

OREGON STATE BOARD OF GEOLOGIST EXAMINERS

MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 4, 2014

Members Present:

Peter Stroud, RG/CEG, Chair
Kenneth Thiessen, RG/CEG, Vice Chair
Scott Burns, PhD, RG/CEG
Hans Feige, RG
Vicki McConnell, PhD, RG, State Geologist*
Stephen Tucker, Public Member
(*Ex Officio member, does not vote on motions)

Staff Present:

Christine Valentine, Administrator

Others: as noted in minutes

LOCATION: WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY, HAMERSLY LIBRARY, ROOM 205, MONMOUTH, OR

Chair Stroud called the meeting of the Oregon State Board of Geologist Examiners (OSBGE) to order at 9:06 AM. He called the roll. Steve Tucker had not yet arrived. All other Board members and Administrator Valentine were present. No guests were present.

Chair Stroud welcomed Burns to his first meeting as a member of the Board. Burns said that he was happy to be on the Board. He mentioned that when working at Portland State University (PSU) he always stressed the importance of professional registration to his students' future careers, and he would like to see the Board work with other universities to explain the importance of registration. Burns mentioned that he is finishing up his work with graduate students at PSU but is retired. He mentioned also that he has taken on the role of president for the International Association of Engineering Geologists and is the first president of that organization from the United States.

Meeting Agenda Review

Chair Stroud opened discussion on the agenda. McConnell requested time under Correspondence to update the Board on the proposed budget for her agency. Stroud affirmatively acknowledged the request. Stroud noted the planned discussion on strategic priorities as an outcome of the Board's discussion at the September 12, 2014 meeting. He also noted that the Board would be joined by guests during the day, first a visitor from the Oregon Department of Administrative Services to discuss classification and compensation issues with the Board and then students and faculty from Western Oregon University (WOU) to join the Board for a lunchtime presentation. He noted that Board counsel would not be attending the meeting but would be available by phone in the afternoon if the Board had any pressing needs for legal advice. There were no questions about the agenda or requests for amendments.

Minutes

Chair Stroud opened discussion of the minutes from the Board's September 12, 2014 meeting. He asked if there were any revisions. Thiessen updated the Board on a comment of his recorded in the September minutes regarding the Washington Geology Licensing Board (WGLB) considering a change in policy to no longer accept the California engineering geologist exam. He has since learned that WGLB decided to not go down this path. Valentine confirmed this update would be

reflected in the minutes for the current meeting. Hearing no further discussion on the minutes, Chair Stroud asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

McConnell moved to approve the September 12, 2014 minutes as presented. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud verified that there was no discussion on the motion. He then called the vote, and all approved.

Application Review Report & Consent Agenda

➤ Consent Agenda: Chair Stroud opened discussion on the consent agenda. McConnell addressed the application review process and the consent agenda for the quarter. Valentine explained how potential denials are brought before the Board. Board members briefly discussed the applications approved. McConnell mentioned an example of a CEG registration application review as an illustration of how she works with staff when questions arise in the review process. She explained that a CEG board member (Thiessen) was asked to help assess the applicant's engineering geology experience as part of the review process.

Tucker arrived at 9:30 AM during discussion of the consent agenda.

Chair Stroud asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Thiessen moved to approve the consent agenda for September 1, 2014 to November 14, 2014 addressing exam and registration approvals. Burns seconded the motion. Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, called the vote. All approved.

Thiessen spoke further on the review process mentioned by McConnell for a CEG registration by reciprocity. He explained how the applicant's supervising geologist was not an engineering geologist, leading to a request for information from the applicant regarding work he may have done in responsible charge of engineering geology projects. Thiessen noted that this experience when combined with the applicant's four years as a California CEG could be sufficient to meet the Board's responsible charge standard of 5 years work experience. Valentine answered questions from Board members about how experience is determined for CEG reciprocity applications. Thiessen noted that Oregon statute requires supervision under an engineering geologist and not under a qualified engineer as is allowed in California and Washington. Burns said he thought the Board needed more flexibility to allow supervision by qualified geotechnical engineers. Valentine mentioned there is a history of Board discussion on this issue.

➤ Quarterly Check/Debit Log: McConnell directed Board members to the payment log. She reminded the Board that as of the last meeting this has been added to the consent agenda as a streamlining measure. Board members and Valentine discussed several entries on the payment log.

