

Washington State Geologist Licensing Board Meeting Transcript

March 9, 2023

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:0.240

Struthers, James (Chair)

[inaudible]

0:0:1.80 --> 0:0:1.910

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I believe so.

0:0:2.690 --> 0:0:3.80

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK.

0:0:3.930 --> 0:0:9.60

Struthers, James (Chair)

So it's now 10:01, and I'm gonna call...

0:0:9.960 --> 0:0:23.890

Struthers, James (Chair)

Call to order this meeting, regular meeting of the Board. And just bring up again, as usual, the Board will provide an opportunity for public comment kind of towards the end of the meeting

0:0:23.960 --> 0:0:35.960

Struthers, James (Chair)

And as a matter of kind of meeting etiquette, if you're not speaking, I ask you to keep your keep your mic muted to kind of cut down on background information, background noise.

0:0:37.510 --> 0:0:46.80

Struthers, James (Chair)

Also for the Board Members, when you go to speak, if you could please state your name so that the staff can capture the comments accurately.

0:0:46.990 --> 0:0:52.180

Struthers, James (Chair)

And with that, Susan, could you call the roll of the Board Members?

0:0:53.80 --> 0:0:54.680

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Yes, Chair Struthers.

0:0:55.650 --> 0:0:56.220

Struthers, James (Chair)

Present.

0:0:56.990 --> 0:0:58.70

Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Vice Chair Hanell.

0:0:59.780 --> 0:1:0.330

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)
Present.

0:1:1.60 --> 0:1:2.0

Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Secretary Brock.

0:1:2.890 --> 0:1:3.410

Brock, Carla (Secretary)
Present.

0:1:4.190 --> 0:1:5.30

Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Board Member Tebb.

0:1:7.60 --> 0:1:7.480

Tebb, Thomas (Member)
Here.

0:1:8.360 --> 0:1:9.420

Nieves, Susan (DOL)
And Board Member Webb.

0:1:15.500 --> 0:1:17.150

Nieves, Susan (DOL)
I have seen Miss Webb.

0:1:19.710 --> 0:1:21.530

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
She's here. At least she was.

0:1:26.450 --> 0:1:27.920

Struthers, James (Chair)
She has no communication.

0:1:29.10 --> 0:1:30.160

Nieves, Susan (DOL)
Ohh. Unfortunate.

0:1:30.940 --> 0:1:31.570

Schaefer, Sandra (DOL)
She's waving.

0:1:32.370 --> 0:1:32.760

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Yep.

0:1:36.520 --> 0:1:40.180

Struthers, James (Chair)

We'll take a visual confirmation of her of her presence.

0:1:41.660 --> 0:1:42.650

Struthers, James (Chair)

By hand wave.

0:1:47.830 --> 0:1:50.20

Struthers, James (Chair)

And so, the role being called.

0:1:50.840 --> 0:1:57.860

Struthers, James (Chair)

I'd like to ask for a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting. If you guys have had time to review that.

0:2:2.720 --> 0:2:7.490

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

This is Casey. I move, Casey Hanell, I move to approve the agenda.

0:2:9.940 --> 0:2:12.680

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, this is Tom Tebb. I second the motion.

0:2:14.490 --> 0:2:20.780

Struthers, James (Chair)

On the matter of approving the agenda for today's meeting, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

0:2:21.380 --> 0:2:21.930

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Aye.

0:2:22.220 --> 0:2:22.590

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Aye.

0:2:22.760 --> 0:2:22.970

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Aye.

0:2:23.110 --> 0:2:23.420

Struthers, James (Chair)

Aye.

0:2:23.340 --> 0:2:23.620

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Aye.

0:2:24.270 --> 0:2:25.380

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Can you hear me now?

0:2:25.970 --> 0:2:27.100

Struthers, James (Chair)

We can, yeah.

0:2:27.580 --> 0:2:28.410

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Yay! I fixed it.

0:2:30.910 --> 0:2:31.350

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Thanks.

0:2:28.460 --> 0:2:38.810

Struthers, James (Chair)

Loud and clear. So, on the matter of approving today's agenda, the Ayes have it and the agenda should be considered approved.

0:2:40.190 --> 0:2:46.680

Struthers, James (Chair)

Next on the agenda is approval of the minutes. Has everybody had an opportunity to review the minutes?

0:2:49.290 --> 0:2:56.800

Struthers, James (Chair)

And if so, I would ask for a motion to approve the minutes from last meeting, which was December 1st.

0:2:58.330 --> 0:3:3.200

Webb, Eileen (Member)

I so move that we approve the minutes from the December 1st, 2022 Board meeting.

0:3:4.990 --> 0:3:6.540

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

This is Carla. I second the motion.

0:3:8.620 --> 0:3:11.590

Struthers, James (Chair)

On the matter of approving the minutes from the last meeting.

