and said okay I had МУ application on the agenda, would you recommend I come in. That can be hard judgment call for me to make. Because in the Darcy Leslie and Brock McDaniel, case of suggested that they both come in, one came the other didn't. And I advised both of them to be here but --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- MR. CHAIRMAN: Ι think the action of the Board warranted what your recommendations were. So I do --I agree with your -- I think agree your decision and your thoughts thought process on that.
- MS. MOORER: And we'd just like some more explicit instructions on it instead of me making that judgment call on my own. I'd like to know what y'all would like to see.
- MS. SIMPSON: One of the options for you is to designate one Board member to review and if that's -- if it's okay with one Board member then that person notifies Sherri, looks good to me, we license them.
- MR. SAXSON: Are you talking about reciprocity now or either way?
- MS. SIMPSON: I'm talking about -- yeah, the one that we do not have parameters for. They don't have a CLARB record, so they're independently sending in transcripts, work verifications --
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Just like we went through.
- MS. SIMPSON: Uh-huh (affirmative response).
- MR. SAXSON: And from my point of view, if the applicant can provide all of the information needed, whether its for reciprocity or not, I

don't see why that would be a problem. If the information is there and is submitted so that its clear whether it can be granted or not, I don't see why there would be a problem with granting that authority to administrative staff.

- MR. CHAIRMAN: With -- are you still in agreement with the review of one of the board members?
- MR. SAXSON: I don't know that you need that. It certainly is not a problem.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: My -- I guess --
- MR. SAXSON: There are some things that are black and white and some that are gray. Now if it's a gray area, I think you might want to involve them -- a board member.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Typically in a -- in a -- between meetings, what are we looking at. Five, six applications total for combined of those two?
- MS. MOORER: I'd say recently the number of applications coming in are increasing. But my -- my leaning at this point in time is if -- I do recommend that they come in if, like the one that showed up today, if we don't have clear documentation, I don't see the degree and the years under the direct supervision. If they

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are applying experience form an engineer or if they work for a city or county and they're on team like Mr. McDaniels was where the engineer wasn't his direct supervisor, it was administrator supervisor but the engineer was working with him on a day to day basis, that got a little bit convoluted and I $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ I did not feel comfortable -- I had doubts.

- SAXSON: Would you like Sherri -- would you like MR. if if wе go back to having Board member, Board one member review it in conjunction with your review, do you want them to review every application that comes just the ones you feel may be more on a gray line as opposed to cut and dry?
- MOORER: The gray line. And the goal with these parameters is to minimize the number of applications that come to review at. the meetings. We want to license people who are clearly qualified. We want to license them as as possible. And people who aren't clearly qualified, we'd like to establish process where we can get them reviewed in less than 90 days, unless they obviously need to appear before you. We -- what we're looking

for is a	a weeding out	process.	We're	trying	to
take the	se application	ns out of	the		

- CHAIRMAN: I don't -- I don't see a MR. I think a good policy and I -- I'd be leaning towards one person as the Board person who would review it.
- MS. MOORER: And that would be okay. I mean, it -we have a secure website and I could post the
 applications and even if one person doesn't
 want to do it all the time, if you want to say
 okay we're going to designate this person for
 the next 90 day period to review applications
 and then the next meeting okay we're going to
 let somebody else --
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Isn't another option to simply -- you send out an e-mail posting it, say its on the secure website. You have 30 days -- you as a Board have 30 days --
- MS. SIMPSON: Three days.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Three days?
- 21 | MR. SIMPSON: Five days.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 22 MR. SAXSON: Yeah, do a small amount of time.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: To review it, yeah I agree because
- otherwise it hits the inbox and sits there.
 - MR. SAXSON: Just the -- one of the considerations is

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

to give good customer service and not to make people who really meet the requirements to have to wait so long to be licensed.

- SIMPSON: Ten days would be reasonable. MS. I was being --
- MR. CHAIRMAN: But then again, we're only talking about the ones that fall within the gray zone right? Not --
- MS. SIMPSON: Τo me, somebody if wе get an application where they have landscape а architectural degree, they have verified six of experience and they've years taken and passed the LARE, that does not --
- CHAIRMAN: I agree. I agree. Why go through the process. It meets all the criteria.
- SIMPSON: But today, these two were different. MS.
- ANDERSON: Yeah, these fell on the borderline. MR. I'm in favor of just posting that to website, sending out an e-mail notification. We respond and copy to each other, to Sherri.
- MR. CHAIRMAN: Ιf we respond, does -- does the website allow that to be posted for within the Board members to review?
- MR. ANDERSON: Is that illegal?
- MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Well, it is if it's

1

parameter, wouldn't it be?