Thiessen moved to approve the log covering debits August 29, 2014 through November 3, 2014 and checks 3822 - 3851. Burns seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

➤ Other Updates: McConnell stated that there were no other updates related to application review or the consent agendas.

Administrator Report

➤ Narrative Report: Chair Stroud asked Valentine to present the Administrator's Report. Valentine focused primarily on topics in the report that would not be covered elsewhere on the agenda. She and Board members discussed: (1) an update on the online payment/renewal project, (2) an update on development of a new agreement for the Joint Compliance Committee (JCC), (3) pending exam results, and (4) information from recent meetings with other semi-independent board representatives, specifically input they received from the Legislative Fiscal Office about biennial reports in April 2015 and information about a records management system being promoted by State Archives, and (5) informing the Board of an adjustment in the OSLAB monthly payment as of January 2015. During this discussion, Thiessen provided a brief overview of the JCC for Burns as a new member. Feige also updated the Board on his experience with the Association of State Boards of Geology (ASBOG) exam at the annual meeting in November.

Valentine also updated the Board on a few items not included in the written report: (1) OSBGE's first quarterly report to the Governor's Office was submitted, (2) Governor's Office response to OSBGE's affirmative action submittal, and (3) staffing of the office in December, including contingencies to ensure appropriate separation of duties.

➤ Action List: Valentine presented the action list for Board review. Feige asked if the date of the next administrative rules training has been announced. Valentine said no but that OSBGE should be on the top of the list to register.

➤ Classification/Compensation Review: At 10:20 AM, the Board was joined by Mike Baird of the Department of Administrative Services (DAS). Chair Stroud told the Board that Baird was invited to talk about the administrator position with the Board and asked for a round of introductions. Baird introduced himself as a Senior Human Resources Consultant and said his role is to work with state agencies and other branches of government on various human resource issues. Board members and staff introduced themselves.

Chair Stroud talked about looking at the administrator position classification based on trends in other state boards and how things are handled in the state personnel system. He asked Baird to explain the DAS approach to classification and compensation for positions similar to the administrator where the person essentially manages the business of a State Board. Baird discussed the existing Principal Executive Manager (PEM) classification, which is currently used for the OSBGE administrator position. He also explained ongoing, longer-term efforts by DAS to modernize the state classification system.

Baird and the Board discussed how OSBGE as a semi-independent agency is not required to follow the DAS classification and compensation system but has opted to do so for many years. Baird said this is very common, with nearly all similar agencies and other branches of government opting to use the DAS system instead of having to put the time and effort into creating and maintaining a separate system. Baird mentioned that any alternative system would need to have a sound basis and that this would be reviewed as part of agency audits or reviews. Board members expressed no interest in moving away from the DAS system.

Baird addressed how the PEM classification system works with different levels of management positions. Board members inquired about the current PEM level for the administrator position, and Baird stated that DAS considered it reasonable. He said the Board would need to review the position description to fully assess the appropriate level but that a D or E classification was likely

where DAS would see this type of position falling. Valentine said her understanding was that the Board had DAS assist in review of the classification level as part of the last recruitment.

Baird then explained how salary is tied to classification level and how within each classification level there are salary ranges each with steps. He further explained the rationale behind the agency head salary rate being applied to positions similar to the OSBGE administrator position and addressed various Board member questions about compensation rates. Baird noted that the agency head rate is about 5% more than other pay rates for PEM positions and that this reflects the accountability and authority vested in these positions to represent the agency and the incumbents service as completely 'at will' employees. Baird noted that OSBGE and the Advocacy Commission are the only two agencies among boards and commissions that he could find that do not classify a position similar to the Board administrator position as an agency head and offer compensation at the agency head rate. He noted that the Advocacy Commission is in a large state agency with a director so that is one difference from OSBGE. He also suggested that the administrator's role to also manage business for the Oregon State Landscape Architect Board serves to reinforce the administrator's role as agency head. He said that DAS recommends that OSBGE classify the position as an agency head and adopt the corresponding pay rate. He then addressed various Board member questions about such a transition, including that DAS recommended a transition that was step to step (i.e., current step 8 becomes the Step 8 at DAS "MEAH" rate). Baird also suggested that the Board might also consider a working title of Executive Director for the administrator position. This is what DAS generally suggests for other boards and commissions.

