

OREGON STATE BOARD OF GEOLOGIST EXAMINERS

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 12, 2014

Members Present:

Peter Stroud, RG/CEG, Chair
Kenneth Thiessen, RG/CEG, Vice Chair
Hans Feige, RG
Todd Jarvis, PhD, RG/CEG
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)

Kyle Martin, AAG, DOJ

LOCATION: ASSOCIATION CENTER, 707 13TH ST. SE, CONF. RM. "A", SALEM, OR

Chair Stroud called the meeting of the Oregon State Board of Geologist Examiners (OSBGE) to order at 9:00 AM. He called the roll. Steve Tucker was not present. All other Board members and Administrator Valentine were present. No guests were present.

Meeting Agenda Review

Chair Stroud opened discussion on the agenda. There were no questions about the agenda or requests for amendments. Jarvis requested five minutes under the Correspondence agenda item to share a document. This requested was recognized by the Chair.

Minutes

Chair Stroud opened discussion of the minutes from the Board's May 30, 2014 meeting. He asked if there were any revisions. When none were requested, Chair Stroud asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

McConnell moved to approve the May 30, 2014 minutes as presented. Vice Chair Thiessen seconded the motion. Chair Stroud verified that there was no further discussion. He then called the vote, and all approved.

Tucker arrived at 9:05 AM just after the motion was 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 noted the summary pages provided for the new registrations issued. Board members briefly discussed the applications approved, and information about the ASBOG exam was shared. There were no requests to remove items from the consent agenda.

Vice Chair Thiessen moved to approve the consent agenda covering approvals issued May 17 through August 31, 2014 as presented. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked for

discussion. McConnell and Valentine noted that the review process continues to work well. Hearing no other comments, Chair Stroud called the vote, and all approved.

➤ Quarterly Check/Debit Log: McConnell directed Board members to the payment log. McConnell explained that this was included here because it is an item that can be approved as part of a consent agenda. She explained that if the Board did not agree, the log would remain part of the Administrator's Report for the next meeting. Board members agreed to review the log as part of the consent agenda process.

Board members and Valentine discussed several entries on the payment log related to exam-related refunds. McConnell asked staff to check on the property tax payment to Ricoh. Her understanding was that similar bills went out in error to all state agencies and were to be refunded. Valentine said she would check on this refund. Tucker asked for clarification on how the Board is billed for Department of Justice (DOJ) legal services. McConnell and Valentine addressed his question.

McConnell moved to approve the log for May 17 through August 31, 2014 and covering debits May 21 through July 31, 2014 and checks 3769 - 3821. Feige 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 issues to discuss this quarter related to the application review process.

Administrator Report

➤ Narrative Report: Chair Stroud asked Valentine to present the Administrator's Report. Discussion focused primarily on the following topics: Board membership update, Board member/executive director training, schedule for Board elections, performance appraisals, posting of final guideline documents, ASBOG exam statistics, removal of the "retired" status name, and policy updates related to affirmative action and government-to-government relations.

➤ Policy Matters: On the policy matters, Valentine addressed recent direction to semi-independent agencies from the Governor's Office of Diversity & Inclusion and Affirmative Action regarding development of an affirmative action plan. She summarized the purpose of an affirmative action plan and how the goal of such a plan is to promote, achieve, and value workforce diversity at the core of the Board's business structure. She further explained how she worked with Chair Stroud to develop an interim response by an August 29, 2014 deadline set by the Governor's Office. She recommended that the Board adopt a diversity and inclusion policy statement but otherwise thought it was prudent to await feedback from the Governor's Office on the Board's existing policies that address affirmative action issues. She explained that Governor's Office staff suggested that having key policies in place might suffice in lieu of a full action plan for very small agencies like OSBGE.