2

MR. SAXSON: We're getting into an area where you --

3

you're almost having a meeting.

4

MS. SIMPSON: Or if there is a hearing later, they're all tainted.

5

6

MR. SAXSON: Right.

7

MS. MOORER: I think that's -- that' why he suggested

8

have one Board member look at. And what would

9

happen is if that -- to keep everybody else

10

from being tainted, if that one Board member,

11

you were the person designated and you

12

looked at the application and you said,

13

know what, I'm not sure about this one either

14

think they need to come before the Board.

15

them on the agenda for the next meeting.

16

Then the other Board members -- you can't hear

17

it at that point, because you've already looked

18

at it. But the other Board members can hear it

19

and take a vote to determine whether or not --CHAIRMAN:

20 21

MR.

The only problem I'm going to that is based on our last. two Board meetings, we wouldn't have a quorum.

22

MS. MOORER: We are working on that.

23 24

SAXSON: We're going to have to be very careful MR. to have a quorum.

	TENTISORY COUNCIL MEETING	76
1	MR. ANDERSON: And maybe for that reason we nee	d to
2	come back around to this, establishing	
3	process after we get those positions fil	
4	And then	_ o a .
5	MS. SIMPSON: The yeah one is professional	224
6	then you have two publics. The publics are	
7	going to be able to contribute a whole lot	

MR. SAXSON: I think you can go ahead and --

a professional standpoint.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN: Can we set the parameter though on MR. these two that -- with --

SAXSON: If you have any fears, this reapplying MR. for licensure, if -- any time they're going to be an unlicensed practice issues or disciplinary issues, that's going to come before you anyway. So you can --

 ${\tt MS. MOORER:}$ I'm going to weed those out. If somebody reapplies for licensure and I see on that application well -- well, I as lapsed in South Carolina, I was sanctioned in another state. I'm going to stop that application right there and I'm going to turn it over to investigations. Y'all won't see it that point in time.

SAXSON: No way that -- what Sherri does in that MR.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

instance keeps you from being tainted. the proper investigation results in a formal complaint then that would come to you disciplinary hearing. And so you're dealing it that way instead of through the application process.

- MOORER: I know it's a very different MS. then we had previously.
- MS. DUKES: think the reciprocity is Ι fine approve at staff level as long as they meet, you know, same our requirements. Ιf some states do not have apprenticeship requirements for licensure.
- MOORER: And if I had any questions, I would ask.
- MS. DUKES: The thing with the two years or more, that was one of my questions with Ms. Newshutz is what had they been do -- if its two years that's probably not a huge deal. Hers was like What had they been doing during that nine. time period and she'd clearly, you know, proved that she had been practicing in similar professions, not landscape architecture related still staying up on health, safety and but welfare issues. With us having the continuing education requirements that probably resolves

1

some --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's going to change the whole game since that is what's -- so have you -- you as a Board in agreement that -- that licensure and reciprocity can move to a staff level with if there is a gray area or a conflict, come back to the Board for review and approval?

MS. MOORER: We can make it --

CHAIRMAN: That was a question.

MR. SAXSON: Why don't we have a motion and a --

MS. DUKES: Let's see we discuss this for like three hours last time.

MS. MOORER: What we can do is we can re-address it. If y'all want to do it that way, that's okay and then once we have our full Board sitting, y'all want to talk about the option designating one person when we have at least one more professional member appointed and we know we'll have forms. We can -- we can always revisit these in the future. So if y'all want approve staff level licensure for reciprocity and reapplication for people clearly meet the requirements and of course if it's a mess, it comes to y'all.

(Off the Record Discussion)

	1	
1	MR.	ANDERSON: I move that we as a Board accept staff
2		level approval for initial licensure in
3		reciprocity and also for reapplying for
4	!	licensure.
5	MS.	DUKES: Absolve.
6	MR.	SAXSON: Would you restate that for the record
7		ploace

please?

MR. ANDERSON: I would make the motion to grant staff level licensure for initial licensure reciprocity and also for reapplying for licensure

MS. DUKES: I'll second that motion.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? All in favor? (Ayes are heard)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ayes have it. It's unanimous.