The Board discussed how it might proceed with any change for the administrator position. Valentine briefly spoke to how the issue emerged as the state compensation and classification system has been undergoing review and the OSBGE positions were in need of a periodic review. The Board discussed addressing this in terms of 2015-2017 budget development and for the current budget period. Stroud deferred further discussion until the afternoon as part of the budget discussion to allow Baird to depart and the Board to complete the next agenda item prior to the lunchtime outreach event.

Chair Stroud called for a break at 11:15 AM. He reconvened the Board at 11:21 AM. Steve Taylor, WOU, and former Board Chair joined the Board at this time.

➤ Quarterly Revenue/Expense Report: Valentine presented the report. She reminded the Board that the actuals for the first fiscal year were presented at the September 12, 2014 meeting. The Board revenues were down compared to projections but so were total expenses resulting in a lower use of reserve funds than planned. For fiscal year two, revenue continues modestly under projections but also with nothing surprising on the expense side so far. The Board looks to have extra savings in several categories, such as professional services, out of state travel, and legal expenses.

➤ 5-Year Comparison of Renewals: The Board briefly discussed the renewals chart.

➤ Update on Edward Jones Investments: Valentine shared the latest investment report with the Board. This led the Board into a brief discussion about reserve funds and trying to look at long-term trends in registrant pool. Board members also asked questions about fees for the Edward Jones accounts and tasked Valentine with preparing a report on fees and possible alternative investments. The Board discussed that any withdrawal of funds from Edward Jones would need to be staggered based on maturity dates of the existing certificates of deposit. Taylor shared some history about the investments with the Board.

OSBGE Strategic Priorities

Chair Stroud briefly summarized some of the issues the Board discussed at the September 12, 2014 meeting as possible strategic priorities. These included continuing education, outreach with universities (students and faculty) and agencies (state and local), and strengthening the understanding of scope of practice for engineering geologists. Chair Stroud suggested that the Board discuss outreach to universities first since Taylor was present and would have some valuable perspective on that issue as an educator. He mentioned how former member Jarvis brought to the Board's attention the changes in academic programs to offer more non-traditional programs and to merge geology programs with other programs. Taylor suggested that a key challenge for the Board in terms of allowing those with more diverse educational backgrounds to pursue registration is the Board tie to the national geology exam. He suggested that the Board think about whether candidates from other academic programs would be able to pass the national exam, which is entirely focused on geology. The Board intends to maintain the ASBOG exam as the standard, but there was discussion about possibly allowing a broader array of individuals to sit for the exam. The Board discussed that it would have to anticipate a higher failure rate and would not be in a position to assist non-traditional candidates with preparations for the exam. Non-traditional candidates would have to take it upon themselves to learn the content necessary to pass the exam.

The Board discussed that outreach with Oregon universities might be a path to encourage the university faculty and administrators to be strong supporters of the registration system, specifically by preparing students to understand the requirements for registration. The Board identified WOU, PSU, University of Oregon and Oregon State University as the core institutions as they continue to have geology programs.

Taylor mentioned how he looked at using the national Fundamentals of Geology exam as exit exam for geology majors but found the timing of the exams and the WOU academic year do not line up. He sees no way to change this under the current ASBOG system with two exam administrations per year. Should ASBOG someday move to a computer-based exam, then there would likely be more flexibility to administer the exams more than twice per year. Feige noted that he suggested movement towards a computer-based exam at the ASBOG annual meeting and the suggestion was not well received. The Board noted that the ASBOG exam is excellent but the process is very structured and rigid.

Outreach Event/Lunch

Chair Stroud called for a break at 12:00 to welcome WOU students and faculty into the meeting. The Board was joined by a group of 10 students and 4 faculty, including Taylor. The meeting restarted a few minutes later with Taylor introducing the Board and staff. He addressed the purpose of the Board's visit at WOU and the role of the Board. Taylor gave an overview of WOU geosciences program within the Dept. of Earth & Physical Sciences. Chair Stroud then gave a presentation about the Board and registration. This was followed by a question and answer session on the role of registration in the public practice of geology.

Chair Stroud called for a break at 1:03 PM to allow the students and faculty to depart. He reconvened the Board at 1:10 PM.

Chair Stroud brought the Board briefly back to the strategic priorities agenda item and said further discussion was tabled until the end of the day as time permits. He opened discussion on the Correspondence agenda item which was planned for before the outreach event but for which there was not enough time.