Feige asked Valentine to clarify how the policy language was developed. Valentine spoke to the general process followed in development of the existing policies. For the new proposed policy, she explained that she reviewed examples of diversity and inclusion policies adopted by other state agencies. McConnell noted that diversity in geosciences is a national topic of concern to professional organizations. She noted that it was not clear if the Board could influence this but that the Board should be sensitive to the challenge of increasing student diversity in university programs. Tucker suggested that the Board address the diversity issue in its future outreach with students.

Tucker moved to adopt the Diversity and Inclusion policy. Vice Chair Thiessen seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any further discussion. McConnell requested a revision to the policy to refer to customers, registrants, and citizens instead of customers and citizens. Valentine noted the requested change. Tucker amended his motion to adopt the policy with the revision recommended by McConnell. Vice Chair Thiessen seconded the revised motion. Chair Stroud called the vote, and all approved.

Valentine reminded the Board that she and McConnell were assigned the task of reviewing a Tribal Policy initially adopted by OSBGE in 2007. They presented the 2007 policy and proposed updates. Valentine explained that she and McConnell reworked the policy to modernize it and better reflect the nature of the Board's programs and intentions for any future communications with tribal governments. Board members were supportive of the proposed updates. McConnell recommended that Valentine sign up for the Commission on Indian Services listserv to receive notifications of its meetings and related matters. She thought this would help the Board track tribal government matters. Vice Chair Thiessen mentioned that the revised policy is an improvement because it recognizes the organic nature of how tribal government issues may come to the attention of the Board. Chair Stroud reviewed the legal exemption from registration for tribal governments to ensure all were familiar with this. He said he finds the new policy more realistic to implement.

McConnell moved to adopt the tribal relations policy dated 2014 to replace the 2007 policy. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

Valentine provided a presentation on possible options for online payment and renewal functionality. The presentation covered two options and addressed estimated costs for processing online payments and renewals. Board members asked numerous questions and ultimately gave Valentine direction to move towards an online payment and renewal system. The Board decided that it would absorb associated costs during the initial implementation and would start with a voluntary system. The Board anticipates evaluating implementation success over several years before any shift to mandatory online renewal. This would allow the Board to also gather additional data before considering any changes in renewal fees to offset the anticipated increase in costs to the Board.

The Board next reviewed exam statistics provided by ASBOG. This data covered changes over time in the number of examinees, passing rates, and the reliability of the examination.

Valentine updated the Board on changes made in the registrant database to remove the retired status category. She also shared example renewal letters that are now in use as of August 2014.

➤ Investment Report: Valentine reported that a CD matured, and funds have been re-invested in another CD per the Board's investment strategy. The Board continues to see a low rate of return. Valentine explained that one particular challenge is the statutory restriction on anything greater than an 18 month maturity on investments. She also noted that the Board is very restricted by statute in the types of investments it can hold.

➤ Report on Monthly Renewals: Valentine presented the quarterly report. She noted that the renewal rate for the big registration month of May was good, with approximately 96% of

registrants renewing so far. She noted that renewals in the January to August timeframe in 2013 when compared to 2014 are steady.

➤ Action List: Valentine apologized for not having the action list in the packet. She provided a copy, noting that many of the items on the list are on the agenda for discussion. The Board members decided not to spend time reviewing the list.

OSBGE Strategic Priorities

Chair Stroud introduced this agenda item as a follow-up to a brief discussion at the May 30, 2014 meeting. He presented various questions for the Board's consideration such as should the Board identify strategic priorities and if so, could the Board discuss these priorities at regular quarterly meetings. He encouraged discussion of possible priorities and related work effort that the Board might take on in addition to its regular business. Board members were in consensus about wanting to identify several strategic priorities. They were optimistic that identification and development of actions plans could occur via discussion at several quarterly meetings vs. holding a special meeting.

Chair Stroud next asked each Board member to tentatively identify a top issue for the Board's consideration. He started by identifying further clarification of scope of practice issues for geology, engineering geology and engineering (in cooperation with the engineering board) as a possible top priority. Vice Chair Thiessen also was interested in this topic area.