0:3:13.380 --> 0:3:21.20

Struthers, James (Chair)

Like to call a roll, call a vote on that. All those in favor of approving the minutes signify by saying aye.

0:3:22.70 --> 0:3:22.640

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Aye.

0:3:22.560 --> 0:3:22.940

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Aye.

0:3:23.700 --> 0:3:24.140

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Aye.

0:3:23.890 --> 0:3:24.260

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Aye.

0:3:26.790 --> 0:3:32.990

Struthers, James (Chair)

It appears the ayes have it. Not hearing any dissent, the minutes from last meeting are approved.

0:3:34.360 --> 0:3:35.290

Struthers, James (Chair)

And.

0:3:36.600 --> 0:3:43.30

Struthers, James (Chair)

I don't... It states on here that there's a no old business to bring up, is that correct?

0:3:43.900 --> 0:3:44.460

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Correct.

0:3:44.980 --> 0:3:55.950

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. So, I'm gonna move on to the first order of business, which is actually the election of Board Members for this coming year.

0:3:57.70 --> 0:4:8.280

Struthers, James (Chair)

And so every year we hold election for the next 12 months. And so we'll need nominations for the Chair, the Vice Chair and the Secretary positions.

0:4:9.740 --> 0:4:13.10

Struthers, James (Chair)

So being that that first position is the Chair.

0:4:13.890 --> 0:4:18.280

Struthers, James (Chair)

I would open the floor for any nominations that anyone may have on that.

0:4:23.790 --> 0:4:31.660

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Chair Struthers. I make a motion to nominate a Board Member, Hansel for Chair.

0:4:38.80 --> 0:4:41.340

Struthers, James (Chair)

Do we have any other Nominations?

0:4:46.320 --> 0:5:0.700

Struthers, James (Chair)

Not hearing any, I would call for a vote by the Board to recognize a Chair Member Hanell as the, or Board Member Hanell as the new Chair. Getting a little ahead of myself.

0:5:2.940 --> 0:5:6.240

Struthers, James (Chair)

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

0:5:7.520 --> 0:5:7.980

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Aye.

0:5:7.580 --> 0:5:8.90

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Aye.

0:5:8.330 --> 0:5:8.620

Struthers, James (Chair)

Aye.

0:5:8.760 --> 0:5:9.210

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Aye.

0:5:11.750 --> 0:5:14.730

Struthers, James (Chair)

Any dissent in the crowd?

0:5:17.480 --> 0:5:30.20

Struthers, James (Chair)

Hearing none, the motion carries and Casey Hanell is now the new Chair of the Board. And with that I will turn over control of the meeting to you, Casey.

0:5:32.440 --> 0:5:33.370

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Woah, really?

0:5:34.60 --> 0:5:35.710

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah. So.

0:5:38.250 --> 0:5:39.900

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Ohh fun alright.

0:5:41.230 --> 0:5:45.520

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

I thought this took effect next meeting but...

0:5:45.10 --> 0:5:46.360

Struthers, James (Chair)

No, just like that man.

0:5:46.830 --> 0:5:48.170

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Keep me on my toes.

0:5:47.360 --> 0:5:48.800

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Are you sure?

0:5:49.430 --> 0:5:50.360

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Yeah, really.

0:5:49.510 --> 0:5:53.190

Webb, Eileen (Member)

I thought, yeah, It shouldn't take effect until the next meeting.

0:5:57.290 --> 0:5:57.660

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Right.

0:5:55.150 --> 0:5:59.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

No. Once the vote has been taken, the Chair takes over.

0:6:0.90 --> 0:6:0.850

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Take it away.

0:6:1.950 --> 0:6:4.620

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Yay, alright.

0:6:3.800 --> 0:6:5.400

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Congrats, Casey.

0:6:5.820 --> 0:6:6.740

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Thank you.

0:6:4.870 --> 0:6:13.400

Struthers, James (Chair)

Just by way of prompting the next order of business will be nominations for the Vice Chair and the Secretary.

0:6:14.320 --> 0:6:37.680

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Can you hold on a minute? This is Elizabeth Lagerberg. I apologize for... I was trying to get the mic off mute. I do believe that this is supposed to take effect at the next meeting. I think it's putting somebody on the spot who wasn't ready and prepared. So, I would go ahead and finish this meeting and then be prepared for the for the next meeting. That would be my suggestion.

0:6:41.920 --> 0:6:42.710

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah, yeah.

0:6:40.370 --> 0:6:43.450

Struthers, James (Chair)

That's probably fair. So OK.

0:6:42.220 --> 0:6:43.880

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Nice try, James.

0:6:44.140 --> 0:6:44.680

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah.

0:6:46.830 --> 0:6:47.80

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Yeah.

