



# Oregon

---

STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS  
FOR ENGINEERING &  
LAND SURVEYING

---

670 Hawthorne Ave. SE, Suite 220  
Salem, OR 97301  
(503) 362-2666  
Fax (503) 362-5454  
E-mail: osbeels@osbeels.org

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING  
Minutes of Meeting  
May 28, 2015

## CALL TO ORDER

In the absence of Vice-President Hoffine, Mr. Kent called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. via teleconference from the Oregon State Board of Examiners for Engineering and Land Surveying (OSBEELS) office at 670 Hawthorne Avenue, SE Suite 220, Salem, Oregon 97301.

## ROLL CALL

### Members present by telephone:

Chris Aldridge (excused)  
Bill Boyd (unexcused)  
Steven Burger  
Shelly Duquette  
Ken Hoffine (unexcused)  
Jason Kent  
Ron Singh (excused)  
Dave Van Dyke  
Amin Wahab  
Oscar Zuniga

### Others Present:

Mari Lopez, Administrator  
Jenn Gilbert, Executive Assistant  
Katharine Lozano, Assistant Attorney General (by telephone)  
Darrell Fuller, PLSO Lobbyist  
Tamara Johnson, PEO  
Erin Austin, ACEC (by telephone)

## PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Fuller briefly summarized the background to the amendments to Senate Bill (SB) 297. Although OSBEELS introduced a straightforward concept, the Professional Land Surveyors of Oregon (PLSO) were approached by members of the hydrography community. This resulted in the A-6 amendment that would exempt the practice of hydrography from the practices regulated by the Board. Mr. Fuller stated that since the introduction of the amendment, Professional Engineers of Oregon (PEO) Lobbyist, Marshall Coba joined him in meeting with the Chair of the House Committee on Business and Labor. After their discussion, he reported that the A-6 amendment will not be entertained by the Committee. For the short term, the A-6 amendment is

off the table with the understanding that future discussion will occur regarding the future of hydrography.

Mr. Fuller went on to state that he hopes the Board will endorse the A-5 amendment that revises the term “program” to “curriculum.” It is his understanding that PLSO concerns relate to colleges that have land surveying “curricula” that meet the requirements for registration but may not have a “program.”

Tamara Johnson attended on behalf of the PEO. She noted that PEO supports PLSO on the A-5 amendment and would report matters back to PEO, as needed.

Erin Austin spoke on behalf of American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) and reported support with Mr. Fuller’s comments opposing the A-6 amendment that exempts the practice of hydrography. ACEC however, currently accepts the A-5 amendment that revises the term from “program” to “curriculum.”

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **SB 297 –A5 amendment**

Mr. Kent asked AAG Lozano if there was advice she could provide for the Board to consider. AAG Lozano responded that the email she previously sent contains the advice that would allow the Board to enter into executive session. **The Board entered into executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(f) to review AAG Lozano’s legal advice regarding the SB 297. All members of the audience were asked to leave the room and were invited to return upon resumption of the public meeting. Upon returning to public meeting, it was noted that no decisions were made and no votes were taken while in executive session.** Upon returning to open session, Mr. Burger noted that over the past several years, several geomatic programs from the Oregon state college system have approached the Board in their efforts to gain traction on establishing programs. He wondered if the position of the Board on A-5 would help or hurt their efforts. Ms. Duquette responded that her position on accepting a geomatics program, as a qualifying curriculum, would depend on the effect on life and safety that might have, and that she had concerns related to this issue. Mr. Kent agreed. Mr. Zuniga noted that the Board already has a pathway to substitute non-degree coursework for experience to be able to qualify. It was moved and seconded (Wahab/Kent) to remain neutral on the A-5 amendment. The roll call vote follows:

Kent: No  
Duquette: No  
Van Dyke: No  
Wahab: No  
Zuniga: Yes

The motion failed. Therefore, it was moved and seconded (Duquette/Burger) to oppose the A-5 amendment. The roll call vote follows:

Kent: Yes  
Duquette: Yes  
Van Dyke: Yes  
Wahab: Yes  
Zuniga: Yes

The motion passed.

It was moved and seconded (Duquette/Burger) to remain neutral on the A-6 amendment. Ms. Duquette did note that it may be a moot point but stated that the Board is not for or opposed to the practice of hydrography. The roll call vote follows:

Kent: Yes

Duquette: Yes

Van Dyke: Yes

Wahab: Yes

Zuniga: Yes

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 a.m.