McConnell identified development of a continuing education program as her top priority, noting how Oregon is one of the few geology boards in the United States not requiring continuing education of registrants. She mentioned how most professions have continuing education requirements. She also would like to see the Board consider targeted outreach to local and regional governments and development of performance metrics to help track the long-term effectiveness of the Board.

Tucker inquired about whether the Board might examine how candidates for registration are required to show competency and skills. He suggested a top priority of outreach to potential registrants as the future practitioners that will serve the citizens of Oregon. He also thought the idea of developing a continuing education program was important as this is standard for many professions, especially those that require licensure.

Feige weighed in that he also sees continuing education as a need. He has also heard from registrants that they want online renewal service but noted that the Board is already moving forward on that front per discussion earlier in the day. For another possible priority, he mentioned that the Board might want to work with DEQ to look at how and when that agency requires that major reports be signed by a registered geologist or engineer. His understanding was that DEQ looks for signature and stamp as a way to ensure it receives legitimate reports. He wondered if the Board might find other similar cross-agency connections regarding who is qualified to provide certain reports or services, such as with cities and counties.

Jarvis mentioned a newsletter article he prepared in 2012 addressing evolution of geosciences and impacts on registration. He continues to see a need for the Board to address how the world is shifting to requiring interdisciplinary work, and this in turn is resulting in shifts within academic programs to offer interdisciplinary degrees. He said this is increasingly common with respect to hydrogeology and also noted the continued rise of environmental science programs. He encouraged outreach to university faculty about the importance of geologist registration and how

to ensure students are being educated and encouraged about the geologist registration. Board members discussed potential challenges for interdisciplinary students with respect to passing the national exam given that it is entirely focused on geology. The Board decided that it might be worthwhile to discuss these issues with others participating in future ASBOG meetings. Jarvis also provided an article he recently authored addressing methods of conflict resolution that might be applicable to Board review of complaint cases. He welcomed the Board to include the article in a future newsletter.

Martin arrived at 11:50 AM. McConnell left the meeting at 12:15 PM and returned for lunch. Jarvis departed the meeting at 12:17 PM for the day. Since this was his last meeting, Board members and staff thanked him for his term of service to the Board and wished him well. Chair Stroud then called for a lunch break at: 12:20 PM.

Chair Stroud reconvened the Board at 12:38 PM. He stated that the Board would come back to discussion of strategic initiatives later as time allowed. Vice Chair Thiessen asked that the Board identify the next steps before adjourning. Chair Stroud agreed and recommended that the Board pick two or three top priorities for further research and vetting. The Board again briefly discussed whether to hold a special meeting to review additional information that might be developed but continued with the plan to build time into quarterly meetings instead. Chair Stroud mentioned that it would be helpful to identify a Board member champion to lead work on each strategic priority that is moved forward for further consideration.

Correspondence

Chair Stroud inquired about correspondence. Valentine informed the Board that she did not have any correspondence requiring Board review this quarter. The item from Jarvis was addressed previously.

Public Meetings/Public Records Training

Valentine started the training by explaining that she and Martin did not have a formal presentation but instead planned a more dynamic refresher on key points of public meetings and public records law. Valentine referred the Board to her memo in the packet and associated background documents, which she summarized as follows: (a) recent news articles about public meetings law issues to illustrate how issues surrounding the law continue to arise, (2) a relatively recent (2011) Oregon circuit court decision addressing public meetings law violations, (3) a document containing some key excerpts from the *Oregon Attorney General's Public Records and Public Meetings Manual* (Jan. 2011), and (4) a copy of the Board's public records management and retention policy.