Correspondence

Valentine reported that staff has not received any correspondence requiring Board review this quarter. McConnell addressed the DOGAMI budget as presented in the Governor's Recommended Budget for 2015-2017. She explained that the Department gets approximately 18% of its budget from the state general fund and has to bring in project funding to cover the rest of the budget. This has resulted in cuts over the last 12 years due to the difficulty of maintaining that level of other funds. For 2015-2017, the Governor recommended some additional general fund for the Department to help backfill cuts in project funding. However, the Governor also presented only a one year budget instead of a biennial budget for the Department. DOGAMI is tasked with preparing a plan for stabilizing the long-term administration through funding and other means. This plan will be used to build a year 2 budget. DOGAMI will be reaching out to those with interest in its programs and services, including OSBGE and Board registrants, as it works on the plan. Board members appreciated the update.

Review of Outreach Event

Chair Stroud solicited comments from Board members. In general, Board members were very pleased with the outreach event and the support and participation from WOU. Tucker reminded the Board about its discussion at the September 12, 2014 meeting about possibly carrying outreach beyond college and into the K-12 system. The Board discussed whether it should play a role in talking to students before the college level. McConnell noted that the Board participated in a Department of Education review of science curriculum for K-12, with former Chair Taylor taking the lead to have more earth science content added. But she noted that the Board's role is not to promote the geology profession. Burns mentioned that PSU has a faculty person that works to promote earth science education and perhaps the Board could support individuals like this and other organizations that already work to teach K-12 students about earth science.

McConnell raised the idea of Board outreach to state natural resource agencies to discuss registration requirements and why registration should be of interest and importance to these agencies. She thought the Board could add value by making sure state agencies know when reports and other geology work products need to be stamped and signed. She and Thiessen mentioned past outreach with DEQ and OWEB and how it might be time for the Board to revisit those past outreach efforts or to even expand on those efforts.

The Board also briefly talked about outreach to various groups involved in land use planning to address what professionals (RG vs. CEG) should be doing what with respect to site evaluations and reports related to proposed land use actions.

No final decisions were made by the Board about outreach activities.

Compliance Report

Tucker updated the Board on complaint cases. He said that two new complaints were filed with the Board office since the last quarterly meeting. He explained that neither case was ready for Board deliberation. He reported that one case involves allegations of incompetence or negligence in technical work and the other alleges violations of the code of professional conduct.

Thiessen asked that the complaint log be updated to remove items listed under "Possible Complaints" if those do not result in written complaints being filed with the Board or Board action to otherwise open an investigation. Board members discussed and suggested that the list be amended to include initial dates received and then remove items that remain unsubstantiated after 6 months. Valentine said she would implement this system going forward.

Chair Stroud opened discussion of a complaint filed with OSBEELS against a RG. He referred Board members to information in the JCC portion of the meeting packet. He presented information from OSBEELS and explained that the complaint was first mentioned at the last JCC meeting. He explained that the OSBEELS Law Enforcement Committee subsequently met and decided to request a recommendation from OSBGE before deciding to open its own investigation. The Board reviewed the information and discussed whether the work that was the subject of the complaint was within the scope of practice for a RG or involved engineering geology work which would require a CEG. Board members had a robust discussion and ultimately determined that input from the RG would be prudent to better understand the scope of his employment on the subject project and what he intended by several statements in his letter reports to the client.

Board members agreed that it was important for OSBGE to take the lead on communicating with its registrant and to be responsive to OSBEELS. The Board further decided that it was premature to open a formal complaint investigation. Chair Stroud and Valentine were asked to prepare a letter to the RG about the OSBEELS complaint and requesting a response. Feige and Burns requested an opportunity to review the letter.

Chair Stroud called for a break at 2:50 PM. He reconvened the Board at 2:55 PM.

Committee Reports

➤ Rules Advisory: Feige presented the rule hearing report and noted that only one comment was received on the proposed rule changes. Valentine raised a question about the deadline for retakes or re-applications for ASBOG exams and said that staff suggests 75 days would be adequate. She explained that 90 days would not give applicants much time between receiving ASBOG results and the Board deadline. The Board discussed that such a change would be beneficial to candidates.

With the notice process completed, the Board decided to proceed with rule adoption and made the following decisions:

809-001-0015 Public Records Requests

Feige moved to adopt the amended language for 809-001-0015 as proposed and presented in the meeting packet. Burns seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, Chair Stroud called the vote, and all approved.

