

OREGON STATE BOARD OF GEOLOGIST EXAMINERS

MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 7, 2012

Members Present:

Mark Yinger, RG, Chair
Rodney Weick, RG, CEG, Vice Chair
Richard Heinzkill, Public Member
Todd Jarvis, PhD, RG, CEG
Vicki McConnell, PhD, RG, State Geologist* (Quarterly Mtg. Only)
Peter Stroud, RG, CEG

(*Ex Officio member, does not vote on motions)

Staff Present:

Christine Valentine, Administrator

Guests:**

PSU faculty and students
Christopher Humphrey, RG, CEG
Kenneth Thiessen, RG, CEG
(*as noted in minutes)

**LOCATION: PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, 1721 SW Broadway, Cramer Hall Room 68
Portland, OR 97201**

WORK SESSION MINUTES

Chair Yinger convened the work session at 9:06 AM. Board member McConnell was excused due to a work-related conflict; all other members were present along with Administrator Valentine.

Agenda Review

Chair Yinger asked if board members had any questions or comments on the day's agenda. Vice Chair Weick asked about having an ASBOG report added, and Valentine clarified that this was included under Old Business as it is a follow-up to the last discussion on the fall ASBOG meeting. Heinzkill asked to add a Phase II to the work session discussion on guidelines to address possible Board work on guidelines for geology reports. *Vice Chair Weick moved to approve the agenda with this one change, and Stroud seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.*

Complaint Case Reviews

Heinzkill and Valentine provided an overview of the cases and associated issues that needed to be discussed by the Board. They stated that the first case, CC#11-12-003, and one other matter related to CC#06-02-005, require discussion of written advice from the Board's attorney, therefore Executive Session was recommended.

At 9:12 AM, Chair Yinger announced that the Board was entering Executive Session for the purpose of considering records or information exempt from disclosure by law, including written advice from the Board's attorney, as authorized under ORS 192.660(2)(f). At 10:00 AM, Chair Yinger announced that the Board was returning to Public Session. No decisions were made in Executive Session. The Board continued with discussion of complaint case procedures.

Valentine provided copies of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between OSBGE and OSBEELS. She asked Board members to take a few minutes to review the MOU, particularly Sections 6 and 9 regarding the Joint Compliance Committee (JCC). She solicited input on whether OSBGE should request the semi-annual meeting to discuss “issues of common concern” as described in Section 6. She also noted that recent JCC cases have not completely followed the procedural path outlined in Section 9. Chair Yinger asked for background on how the JCC has operated in recent years. Vice Chair Weick, as a long-standing member of the JCC, gave an overview of how the JCC developed and has operated of late. Discussion ensued, with the Board ultimately determining that it would be appropriate to request a general meeting of the JCC to allow for introduction of new committee members, discussion of general procedures by those members, and approval of meeting minutes from the last JCC meeting of November 2011. Weick offered that periodic teleconferences may be needed to ensure that meeting minutes are finalized in a timely manner given that the JCC does not meet regularly. Weick also suggested that the two boards might consider holding a joint meeting so all board members and not just JCC delegates get to know each other. The Board did not opt to pursue this idea at this time.

Chair Yinger called for a break at 10:23 AM. He reconvened the Board at 10:37 PM.

Rule Amendments/Review of Public Comments

Valentine introduced this topic by referring to the pending rules for four topic areas: (1) Complaint Process rule, (2) Misconduct rule, (3) Procedural rules, and (4) Operating Budget rule. She explained that no comments were submitted to OSBGE on any of the rules out for notice in November. She stated that the Board needs to decide if it is ready to take action during the quarterly meeting to adopt the rules.

Complaint Rule, OAR 809-055-0000: Vice Chair Weick introduced proposed changes to the Complaint Rule intended to streamline the rule text but not change rule intent. He suggested that a new section (5) be added to globally address that it is the Board making decisions on complaint cases with subsequent renumbering and deletion of similar statements in sections (5)(e) and (6)(d) as drafted. The new (5) would state: “The Board makes all recommendations and decisions regarding complaint cases at a Board meeting.”