Valentine and Martin responded to Board member questions about what constitutes a public meeting. They covered issues such as quorum, purpose of meeting, direction given to committees, email communications, etc. Valentine and Martin explained that a quorum of the Board is three members but that a committee of two board members could also trigger the law if the committee is charged with making recommendations or decisions on behalf of the Board. Martin advised that Board members need to avoid having a quorum discussing issues by email or creating any meeting like conversation via email. Martin summarized the outcomes of the court case Valentine provided to illustrate a situation where individual county commissioners were found to have willfully violated the public meetings law. Martin recommended that board members generally communicate through the administrator to avoid inadvertently starting a public meeting.

Board members reviewed the public records management and retention policy. Valentine and Martin addressed questions related to public records requests, Board member notes, official records vs. courtesy copies, and confidential materials. Martin provided various suggestions to board members about how to limit holding unique public records vs. courtesy copies. He also explained that the use of the public records law has become more prominent in the last five years as a way for parties to gather information for legal proceedings. He suggested that this is because it can be easier to obtain records this way compared to the traditional legal discovery process.

Vice Chair Thiessen asked if the Board should look at moving to individual tablets and electronic documents only. Martin said his understanding is that most boards that have gone that direction have done so for efficiency and cost savings and not due to public records issues.

Compliance Report

Valentine summarized that the Board had three open complaint cases (CC#13-01-005, 13-01-006, and 13-01-007) and that no new complaints have been filed with the Board office. She further stated that no other possible compliance-related matters have been brought to the attention of staff. She referred the Board to written advice from counsel to consider regarding CC#13-01-005.

At 1:53 PM, Chair Stroud announced that the Board was entering Executive Session to consider written advice from counsel per ORS 192.660(2)(f) and read the script. Chair Stroud returned the Board to public session at 2:45 PM. No final decisions were made in Executive Session.

Chair Stroud asked if there were any motions related to the Board's open compliance cases.

Tucker moved to close case CC#13-01-005 with a letter of concern. McConnell seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

Tucker moved to close case CC#13-01-006 with a letter of concern. McConnell seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

Tucker moved to close case CC#13-01-007 with a letter of concern. Vice Chair Thiessen seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

Chair Stroud called for a break at 2:49 PM.

Committee Reports

Chair Stroud reconvened the Board at 3:01 PM and opened discussion on committee reports.

➤ Rules Advisory: Feige presented the report, including four proposals for rule amendments. He said he took direction from the last Board meeting and worked with Valentine on rules addressing roster, date of application, and public records. He summarized the drafting process and involvement of committee members. Comments received from committee members were shared with the Board. Valentine assisted with details about the administrative rules process.

◆ *Roster Rule, OAR 809-050-0020*: The proposal was to delete the existing rule in its entirety. Valentine shared the desk manual procedures in place to address the statutory requirement to

maintain an annual roster. Feige recommended that the Board authorize issuance of notice for permanent rulemaking.

McConnell moved to issue notice of rulemaking to delete OAR 809-050-0020. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved

◆ *Date of Application Rule, OAR 809-040-0001*: The proposal was to amend the rule to, at a minimum, add in a shorter application deadline for candidates retaking an examination. Feige reviewed a possible ‘good cause’ clause and comments received from committee members about this. The Board discussed the possible pros and cons of adding a “good cause” clause for accepting applications after the standard deadlines. Valentine noted that there has not been a lot of demand and felt that most applicants who have missed a deadline have done so because they did not research the application process until close to the exam date. She noted that staff would like clarification about the shorter deadline for those retaking the ASBOG and also for CEG exam applicants. With respect to the CEG exam, she said the standard 120 day deadline can be excessive since ASBOG is not in the loop. The Board decided to not pursue a ‘good cause’ clause but was supportive of a shorter application deadline for retakes and the CEG exam. The Board identified the following amended language for the draft rule: Application for retake of any examination or an initial application for the engineering geology examination must be postmarked 90 days prior to the examination date for which the candidate is applying.

Feige moved to authorize issuance of rulemaking notice for 809-040-0001 with subsection (2) amended to clarify the 90 day deadline applies to ASBOG retakes and the CEG exam and deleting draft subsection (3) in its entirety. McConnell seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked Valentine to repeat the amended language for the record, which she did. He then confirmed there were no further comments on the motion. He called the vote, and all approved.