809-040-001 Date of Application

Feige moved to adopt the amended language for 809-040-0001 with one revision of the deadline for repeat applications for the ASBOG exam and applications for the engineering geologist exam changed from 90 to 75 days. Thiessen seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

809-050-0020 Roster

Feige moved to delete the Roster rule 809-050-0020. Burns seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

809-050-0050 Required Application Information

Feige moved to adopt the amended language for 809-050-0050. Burns seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked for comments and said he had a question about what the Board needs to do to address the temporary rule. Valentine explained that the Board would need a motion and vote to rescind

the temporary rule once the permanent rule was adopted. There were no other questions or comments. Chair Stroud called the vote, and all approved.

Feige then moved to rescind the temporary rule for 809-050-0050 adopted September 12, 2014. Burns seconded the motion. Chair Stroud, hearing no further discussion, called the vote, and all approved.

Valentine presented information on five year review of new administrative rules. She highlighted two rules that will need review in the 2015-2017 biennium. She explained that a 5 year review could but does not necessarily need to result in further rulemaking. She said that review results would need to be documented in some manner, such as in meeting minutes.

➤Joint Compliance: Chair Stroud noted that the Board discussed part of the JCC report under the Compliance Report. He updated the Board on the JCC's work to build a replacement Memorandum of Understanding for OSBGE and OSBEELS consideration. He said the MOU has been reviewed once and will be reviewed again at the February 2015 JCC meeting. Valentine explained that legal counsel has reviewed the draft MOU and that this input would be shared with the JCC. She anticipates the JCC may request some final revisions but will ultimately make a recommendation to the Boards about the MOU. She anticipated that the MOU could be on the OSBGE agenda as soon as the next quarterly meeting.

Stroud and Thiessen explained that formal review of the legal opinion on practice overlap between engineering and engineering geology is on hold as the JCC decided that the MOU would take first priority. There has been discussion about whether the MOU can resolve some issues and whether there will be a need or sufficient value in proceeding with formal review of the legal opinion.

➤CEG Examination: Thiessen summarized the CEG exam review that occurred on October 28, 2014 in coordination with the exam committee of the Washington Geology Licensing Board. He recognized the participation of Adam Reese, CEG, who volunteered to participate in the review to bring the perspective of a registrant with recent experience taking the exam. He reminded the Board that the exam committee is different than other OSBGE committees in that it makes decisions on behalf of the Board. He also explained how the exam review results were memorialized and applied to the October 2014 exam results.

Thiessen mentioned that staff was working to obtain a copy of exam data held by private company. Valentine said the data was recently received on CD. Staff had not yet had time to review it.

Burns applauded the work on the exam review and suggested that this needs to occur every few years to maintain the exams. Feige offered how the exam and the ASBOG exam compare and contrast with respect to the exam review process.

➤Legislative: McConnell presented information to the Board about the Oregon Design Professionals Day at the Capitol planned for February 2015 with a focus on disaster resilience. She shared her knowledge about the process that went into building the resilience plan and how various recommendations from that plan have been translated into the Governor's Recommended Budget for 2015-2017. Board members briefly discussed that registrants might participate in this legislative event. If any Board member participates, it will be as an individual and not representing the Board.

➤Budget: Chair Stroud asked Valentine to present the Budget report. Valentine reviewed the anticipated scenario for the budget rulemaking, with a two meeting process proposed starting with

the current meeting. She acknowledged the Budget Committee as a sounding board and was appreciative of their input as this helped her prepare the recommended budget.

Valentine presented her recommended budget to the Board explaining the two versions prepared and how revenue and expense line item estimates were developed. She explained how reserve funds are analyzed in the process and addressed a general trend of revenues not keeping pace with expenses. She pointed out that revenues have been fairly static for several biennium while expenses continue to creep up each biennium. She noted that personal services remain the primary expense for the Board. The Board needs to have an accurate calculation due to the cost split with OSLAB. For expenses, she noted that some cannot really be trimmed but others can be managed such as legal, travel, and training expenses. She recommended building some flexibility into the expense side and said the Board can always spend less than budgeted. Board members discussed various line items and asked Valentine questions about her estimates. There was discussion of looking at trends in registration based on past renewals and demographics of the registrant pool. The Board agreed that the recommended budget was appropriately conservative and appreciated the work that went into developing the draft.