Also on the Complaint Rule, Heinzkill raised a question about interpretation of section (6)(b)(A). He wondered if this language accommodates the coordinator talking with more than one board member on individual basis. The Board discussed that the intent was to allow for the Coordinator to ask for technical assistance from more than one board member during an investigation provided this is done without generating a quorum. Vice Chair Weick ultimately recommended that the Board reword the section to clarify that the Coordinator may consult with individual board members.

Misconduct Rule, OAR 809-020-0030: Vice Chair Weick asked for discussion on the use of the term felony in the draft rule and how this relates to the public practice of geology. Valentine reminded the Board that this issue was referred to counsel per request of the Board with counsel input shared at the September 21, 2012 meeting. The Board ultimately decided that no further changes were needed.

Budget, OAR 809-010-0025 and Notice/Procedures, OAR 809-001-0000, 0020, 0025, 0030: Board members had no further questions or changes to propose. Chair Yinger noted that the Board appeared ready to adopt these rules in the quarterly meeting.

Guidelines Project – Phase 1: Engineering Geology Guidelines

Valentine referred the Board to the documents contained in the work packet, and Jarvis and Stroud briefly spoke to their work preparing the draft scope of work for the Board's consideration. Chair Yinger offered his comments to open discussion. He recommended rewording Item 3 to clarify that the contractor may incorporate elements from other guidelines into the OSBGE guidelines. His concern was that the draft language could be read as directing the contractor to incorporate other guidelines in whole. He also asked for discussion of Item 4, particularly how the contractor will know what the Board wants with respect to a fact sheet. The pros and cons of having a fact sheet prepared in tandem with the guidelines were discussed by all, with a decision to proceed with the scope of work as proposed. Item 3 was briefly discussed with respect to clarifying the format in which the guideline would be provided to the Board. Item 5 was discussed for longer, specifically the notion of restricting the industry sector panelist to a person from a mid to large size company. The Board decided that it would not bias the selection of the panel members by having mandatory qualifications of this nature. The Board did not rule out making some recommendations in the scope of work about such qualifications.

The Board discussed whether a request for qualifications was needed to provide further information. The Board decided to go right to a request for proposals (RFP) and discussed how the Administrator would model the RFP on the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) template for RFPs. Valentine discussed how she will need additional information to complete the RFP. She mentioned that proposals usually address details like contract term, method of compensation, details on how to respond, content standards for proposals, draft contract form, and evaluation/ranking process. The Board decided that Stroud and Jarvis would continue to be point persons for Valentine on these and other aspects of RFP development. She also asked for input on how the RFP is circulated, saying that she would anticipate advertising via the State of Oregon ORPIN system, on the OSBGE website, and in the next OSBGE newsletter. The Board agreed with those venues and also suggested a global e-mail to registrants. The Board would like to see the RFP finalized and advertised as soon as feasible instead of waiting to review further at the next quarterly meeting.

Heinzkill reminded the Board that the agenda was amended to add discussion of guidelines for preparing geology reports. He mentioned that he recently came across a document that describes the contents of typical geology report and is wondering if this is the sort of project the Board was looking to take up. Chair Yinger, after consulting with the Board, decided to put this on the next work session agenda as the time was nearing for the outreach presentation with PSU students and faculty. Heinzkill stated that this was acceptable to him and turned over the document to Jarvis for his review. Heinzkill expressed the thought that the Board might consider the document further at the next meeting. No additional topics were specifically identified for the next work session, and the work session was adjourned at approximately 11:30 AM.

PSU Outreach Event:

From 11:30 AM to 12:45 PM, the Board was joined by students and faculty from the PSU Geology and Geography Departments as well as registrants Christopher Humphrey, RG, CEG and Kenneth Thiessen, RG, CEG for lunch along with a presentation and question/answer session on the role of registration in the public practice of geology. Jarvis narrated the presentation, and all Board members and staff participated in the question/answer session. The Board was pleased to see a good turnout from PSU for this event.