◆ *Public Records Requests, OAR 809-001-0015*: The proposal was to replace the existing rule with new language. Feige summarized the comments received from committee members. He noted that several members suggested that the Board not specify fees in rule to maintain flexibility to adjust fees without subsequent rulemaking. He noted that Valentine identified the statutory reasons why fees must be stated in rule. McConnell asked if the fee issue is covered in the semi-independence statute. Valentine said yes but the public records law also requires that the Board be clear about process and costs.

Chair Stroud asked for an explanation of terms such as responsive records and responsive non-exempt records. He wondered if definitions of such terms should be added into the rule or if these terms are explained elsewhere in state law. Martin addressed what the terms mean and said the terms are already well understood under the Oregon Public Meetings Law. He advised that he did not see value in adding definitions to the Board rule.

Feige explained that he and Valentine worked with Martin on development of the rule language. Valentine explained that the rule was developed based on advice found in the DOJ Attorney General’s public records manual and review of similar rules in place for other boards and small agencies. She stated that the proposed language is very similar to rules for public records requests that other agencies have on the books. She summarized the major changes between the existing and proposed rule including exemptions added, inclusion of language allowing the Board to recoup attorney review costs, notice to the requesting party about cost, etc. Board members appreciated the overview.

Chair Stroud asked about setting an email size given that various servers can have different capacities. Vice Chair Thiessen wondered if a FTP site could be used. Valentine clarified that the language is written to address the capacity of the Board's server. Staff would include as many documents in one email as the Board system will allow, but there could be cases where the requesting party is charged for more than one email. Vice Chair Thiessen questioned whether any other types of data transfer options such as scanning or FTP should be identified or if the Board should specify a charge for providing a USB drive or disc. Valentine said the language was designed to have the Board make the decision about how to transfer files.

Vice Chair Thiessen asked about the staff labor rate included in the draft rule. Valentine said she looked at what other agencies are charging and also considered a blend of time spent by the two staff positions. Tucker asked if rule could set a maximum rate. Valentine recommended a flat rate for sake of clarity. Tucker appreciated that and stated that it is important for the Board to be able to recover staff costs associated with response to requests.

McConnell moved to authorize issuance of rulemaking notice for 809-001-0015 as presented. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

◆ *Required Application Information, OAR 809-050-0050:* The primary purpose of the proposal was to amend the rule to ensure the Board remains fully compliant with federal law regarding collection and use of social security numbers. Housekeeping clarifications to rule language were also proposed. Valentine said this rule was not identified by the Board for revision. She instead discovered a need to update the rule to ensure full compliance with Federal law restrictions on use of social security numbers and that staff only recently was made aware of the need for an update. She recommended the Board adopt a temporary rule and simultaneously authorize issuance of notice for permanent rulemaking. The Board reviewed the language, verified with counsel and staff when the Board is required to obtain social security numbers, and discussed the temporary and permanent rulemaking options.

McConnell moved to adopt the amendments to 809-050-0050 as presented as a temporary rule. Feige seconded the motion. Chair Stroud asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

McConnell further moved to authorize issuance of notice for permanent rulemaking. Feige again seconded the motion. Chair Stroud confirmed there was no discussion, and again all voted to approve the motion.

➤ Joint Compliance: Chair Stroud opened discussion on the committee update. He asked Martin to address a question before he departed from the meeting. Chair Stroud explained that the Board was interested in having the JCC assist in designing questions for OSBEELS and OSBGE to consider in asking for an updated joint legal opinion about practice overlap. He wanted to know the extent to which committee members can share information about a topic where the Board has received legal advice subject to attorney-client privilege. Martin advised that committee members can share information at a conceptual level only and not as advice from counsel. Chair Stroud thanked Martin for the advice, and Martin departed the meeting.

