

**Responses to Survey - Board of Architects and Landscape Architects** Total responses: 53 (of which 14 out-of-state)

<p><b>Highest Compliment</b> (more than one answer possible)</p>	<p><i>Ability to monitor on behalf of licensees</i> - 35  <i>Ability to keep profession from criticism because of bad actors</i> - 8  <i>Other</i>: - Ability to represent the public interest as it relates to our profession. - Efficient administration. - Provide information on continuing education and [respond] to requests for information.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Ability to streamline Continuing Ed</i> - 5  <i>None</i> - 9</p>
<p><b>Biggest Complaint</b></p>	<p><i>Licensing fees too high</i> - 14  <i>Licensing renewal timelines too rigid</i> - 3  <i>Other</i>: - Dealing with unethical behavior. Nothing wrong with the scope, just the enforcement. It has to be a slam-dunk for the board to act. -- No clear definitions of who needs to be licensed - As a multi state architect I find the different law/ requirements confusing (but I understand why). I don't agree with continuing education requirements. - Board's inability to assess large enough fines.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Lack of Information</i> - 1  <i>Regulations too strict</i> - 1  <i>Board's response to unlicensed practice</i> - 9  <i>None</i> - 26</p>
<p><b>Other reasons the board is important:</b> - Architects go through a long education an intern process to make sure they are ready and technically sound to practice. Without this, anyone can call themselves an architect and not provide the level of expertise and understanding to protect the public and the client. -- The ethics of a professional Architect are first and foremost to look out for the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Without a board to review the actions of the professional community these interest are left to the individual for interpretation. Not every interpretation is created equal. The board can guide the licensed individuals to be, or strive to be, ethical and accountable. Nonlicensed people who practice architecture do not carry the same requirements to comply with the national and local community's values and rules. A rigorous licensing process ingrains the professional ethics into the licensed individual's every actions since they could be deprived of working in the state if they fail to support the health, safety, and welfare of the public. -- Licensing is a fundamental requirement to ensure that practicing architects maintain proper credentials. Architecture is a professional practice and must be treated as such. Eliminating the board would be a bad idea. -- What is the implications of the practice if there is not licensing by the state. How would it look to other states, (license transfers etc.) -- It assures a competency level and professionalism for the landscape architectural profession. It regulates and protects the profession. It helps to maintain the integrity and confidence of the profession to the public. -- To keep the profession valid. -- Public health safety and welfare are all important issues dealt with on our board level. - Sets a bar for performance or talent. -- The landscape architect members of the board provide solid, professional input to state laws that support safe, accessible and environmentally sustainable outdoor public spaces for Montana citizens. -- Professional accountability. -- Because licensure for design professionals, especially architects and engineers, is well established, it provides a level of status and credibility for those professions. Likewise, licensure for landscape architects, albeit for a much smaller and more recent number, provides the same level of status and credibility, that, if it were removed, would place us at a decided disadvantage to the other design professions in the world of planning, design and construction. Equally important is the role of the board in protecting the public health, safety and welfare by assuring that all licensees have met a minimum standard of competence through their combined experience and ability via rigorous testing. -- Holds licensed practitioners to a high standard to protect the public's health, safety and welfare. -- There needs to be some regulating body overseeing the practice of Architecture in Montana. During the building boom of the early 2000's, there were a great number of "designers" masquerading as architects, and taking work from architects. The greatest challenge to architecture in Montana is [the idea] "anyone can do it." Anyone cannot do it, even if they are an experienced builder, or a suitcase GC. The Board should be pushing for laws requiring an Architect's license and permitting for any structures, not exempting single family houses. Penalties for practicing architecture without a license should be stiff. - Public Health, Safety, and Welfare are serious issues pertaining to public spaces. I assume that if a board goes away, so doe the license that it represents. If my board were to be eliminated, my livelihood would most likely be destroyed. Our clients would still require the use of professionals so the work that landscape architects currently perform would go to other professions that are not trained or qualified to perform this type of work. Work performed be unqualified individuals is a public health, safety, and welfare nightmare waiting to happen. - Licensing provides the public a base level of service that they should expect from a licensed practitioner. The services that landscape architects provide frequently require significant investment and the consumer should know what to expect for their investment. - Without this licensing board, the ability to recruit qualified professionals to the state is limited. - Competency of design professionals is necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of the general public. I am NOT a proponent of more government, quite the contrary. However, there must be some minimum standard set for practice. My interactions with this MT Architectural Board's administrators has been productive. - Everyone thinks they are an architect if they can draw in AutoCAD, but they are not. On the national level, we are required to meet certain standards, including rigorous testing.</p>	