QUARTERLY MEETING MINUTES

At 12:57 PM, Chair Yinger convened the Board for its quarterly meeting. Member McConnell joined the Board for the meeting, such that all members were now present. No visitors were present.

Minutes:

Chair Yinger lead the Board in a review of meeting minutes from Sept. 21, 2012. Hearing no requests for revisions, Chair Yinger asked for a motion. *McConnell moved that the Board adopt the September 21, 2012 minutes as drafted. Vice Chair Weick seconded the motion. Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.*

Administrator Report

Administrator Report

Valentine proposed to cover issues addressed in the report that were not otherwise covered in the agenda. However, she also asked if members had particular topics from the narrative report that they wanted her to address. Chair Yinger asked for an explanation of vehicle insurance coverage through the Department of Administrative Services. Heinzkill expressed his interest in hearing more on the topics listed under Compliance in the narrative report.

Valentine explained the history of OSBGE's coverage under the State of Oregon's vehicle insurance coverage. She explained how the coverage is secondary when a person is using a private vehicle for board-related business in accordance with vehicle rules. The Board agreed that it would continue to maintain this coverage.

Valentine next addressed proposed upgrades to the database software, which would switch from the jerry-rigged system now in place to having a Filemaker server platform. The Board's current computer and database contractors have confirmed that this switch can be made readily through purchase of software and without further upgrades to the hardware. The Filemaker software is nearing time for upgrade anyhow as maintenance of the old version is becoming limited. The Filemaker Server software would be new. Valentine summarized the likely costs and advantages of the upgrades. The Board was supportive of the proposed upgrades.

Valentine explained that it was time again for OSBGE to enter into its annual interagency agreement with the Public Employees Benefit Board (PEBB) for insurance benefits. In the past, the Administrator has signed these agreements on behalf of the Board; Valentine confirmed that this is what the Board expected again. She also reminded the Board that it continues to have one employee opting out of insurance and one covered employee. For 2012, the Board opted to continue fully paid insurance benefits, not following suit with the State of Oregon which started requiring that employees pay 5% of premiums in 2012. Valentine provided details about the 5% amount for 2013 and asked whether the Board would continue with fully paid premiums for 2013. The Board discussed how to proceed for 2013, debating several scenarios. While noting concerns about financial impacts to staff, the Board ultimately decided that for 2013 it would follow suit with the State of Oregon. Primary reasons for this included parity with other state employees and parity with other semi-independent boards. Valentine was directed to notify staff of this decision and finalize the PEBB contract accordingly.

Valentine updated the Board about the sublease situation; a tenant is moving in effective January 1, 2013. She confirmed that the tenant is the same organization that was interested during the summer of this year.

Valentine next asked for a few minutes to provide a refresher on semi-independence given the Board has several relatively new members and issues related to this could come up in the 2013 Legislative session. She passed around copies of the 2011 white paper on semi-independence prepared by the Semi-Independent Boards Association (SIBA). The Board discussed various ideas that have been floated over the years related to semi-independence. The Secretary of State's audit of boards and commissions from June 2012 also came up in conversation. In relation to the audit findings, Valentine was asked to discuss with the SIBA group the concept of working upfront to develop proposed input or guidelines related to possible board efficiencies. She agreed to raise the topic at the next SIBA meeting in January 2013.

Moving on to Compliance topics, Valentine asked for input on whether the Board is interested in establishing a legal mechanism to provide compensation to future technical reviewers and whether there is any interest in having access to investigation services via the Architect Board. The Board expressed tentative interest in the request for qualifications/personal services contracting model presented by Valentine. Valentine will bring draft documents to the Board for review at the next work session or meeting. Heinzkill asked about how a contract would impact immunity from civil liability for technical reviewers, specifically whether contract reviewers would be covered by the liability clause the Board is pursuing. Valentine was asked to consult with counsel about how a contract for service would impact liability of technical reviewers either under the status quo or under the proposed legislative concept. As for a professional investigator, the Board decided that its need for such assistance is too irregular. The Board did express some interest in developing a relationship with OSBEELS investigators due to practice overlap being most common with that board. However, no immediate action was decided upon.