Chair Stroud noted that JCC has not met since the May 30, 2014 Board meeting. The JCC is scheduled to meet next on October 2, 2014. He reminded the Board that the JCC will be starting

work on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to replace the existing version. From the discussion on the MOU, he thought the JCC could then shift into review of the questions asked in the 1983 legal opinion. He hopes that OBEELS and OSBGE can use the JCC as a place to have more informal discussions that would inform both boards. Valentine commented on the staff work underway to prepare a first draft of a new MOU for the JCC review.

Chair Stroud reminded the Board about an idea previously discussed regarding development of an engineering geology rule to address scope of practice for CEGs. The discussion was whether such rule, similar to the OBEELS rule for geotechnical engineering or the Washington Geology Licensing Board (WGLB) rule for engineering geology, could be helpful to have in place before requesting an updated joint opinion on practice overlap. The Board did not discuss in detail but kept this idea on the list for future discussion.

➤ CEG Examination: Vice Chair Thiessen provided the committee update. He referred the Board to a memorandum from staff regarding research into California and Washington laws and rules related to engineering geology. He reminded the Board that this research was requested at the last Board meeting. He also mentioned that discussion continues with WGLB and the California board about title vs. practice requirements for engineering geology certification. He noted that it appears California's certification is for use of title, such that any geologist registered with that Board can practice engineering geology but cannot use the title. This contrasts to OSBGE and WGLB requirements to have the certification before practicing in the specialty. He also noted that it appears that engineering geologists in California may have less clear authority to be involved in design compared to those registered in Oregon and Washington. Vice Chair Thiessen said that he understands the WGLB is looking at possibly not accepting the California engineering geology exam results for reciprocity due to these differences. He suggested that OSBGE track the WGLB discussion and consider an advisory to OSBGE registrants about a possible change. He also wondered if the Board should look closer at the issue of allowing work under a civil engineer in certain circumstances as qualifying experience for the exam and CEG registration. This would be similar to practices in Washington and California. Valentine noted that statute currently limits what the Board can accept but said the Board could consider whether to pursue a legislative change in the future.

Vice Chair Thiessen briefed the board on a joint meeting held with the WGLB exam committee in early June. The agenda covered the history of the joint engineering geology exam, review of the Comira exam item bank database, evaluation of a subset of exam questions from exam form A, and related matters. The key outcomes were direction to staff to explore options for obtaining direct control of the exam item bank data and agreement to hold a full exam review of exam form A after the October 2014 exam administration.

Chair Stroud noted again that WGLB has adopted a rule on engineering geology and wonders if OSBGE should look closer at that model. McConnell mentioned that OSBGE has struggled repeatedly trying to clearly articulate scope of practice issues for registrants and others to understand. The Board did not make a decision about if or how to proceed with such a rule.

➤ Legislative: McConnell spoke briefly about the approaching gubernatorial and legislative elections and the 2015 session. She mentioned that interim legislative days were coming up. Valentine reminded the board that it did not submit any legislative concepts for the 2015 session. She and McConnell will monitor the 2015 session but neither currently had specific legislative proposals on the radar screen as of interest to OSBGE business.

➤ Budget: Chair Stroud opened discussion and asked Valentine to address the budget update regarding cost of living adjustment (COLA) for employees. Valentine reminded the Board of its previous decision to generally follow the 2013-2015 State of Oregon benefits package for state employees for the benefits provided to staff. In the interest of full transparency however, the Budget Committee requested that the issue of early implementation of the 2014 COLA be raised at the Board meeting. Valentine explained that the State of Oregon agreed during bargaining for the current labor contracts to a health insurance “savings clause” for 2014. Under this clause, the December 1, 2014 COLA of 2% is implemented earlier if premiums stay below certain levels. In a memorandum sent to state agencies, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) explained that insurance rates for 2015 have actually decreased and the December 1, 2014 COLA is accelerated by three months (i.e., starting September 1, 2014). DAS is applying the COLA acceleration to all represented, unrepresented, and management/executive service employees. Valentine explained that the estimated budget impact for this change is minimal.