<b>Public Health</b> - 0	<b>Public Welfare</b> - 1	<b>Public Safety</b> - 7	<b>None of these</b> - 4	<b>All or combination</b> - 37
<b>Scope of Practice:</b>	<b>Too Narrow</b> - 2	<b>Too Broad</b> - 2		<b>Just Right</b> - 43
<p><b>Problems with own or other professions' scope of practice</b> - None with own profession = 49 Yes = 2 - of which: 1) Board of Prof. Engineers/Land Surveyors - 2) is the Contractor Registration Unit in the Dept. of Labor and Industry because person walks on a jobsite. "This is stepping over the line... I do not feel comfortable registering as a Contractor, because I feel it misrepresents my practice and scope of work."  -- <b>Comments regarding too narrow a scope:</b> -- State law does not require landscape architects for park &amp; trail design, recreation planning, restoration, streetscapes, and public planting projects that directly impact the public's health and safety when they use these highly public spaces. - The fine line between architecture and landscape is blurry along with urban design. There seems to be much cross over.- Board should have more discretion in fines and rule making  -- <b>Comments regarding too wide a scope</b> -- I completely understand the logistical need in 2007 to combine the Board of Landscape Architects with the Board of Architects. However, if there were any way logistically for landscape architects to be regulated by an independent board it would be better for the profession.</p>				
<p><b>What laws/regulations have caused the most problems?</b> None - 9  Continuing ed will be challenge but if you are licensed in other states you are already doing it. -- As a multi state architect I find the different law/ requirements confusing (but I understand why). I don't agree with continuing education requirements. I need to comply with multiple criteria concerning 14 states. So I'm taking 12-16 hours a year to fulfill all the requirements. Every 3 years I spend about 20 hours a month for 3 months relearning the new codes. Then I'm reviewed by a plan check review, an inspection process and another licensed profession, the contractor, let alone the legal process like everyone else. I'm over educated and underpaid. Architect are one of the few professions you don't read about in the papers. We aren't ripping people off and we not trying to kill people. The CEU system is a rip off. I can buy it or get it free, take a seminar or log on to the internet, and do I really learn anything? I learn twice as much just working. The rate of change is getting to be too much. Are we really safer if the codes change radically? Are we more educated if we take a CEU or did we enrich the test givers? -- When things get real busy, renewal can get hectic. I would like to be able to pay my licence for more then one year at a time and have more of a grace period. -- The law that required fees for licensure to be calculated exactly the same for all professions regardless of the level of service required due to small numbers of licensees and the level of legal action typical for the profession.[NOTE - boards now are assessed based on staff time spent on a board.] -- Ability for uneducated and untrained persons to become licensed landscape architects. -- A landscape architect commented: the fact that architects and engineers can engage in the practice of landscape architecture as part of their own projects continues to be frustrating as does the increase in licensing fees, especially as compared with the fees paid by the architects for their renewal. - The board is important; but the fees, particularly in this economic climate, are not justified by the services provided. In particular, the license fee for a Landscape Architect should not be double the license fee for an Architect, when the Board itself is the same, as well as all the particulars. - Exemptions. Some are necessary for overlapping practice, but it should be reciprocal across the affected boards. - Adopting International Building Codes, then amending parts to essentially gut a good share of the rules for building permits requiring licensed professionals.</p>				
<b>Consumer complaint filed?</b>	No = 42 Yes = 2 <b>Board was effective</b> = 2 Comments: (1) A landscape contractor was advertising as a landscape architect. Once reported to the Board, the contractor was notified and discontinued [the advertising]. (2) I had noted the listing of individuals and companies as landscape architects in a local phone book, even though I knew most of these listings were incorrect. The initial staff reaction was to notify each listing of my complaint (not anonymously), thus I received angry phone calls from friends and others suggesting I was trying to put them out of business. In most of these cases, the phone book company had made the listing on their own without ever bothering to check if the individual/company was a landscape architect or not. As originally notified, the individuals so listed would have had to appear before the board regarding the matter, even though they had nothing to do with the listing. I believe the Board finally agreed to pursue the responsible phone book companies with a formal letter of complaint suggesting that continued erroneous listings on their part could lead to further official action. <b>Board was not effective</b> - 1.Comment: filed a court case			
<b>Nonlicensee comments</b>	Saying Board of Architects and Landscape Architects: Necessary for Public Health - 120 , Public Safety - 165, Public Welfare - 87. At least 65 respondents marked all or a combination -			