MS. MOORER: And to clarify for the record what that means. Tf $W \in$ get an application for reciprocity or re-applying for licensure they submit documentation that they got the two years, I see that they got the education. the two years or the five years was verified by a landscape architect and they pass the exam and they're in good standing, I go ahead and license them. Anything else still comes for an application review at least if there experience

is varied, if it falls under that definition of at the discretion of the Board, as in its under an engineer or another qualified individual. thev will still come for an application hearing. So we're not cutting you out of the process.

7 8

MR.

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

SAXSON: And Sherri's not working in a vacuum either. She can always talk with me if there are any questions -- legal questions. MR.

CHAIRMAN: And I guess for the record too, want to state that when this Board reaches closer to its designated number of members, that we want to revisit about assigning individual to review along with Sherri.

MR. ANDERSON: Do we need a separate motion on that?

MS. DUKES: No, I think we'll review that at the time.

MS. MOORER: Just have a note, so I'll know to put it back on

DUKES: I think just be -- I mean I know you're very careful it, but make in sure that number of months is substantiated in several different places, because sometimes even in the employment verification on the back, like a couple of those, you know, we saw today, you

know.

2

MR. SAXSON: Creativity.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

MS. DUKES:

Yeah, we deal with some creative folks here.

MS. MOORER: What is so hard about that is that they fill out the application in July and the person doesn't turn in the reference form until August September, there's a two three month ordiscrepancy already. But, I'm hoping that our regulations will take care of that because the regulations will put the burden on the applicant of getting those references and employment verifications back to us instead of me sending them out and them sending them back. The new regulations are going to put it all out there and that going -- the applicant's going send those out themselves and then return the whole package to us. I hope once the regulations pass, that problem that wе seeing about three months here, five months there, is going to clear up.

MS. DUKES: I'd also like to see, I don't know if we can do it, but on that part of the application that they have to list their direct supervisor on there too. I mean, it just --

MS. MOORER: It doesn't ask for it.

1

4

5

6

7

8

14

15

16

17

18

- 2 MS. DUKES: It just says employer name and complete address, so.
 - MS. MOORER: I thought we did ask for the direct supervisor. I need to go back and look at that.
 - MS. DUKES: Yeah. Typically they do kind of put that, but --
- 9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we do that without --
- 10 MR. SAXSON: Yeah, you don't need --
- 11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Major hurdles.
- 12 | MS. DUKES: Yeah, I think that would be --
- 13 MR. SAXSON: It's a typing thing.
 - MS. MOORER: That falls under the application as approved by the Department clause and the law so we can change the application without any problem.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

- 19 MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Election of officers.
- 20 MS. MOORER: What we really need is a Chairman and Vice Chairman.
- 22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Morgan not chair?
- MS. MOORER: He is on the record as being the
 Chairperson but since his term expired -- this
 is something we've been through. Although his

term expired on June 30th, he is supposed to serve until his --

- MR. SAXSON: Re-appointment. Until his appointment replaced.
- MOORER: He did not ask to be reappointed. MS. So until his successor is appointed, hе is supposed to be here. There has been an application for that spot, it's just a matter of waiting for it to go through and we talked to people about it and we've chased up chain of command to try to see what we can do to get the vacancies filled because I do have a concern that we've only had three members present at the last two meetings. And I want to be --
- MS. SIMPSON: We talked to the people who can make it happen. We just have to wait.
- MS. DUKES: Okay. And then to deal with -- I mean,
 I know, John has had different reasons for not
 coming but we make these schedule dates a long
 time ahead to --
- MR. SAXSON: And you're here --
- MS. DUKES: He's putting the -- yeah, it's my 50th birthday and I'm here.
- 25 MS. MOORER: Happy Birthday.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- MS. SIMPSON: Have one of those brownies. 2 MS. DUKES: It would be nominees -- he's -- you know, 3 those two are putting an awful burden of the 4 remaining three of us. It would be nice if 5 they could start --6
 - SAXSON: It would probably be good to go ahead MR. and elect somebody.
 - MS. DUKES: I make a motion to elect Parks -- Parks McLeod as Chairman and Barrett Anderson as Vice Chair.
- 11 MR. ANDERSON: I would second that.
- 12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussions?

1

8

9

10

- MS. DUKES: You knew it was coming. 13
- 14 MR. ANDERSON: No, it's not a problem.
- 15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

16 (Ayes are heard)

- 17 MR. CHAIRMAN: It's unanimous. Thank you.
- 18 MR. ANDERSON: Your welcome.
- 19 SIMPSON: Is this normally a one year term or is MS. 20 there --
- 21 MR. ANDERSON: I think it's а one meeting 22 We'll vote again next meeting.
- 23 DUKES: It's four meetings you've already done MS. 24 two as fill in.
- 25 MR. ANDERSON: That's right.