Feige moved to confirm that the Board was implementing the COLA as of Sept. 1, 2014. McConnell seconded the motion. Chair Stroud confirmed that there was no further discussion. He called the vote, and all approved.

Valentine next presented an update on the first fiscal year of the 2013-2015 biennium and summarized that the Board was in good financial shape and well within the bounds of its adopted budget. She noted that the Board has spent more than it received in revenue during the fiscal year but reminded the Board members that this was anticipated and addressed by including carryover/reserve revenue in the budget. She pointed out that the Board did not spend the full carryover/reserve amount allotted for the fiscal year. She then reviewed line items with variances from budgeted amounts, noting that most were previously discussed with the Board.

Valentine updated the Board on information she recently received regarding the Public Employees Benefit Board (PEBB) health insurance benefits for 2015. She reminded the Board that it decided as part of the current budget to offer employees PEBB benefits as are offered to other state employees. However, she further reminded the Board that PEBB requires OSBGE to enter into an annual benefits contract due to its semi-independent status. The annual contract is generally provided by PEBB in December, and the Board has previously authorized the Board Administrator to sign the annual agreement. When feasible, she has provided a copy of the agreement at the Board’s December meeting prior to its execution for the Board’s review. She noted that this timing is awkward since PEBB requires OSBGE employees to enroll for coverage in the fall, i.e., prior to the Board-PEBB annual contract being executed. The built in assumption is that the Board is staying with the PEBB benefits and only issues like payment details and part-time employee options might be amended in the annual contract. Valentine pointed out some changes in the 2015 benefits that will have some modest implications for the Board’s budget. Valentine explained these were in the area of opt-out cash back to employees and a new option for employees to enroll for dental and vision insurance without having to enroll in a medical plan. She estimated that the benefits costs would increase from \$200 to \$270 per month for the 2015 calendar year.

McConnell moved to approve staff enrollment through PEBB for the 2015 calendar year. Tucker seconded. Chair Stroud asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he called the vote, and all approved.

➤ Outreach: Chair Stroud and Valentine reminded all that the Board's next meeting is on December 4, 2014 at Western Oregon University. This allows for a Board presentation to students and faculty.

Public Comment

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

Old Business

Chair Stroud noted that there was no additional old business other than items already addressed elsewhere on the agenda.

New Business

➤ ASBOG Fall Council of Examiners (COE)/Annual Meeting: The Board confirmed that Feige would attend. Valentine said she would work with Feige on the required paperwork and travel arrangements.

McConnell commented on ASBOG apparently changing the annual meeting to a time separate from the COE starting in 2015. Valentine said she noticed this but had not received any explanation as of yet from ASBOG.

Chair Stroud returned the Board to discussion on strategic priorities to bring closure to the Board's discussion about possible next steps. He suggested the development of conceptual plans for the discussion items of continuing education, outreach regarding public practice of geology, and future of the profession. He asked McConnell to take the lead on sketching out possible steps to research and develop a continuing education strategy. Board members agreed that the December meeting would provide an opportunity to start testing out how to reach out to students and faculty and that an incoming board member might be interested in being champion for this project. Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss any other areas of possible outreach.

➤ Proctors for October 10, 2014 Exams: Valentine mentioned a need for either a full-day proctor or 2 proctors split between the AM and PM exam sessions. Chair Stroud said that he could proctor in the PM.

➤ Elections Reminder: Valentine reminded the Board that officer elections last occurred at the December 2013 meeting and therefore elections would be on the plate for the next meeting.

Announcements

Chair Stroud asked if there were any announcements. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting at 5:04 PM.

+++++

The minutes of the September 12, 2014 quarterly meeting were approved as presented at the December 4, 2014 quarterly Board meeting.

Christine Valentine, Administrator