Fee increases are not proposed as part of the recommended budget. However, Feige asked about the process to change fees should that become necessary in the future. He asked because OSBGE renewal fees are low compared to other geology boards, and he felt this may not be sustainable for too many years. Valentine explained that fees must be adopted in rule and that the process would be similar to adoption of the budget. She added that generally fees are examined as part of the budget development process although events could lead to a need to adjust fees outside of that process. The Board committed to continued monitoring of reserves and revenues with the goal of having ample warning about a need for fee changes.

McConnell noted that the Board does not have a contingency plan for operating on its own and that this may be something for the Board to develop. Without the partnership with OSLAB, she felt that OSBGE would have difficulty maintaining current staffing or may have to steeply raise fees.

Chair Stroud noted that the Board needed to decide on the classification and compensation issue discussed earlier in the day for the Board administrator to give needed input on the budget scenario that would move forward. Valentine said she needed to take a break, and Stroud excused her from the meeting. The Board discussed options for addressing the shift to the agency head classification and pay rate for the administrator position. The Board concluded that it made sense to make this shift to fall in line with other similar agencies and to reflect the duties and responsibilities that the administrator was performing.

Valentine returned to the meeting at this point, and Chair Stroud explained that the Board decided to go with the budget scenario for 2015-2017 that has the administrator position paid at the agency head rate. He further said that *the Board unanimously agreed to change the Board administrator's classification and compensation from the current Executive Service Supervisory (MESN) D, Step 8, to Executive Service Supervisory Agency Head (MEAH) D, Step 8 to be consistent with DAS policy and practice. He said this change would be effective at the start of the new biennium.* He committed to the Board that he would discuss this compensation change with the Chair of OSLAB soon after the meeting. Valentine thanked the Board for working through this issue and the clarity provided regarding the budget.

Chair Stroud stated that the Board was supportive of the Administrator shifting to use of Executive Director as a working title. Valentine said she would consider this but also may need to discuss with OSLAB.

➤ Outreach: Chair Stroud formally asked Burns if he would serve as the outreach coordinator for the Board. Burns accepted the assignment and said he looked forward to working to share information through university outreach and through communications with professional societies and others interested in the public practice of geology.

The Board decided that it wanted to hold its next university outreach visit at Oregon State University. Valentine noted that the timing of either the May or December meeting could work for this outreach.

Public Comment

Chair Stroud noted for the record that there was no one present to provide public comment.

New Business

➤ ASBOG Annual Meeting Report: Feige said that he had already talked some about the ASBOG meeting during the day so would limit his remarks. He attended the fall Council of Examiners and the annual meeting held in Indianapolis, IN in November. He noted that there was little to no interest among the group in moving to electronic exams and that there was much debate about holding some virtual meetings. He mentioned a report shared by ASBOG that provides an analysis of geoscience jobs as linked to academics. He said he would send the report to Valentine for circulation to Board members. He also mentioned that New York State is considering joining ASBOG.

➤ Election of Officers: Valentine reminded the Board that its last elections were in December 2013 but that Board rule says elections will occur once a year at the first board meeting held after July 1. She noted that sometime prior to 2011, the Board shifted to holding elections at the last meeting of the year. She wondered if the rule should be amended or if instead the Board should shift elections back to the fall meeting. She suggested that such a transition could be made by having elections made at this meeting effective through the fall instead of for a full year. She noted that there is nothing in statute requiring elections at a specific time of year. The Board discussed that it would prefer to continue with the status quo until the fall 2015 meeting.

McConnell moved to maintain current officers until elections held at the fall 2015 quarterly meeting. Tucker seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked for discussion. Thiessen and Stroud indicated their willingness to continue as Vice Chair and Chair, respectively. No other Board members had objections. Chair Stroud called the vote, and all approved.

➤ 2015 Meeting Dates: Valentine said that dates were proposed based on best available information but that she has since learned of conflicts with the spring and fall meeting dates proposed. She asked the Board to consider March 19 in lieu of March 13 and requested discussion about the fall meeting date. The Board selected the following dates: 3/19, 5/29, and 12/4. The Board asked Valentine to poll Board members about September dates again in another couple of weeks. The fall meeting date would then be revisited at the next quarterly meeting.

Announcements

There were no announcements.

Chair Stroud announced that the Board had completed its agenda and adjourned the meeting at 5:06 PM.

+++++

The minutes of the December 4, 2014 quarterly meeting were approved as presented at the March 19, 2015 quarterly Board meeting.

Christine Valentine, Administrator