To conclude, Valentine notified the Board that ASBOG exam results arrived recently. For the October 2012 exams, all candidates passed. She noted that staff could not remember a previous exam when all candidates passed.

While on the topic of recent examinations, Vice Chair Weick mentioned to the Board that he and Valentine recently discussed a request from a CEG exam candidate for a numeric score. Weick noted that the Board position has been to only give Pass/Fail. Valentine mentioned that the candidate seemed to be interested in the score as a way to evaluate what he might need to do to prepare to retake the CEG exam. He also asked about knowing what types of questions he missed, but Valentine noted the CEG is not setup in a manner that accommodates staff providing a breakdown by subject area like ASBOG can do with its exams. The Board then discussed that perhaps a proctored review should be allowed. A proctored review would allow for a candidate to see what questions were answered incorrectly but would not provide the correct answers to the questions. The Board decided that it would like to see a proctored review made available to anyone who requests this. Jarvis suggested that Board needs to allow for this now and doesn't need any formal process to begin offering these reviews. Valentine addressed how some policy or at least process guidelines would be helpful to staff, i.e., how to request, what is reviewed, how long the review lasts, etc. The Board discussed and asked Valentine to draft an interim policy statement and conditions for proctored review for use in the short-term. Rulemaking may be pursued as necessary to memorialize the process.

Updated Revenue/Expense Report for Current Biennium

Valentine explained that staff added in a column to show the adjusted budget numbers for year 2 based on the budget revisions approved at the Sept. 21, 2012 meeting and which will be fully reflected in an amended rule, presuming the Board takes action today to formally adopt that rule. She summarized the budget situation as good, with revenues on track and expenses within projections. She also discussed how staff tried a new approach for displaying the revenue and

expense report and balance sheet, more clearly separating out the year 1 and year 2 data as well as giving the totals. Valentine noted that OSBGE continues to have a healthy reserve. She suggested that the Board consider adopting a reserve policy and recommended a target of between 6 to 9 months operating expenses in reserve. She thought a reserve policy might help the Board with longer-term financial management, including explaining the financial basis for any fee increases that become necessary down the road.

Yinger asked if there were any questions on the various documents. None were raised.

Approve Quarterly Payment Log

Valentine addressed a few questions from board members about particular items on the log. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Yinger asked for a motion. *Vice Chair Weick moved to accept the payment log dated Sept. 7 through Nov. 20, 2012 as presented for debits Sept. 24, 2012 through November 20, 2012, checks #3496 through 3527, and checks #9173 through 9178. McConnell seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.*

3-Year Comparison of Changes in Monthly Renewals and Examinations

Valentine provided the Board with the renewal and examination report. Board members briefly discussed.

Update on Edward Jones Investments

Valentine noted that the value of CD investments continues to stay rather steady, with limited income from interest. The next CD to mature does so in March 2013. McConnell asked about the money market part of EJ account, and Valentine provided the requested information.

Compliance Report

Heinzkill summarized the complaint for open case CC#11-12-003 as allegations of a CEG providing professional services outside his training and experience in the construction of a roadway. He noted the Board discussed the case in the AM work session. Chair Yinger asked for comments or a motion. *Vice Chair Weick moved to close the case, specifically by notifying the respondent that the Board reviewed the information obtained during the course of this investigation and determined under its statute and rules that the allegations against the respondent related to the practice of geology are unfounded. OSBGE will also specify that it defers to the Oregon State Board of Examiners for Engineers and Land Surveyors (OSBEELS) regarding allegations related to the potential practice of engineering but that OSBGE may reopen this matter if it receives new information that merits such action. Heinzkill seconded the motion. Chair Yinger opened the motion for discussion. Vice Chair Weick noted that during the course of the investigation the Board learned that a professional engineer had been involved with the project from the beginning. Hearing no other comments, Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.*

Chair Yinger announced a break at 2:36 PM. He reconvened the Board at 2:44 PM.

Committee Reports

Administrative Rules Committee

Valentine directed the Board to the Hearing's Officer Report in the meeting packet. Chair Yinger stated that the rules were addressed in the work session, and he would welcome motions regarding adoption of the various rules.