MS. MOORER: First

MS. SIMPSON: February what?

building we're in now.

24

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the within Soil Advisory Meeting consisting of Eighty-Six (86) pages, is a true and correct transcript of the testimony given; said meeting was reported by the method of Stenomask with Backup.

I further certify that I am neither employed by nor related to any of the parties in this matter or their counsel; nor do I have any interest, financial or otherwise, in the outcome of same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and seal on November 15, 2011.

Carla S. Dominick Court Reporter

Notary Public for South Carolina My Commission Expires: 5/8/2012



109 Court Avenue West Greenwood, SC 29646 Voice 864.388.1250 Fax 864.388.1253

October 14, 2011

South Carolina Labor, Licensing, and Registration Board of Landscape Architects

Dear Board Members,

The Greenwood Partnership Alliance, the economic development organization representing Greenwood County, has used the services of Davis & Floyd over the past four years to perform a variety of services to forward economic development in the county. I am pleased to give them a positive reference for the support they have provided and will continue to use the firm in future efforts.

Yancey Robertson, Senior Landscape Architect, Davis & Floyd, has been a key resource for our office on several projects and I value his input.

Best regards,

Mark Warner

Chief Executive Officer

Mach Alla

MHW/mw





P.O. Box 40 Greenwood, South Carolina 29648-0040 www.cityofgreenwoodsc.com

October 13, 2011

South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation Board of Architectural Examiners PO Box 11419 Columbia, S.C. 29211-1419

Re: Certificate of Authority (COA) Davis and Floyd, Inc.

To Whom It May Concern:

I understand that Davis and Floyd, Inc. is appearing before the Board for the purpose of obtaining a Certificate of Authority (COA) for the firm to perform and advertise landscape architectural services. Davis and Floyd's staff registered landscape architect is Mr. Yancey Robertson. I would recommend them to you as a quality and reputable engineering and design firm. Mr. Robertson has done an exceptional job for the City of Greenwood.

Over the last decade, Davis and Floyd has provided engineering and construction management services on nine different projects for the City of Greenwood that have included parking lot design, streetscape enhancements, drainage improvements, roadway development and the installation of new sidewalks. We have worked directly with Mr. Robertson on a number of these projects. We have been very satisfied with Davis and Floyd's performance. They are very thorough from design to implementation.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have about the work Davis and Floyd has done for us on these various projects. Feel free to contact me at (864) 942-8410.

Sincerely,

J. Charles Barrineau, Jr City Manager



STV/Ralph Whitehead Associates

1000 West Morehead Street, Suite 200 Charlotte, North Carolina 28208 (704)372-1885 fax:(704)372-3393

October 18, 2011

South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation Synergy Business Park; Kingstree Building 110 Centerview Drive Columbia, SC 29210

SUBJECT:

Reference Letter for Yancey Robertson and Davis & Floyd, Inc. for the Purpose

of Obtaining a Certification of Authority

Mr. Yancey Robertson, RLA Davis & Floyd, Inc. 1319 Highway 72/221 East Greenwood, SC 29649

Dear Labor, Licensing and Regulation Board Members;

I have worked as a consultant for Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC as part of the Lake Services Team since August, 2008 providing professional engineering and project management services. During this time I have worked with Yancey Robertson and Davis & Floyd on twenty-two projects. The projects are in accordance with relicensing agreements with the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee (FERC) for access areas associated with Duke Energy's hydroelectric dams located on the Catawba-Wateree, Keowee-Toxaway, and Nantahala Area watersheds in the Carolinas.

During this time, Yancey Robertson and Davis & Floyd have provided exceptional professional services. I have been pleased with the level of detail and knowledge Yancey Robertson and Davis & Floyd have provided and look forward to continuing to work with them on future projects.

Sincerely,

STV/RALPH WHITEHEAD ASSOCIATES, INC.

Brian A. Couture, PE

Project Design Engineer

cc: Yancey Robertson, RLA

South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation Board of Landscape Architectural Examiners

License Type Landscape Architect License Number LSA . 788

YANCEY MCMILLAN ROBERTSON JR.

Effective Date 03/24/2011

Expiration Date 91/31/2013