Vice Chair Weick moved to adopt the Complaint Process rule (OAR 809-055-0000) with amendments proposed during the AM work session. Stroud seconded the motion. Yinger asked for comments. Valentine verified that she had the amendments referred to by Weick documented for the record. Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.

Vice Chair Weick moved to adopt the Misconduct rule (OAR 809-020-0030) as drafted. Stroud seconded the motion. Chair Yinger asked for comments and hearing none called for a vote. All approved.

Stroud moved to adopt the Operating Budget rule (OAR 809-010-0025) and Notice rule (OAR 809-001-0000) as drafted. McConnell seconded the motion. Chair Yinger asked for comments and hearing none called for a vote. All approved.

McConnell moved to have the Board delete as proposed the Contracting rule (OAR 809-001-0020), Purchasing rule (OAR 809-001-0025), and Personnel Policies rule (OAR 809-001-0030). Weick seconded the motion. Chair Yinger asked for comments and hearing none called for a vote. All approved.

Valentine noted that she will file the final changes to these rules on behalf of the Board as soon as is feasible.

Budget Committee

Valentine presented the draft 2013-2015 budget on behalf of the Committee. She stated that the Board is not being asked to approve the budget at this time but indicated how Board input at this stage will help shape budget development. She summarized the revenue projections as only modest growth in registration/renewal income based on a 5 year average for revenue streams but a big jump in the administrative fee paid by OSLAB. She explained that the OSLAB increase reflects the impact of a projected 13-16% jump in Personal Services expenses. She further explained that the increase is on account of increased PERS employer rates that are effective July 1, 2013. She noted that the increased PERS costs do not reflect an increase to employee compensation. She notified OSBGE that OSLAB is aware of this and understands that the administrative fee also needs to increase in response. OSLAB remains committed to a continued administrative relationship with OSBGE.

Valentine pointed out that there is an apparent need for some “carryover/reserve” funds to be earmarked as revenue for 2013-2015. She noted that whether the Board will have revenue from 2011-2013 remaining to carry over will not be known until closer to when the budget must be adopted. She noted that reserves are strong, as was discussed earlier during the Administrator’s report. The Board has over 1 year of operating expenses in reserve using projected expenses for 2013-2015.

Valentine explained that remaining expenses as shown are bare-bones estimates in the budget draft, and she is now thinking the projections may be too low, at least for year 2. She suggested the budget be updated to include an inflation factor for year 2. She also welcomed Board input on issues such as possible reductions in attorney services, out-of-state travel, limited computer services, limited professional services, and the question of whether a CEG task analysis needs to occur in 2013-2015. Despite these limitations in the draft, Valentine stated that she thinks the Board can manage through the 2013-2015 biennium without fee increases by use of reserves and careful management of expenses.

McConnell highlighted that the Board has to make a policy choice through the budget ultimately adopted in 2013 about whether and how much to use reserves and when to instead or in addition to use of reserves look at increasing fees. The Board discussed this for a while, covering concerns such as spending down its reserve before going for fee increases, ensuring the Board budgets in a manner that it can carry out its mission and key initiatives, the challenge of estimating personal services expenses prior to early summer 2013, thinking beyond the 2013-2015 budget, and not spending too much time debating over small sums of money in comparison to the overall budget and existing reserve.

In summary, the Budget Committee was asked to continue development of the budget taking the following factors into consideration: (1) continued work on the guidelines, with anticipated spending of up to \$20,000 more in 2013-2015, (2) accommodate two representatives attending each annual ASBOG meeting and one representative the attending spring ASBOG meeting, (3) add some inflation into the expense projections, (4) include \$15,000 to 20,000 for a CEG task analysis for now, pending discussion with the Washington board in the New Year, and (5) develop some operating principles for how reserves are used. Valentine was asked to take the lead on reworking the draft budget. A revised budget will be presented at the next quarterly meeting.

Joint Compliance Committee

Vice Chair Weick mentioned the discussion in work session about the existing MOU with OSBEELS. He noted that the Board discussed a JCC meeting to get meeting minutes approved, introduce new members, provide updates on cases involving overlap, and explore roles and responsibilities. He had nothing further to report.

Legislative Committee

McConnell provided an overview of the process for filing bills. She noted that OSBGE's concept is expected to be in the package of bills submitted by Governor Kitzhaber. The deadline for the Governor's submittal deadline is close, so the Board will know for sure soon if it has a bill moving forward. She suggested that the next things to do if the bill is filed by the Governor are: (1) review the new committee structure, (2) determine which committee the bill is assigned to, and (3) get on the schedule to talk to committee staff or the Committee Chair. Vice Chair Weick mentioned that the Board might want to see if past technical reviewers would be willing to talk to legislators about this bill to explain how it would impact them.

Valentine added to McConnell's update by describing the meeting she and Chair Yinger had with the Governor's Office about the bill concept in early October. The only issue raised was whether ACLU continues to have concerns with the bill. Valentine has been in contact with the ACLU representative since then by voice mail and e-mail, requesting feedback. Exchanges related to why specific language was included and excluded. Ultimately, Valentine shared with the Governor's Office staff how ACLU described its concerns as substantially resolved and how the Board has provided answers to questions ACLU asked about the language. She is hopeful that OSBGE's bill will move forward and be included in a package of simple bills submitted with a request for early review by the Legislature.

Outreach Committee

Jarvis commented on the good turnout from PSU at the lunchtime presentation. All agreed that the event went well, and all would like to see this replicated at another university in 2013.

Jarvis presented an idea proposed by Heinzkill, stating that he has reviewed and supports the idea. The concept is titled "Hiring a Geologist" and would involve creating a new section for the OSBGE webpage to help citizens understand when and how to find a registered geologist. He also

mentioned how he had discussed with Valentine the idea of adding License Lookup (as part of Hiring a Geologist) to the website, as was briefly discussed earlier in the day. He noted how he, like staff, routinely receives calls from citizens looking for a geologist. Valentine explained how the Board currently relies on a manually created registrant list that is updated monthly at best and is in a PDF that is not easy to search. She noted how most regulatory boards have online licenses lookup functionality on their websites. She noted that OSBGE could add online license lookup pulling real-time data if the system is updated to Filemaker server as was discussed earlier in the day.

Jarvis noted that Heinzkill's outline presents a very thoughtful approach to how to enhance the website to provide better customer service. The page would cover what geologists do in Oregon and how that work relates to the public interest. He asked for Heinzkill to comment. Heinzkill volunteered to prepare a draft, then submit to Jarvis and Valentine for review and then bring it back to the full Board for review. His outline was intended to give an overview of what might possibly end up on the page, and he would like input from Board members. Jarvis noted how the Board could also use the information created also for outreach, such as a one-page fact sheet. Weick suggested that this project move forward quickly as there is an obvious need. He suggested that Heinzkill and Jarvis proceed and not wait for the Board to review a draft at the next quarterly meeting. Other Board members agreed and also volunteered to serve as a resource for Heinzkill if he has particular questions about geology practice as he works on the draft webpage. Stroud expressed particular interest and told Heinzkill he would have time to assist with the project.

Professional Practice Committee

McConnell stated that the main thing is to get moving on the guideline project and noted that this was already discussed during the work session. The Board recapped how the RFP would be finalized and issued on ORPIN plus with notice to registrants. The Board would like the RFP issuance to proceed prior to the next Board meeting. The RFP is not committing the Board to a contract so there are no issues with it needing Board approval prior to release, as per the Board's Contracting and Procurement policy.

Old Business

Follow-Up Report: Research on Policy Issues

Topic 1 - ASBOG Manual Re-grades and Proctored Reviews: Valentine presented her research into the issue of offering proctored reviews and not just manual re-grades. She summarized that a rule amendment appears to be required and sought direction from the Board. The Board would like to see a rule amendment drafted for consideration at the next meeting. Vice Chair Weick suggested that it may be as simple as stating that OSBGE follows ASBOG policy for proctored reviews. The rule could also address proctored reviews for the CEG examination as was discussed earlier in the day. Valentine noted that ASBOG will need to be notified of the new policy, as otherwise they will not accommodate proctored reviews in Oregon. She also noted that the Chair would be consulted once the rule is drafted about whether to bring the proposed rule to the Rules Advisory Committee before the next quarterly meeting.

Topic 2 - "Statute of Limitations" Idea for Complaint Cases: Valentine next presented her research into the idea of setting a time limit for filing a complaint about a registrant's work. She summarized that from a legal perspective setting a hard and fast limit appears problematic but that the Board does apparently have the ability already to consider how long ago work in dispute was done as part of its evaluation of a complaint. She sought direction from the Board. The Board would like to see some guidelines memorialized in policy or elsewhere with complaint case procedures about how the timing issue might come up and be handled by the Board. This would be based on lessons learned from past cases and would ensure future boards are privy to this

information. The policy might suggest criteria or at least considerations for the Board when faced with a complaint about an old report or other old work. The policy might also suggest how or when new work must be assessed to determine if old work practices continue.

Update on Candidates for Board Membership

Valentine explained that the Governor's Office has a pool of four registrants to choose from and is in the review process. As of yesterday, the Governor's Office had not communicated its decision and as far as is known has not communicated with any of the applicants to indicate its preference. Valentine will continue to coordinate with the Governor's Office on this. She noted that Vice Chair Weick can continue as a Board member until his replacement is appointed and confirmed.

Report on ASBOG COE/Annual Meeting Attendance

Vice Chair Weick provided a written report for the record and comments on the highlights of the ASBOG meeting which he attended this fall (i.e., Council of Examiners and annual meeting.) He highlighted how ASBOG is considering whether to develop specialty modules as part of the exams (e.g., petroleum, mining, environmental, hydrology, engineering geology). In addition, ASBOG is considering the development of a CEG examination for use in AZ, CA, OR, and WA. He also pointed out that in discussion of continuing education at ASBOG, Oregon is one of only a few states that does not require continuing education of its registrants. He highlighted key issues and accomplishments shared via the ASBOG meeting by neighboring states of CA, WA, and Utah. The Board discussed and thanked Weick for his report. In closing, Jarvis offered that it sounds like ASBOG is moving in directions that might mesh with Oregon discussions about looking at changes in the registrant base, standards for exam approval, registration, etc.

Update on OR/WA CEG Exam Review Meeting

Valentine reported that efforts are still ongoing to find a meeting date. Staff for the Washington State Geology Licensing Board took the lead in scheduling logistics. There is tentative agreement to hold the meeting in southwest Washington, likely in late January or early February.

Action List Review

The Board elected to skip review of the action list due to time constraints.

Newsletter

Valentine stated that she has a few articles for the next newsletter but asked for a volunteer to prepare a submission for the next in the Meet the Board series. Stroud volunteered to provide a contribution for the series.

New Business

Officer Elections (OAR 809-001-0010)

McConnell moved that Yinger serve as chair for another year. Stroud seconded the motion.

Yinger asked for discussion and indicated that he was willing to serve as Chair again. Hearing no objections to the nomination, Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.

Jarvis nominated Stroud for Vice Chair. Weick seconded the motion. Yinger asked for discussion. Stroud agreed to accept the nomination. Hearing no objections to the nomination, Chair Yinger called for a vote, and all approved.

2013 Meeting Dates

The Board selected the following 2013 meeting dates:

- Fridays March 22, May 31, September 20, December 13.

The May 31 meeting was selected as the date for the next university outreach event.

Public Comments/Announcements

No one was present to provide comments. No additional announcements beyond 2013 meeting dates were made.

The meeting was closed with recognition of Weick for his two-terms of service on the Board. He was presented with a plaque and small gift in appreciation of the time and energy he has dedicated as a volunteer board member.

Chair Yinger adjourned the Board at 4:40 PM.

+++++

The minutes of the December 7, 2012 quarterly work session and meeting minutes were approved with revisions incorporated herein at the March 22, 2013 Board meeting.

Christine Valentine,
Administrator