0:6:44.290 --> 0:6:47.160

Struthers, James (Chair)

Well, well, you know, it's it worth a shot.

0:6:56.450 --> 0:6:56.780

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Yeah.

0:6:48.890 --> 0:6:58.220

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, I thought that was a little bit surprising in the in the order of the agenda, but figured I'd see how it flew. So it's still the.

0:6:58.550 --> 0:7:1.930

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

That's why I like having the AAG here. Thank you, Elizabeth.

0:7:2.110 --> 0:7:3.850

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, Dang.

0:7:4.560 --> 0:7:6.290

Struthers, James (Chair)

Didn't know you were going to lawyer up, Casey.

0:7:7.730 --> 0:7:8.340

Struthers, James (Chair)

So.

0:7:8.150 --> 0:7:8.450

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

That's.

0:7:9.500 --> 0:7:14.80

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, so the next, the next position that we need to consider is the Vice Chair position.

0:7:14.160 --> 0:7:22.620

Struthers, James (Chair)

So, I'd at this time entertain any nominations that the Board Members have for that.

0:7:25.630 --> 0:7:32.880

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

This is a Board Member Tebb. I would like to make a nomination for Board Member Brock as Vice Chair.

0:7:36.980 --> 0:7:45.370

Struthers, James (Chair)

Very well, Board Member Brock has been nominated and I'd like to call a vote on that issue.

0:7:46.590 --> 0:7:54.560

Struthers, James (Chair)

All those in favor of Board Member Brock as the vice Chair position, signify by saying aye.

0:7:55.540 --> 0:7:56.70

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Aye.

0:7:56.370 --> 0:7:56.740

Struthers, James (Chair)

Aye.

0:7:57.90 --> 0:7:57.480

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Aye.

0:7:57.310 --> 0:7:57.710

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Aye.

0:7:59.470 --> 0:8:1.270

Struthers, James (Chair)

It appears that the ayes have it.

0:8:3.260 --> 0:8:5.390

Struthers, James (Chair)

Congratulations Board Member Brock.

0:8:8.820 --> 0:8:18.690

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, the final position that we need to consider is for Secretary and I'd like to open up to the Board Members nomination for that.

0:8:21.140 --> 0:8:26.610

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Who's left that's gonna be around in six months? I mean, really, it's like...

0:8:27.580 --> 0:8:30.630

Struthers, James (Chair)

Well, we could always start recycling positions.

0:8:31.610 --> 0:8:32.60

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Alright.

0:8:31.720 --> 0:8:36.150

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Who? It's just it's just you, Eileen, right. That's ending your term after this meeting.

0:8:37.700 --> 0:8:38.150

Webb, Eileen (Member)

No.

0:8:37.560 --> 0:8:38.520

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, I think you're just.

0:8:39.400 --> 0:8:40.190

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I think that's right.

0:8:40.230 --> 0:8:42.600

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Tom and I came on at the same time, so.

0:8:44.530 --> 0:8:46.780

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Both of us are not going to be around for the June meeting.

0:8:50.990 --> 0:8:51.590

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Is that right?

0:8:50.140 --> 0:8:51.820

Struthers, James (Chair)

Well, I think that probably leaves me then.

0:8:57.30 --> 0:8:57.470

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Mm-hmm.

0:8:52.500 --> 0:8:58.590

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

I thought I had a little bit more time, but maybe staff can check my tenure.

0:9:0.820 --> 0:9:7.870

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

You can also continue to serve until there's a position, until you have somebody to replace you. So...

0:9:7.550 --> 0:9:8.890

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Ohh.

0:9:11.420 --> 0:9:11.870

Webb, Eileen (Member)

But I.

0:9:11.280 --> 0:9:14.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Tom, you have until through May 1st, 24.

0:9:16.690 --> 0:9:17.220

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Ohh.

0:9:15.880 --> 0:9:17.710

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

That's what I thought. Yeah, I thought I had another.

0:9:18.940 --> 0:9:19.470

Webb, Eileen (Member)
OK.

0:9:19.80 --> 0:9:19.480

Tebb, Thomas (Member)
Thank you.

0:9:20.720 --> 0:9:21.580

Brock, Carla (Secretary)
Well, given that.

0:9:20.390 --> 0:9:26.350

Struthers, James (Chair)
Well, that being said, I'd like to nominate Tom for the for the Secretary position.

0:9:32.80 --> 0:9:34.670

Struthers, James (Chair)
Do we have any other competing nominations for that?

0:9:36.950 --> 0:9:47.780

Struthers, James (Chair)
If no, I'd like to call the vote on that. All in favor of Tom fulfilling the duties of the Secretary, signify by saying aye.

0:9:48.990 --> 0:9:49.340

Brock, Carla (Secretary)
Aye.

0:9:48.730 --> 0:9:49.460

Webb, Eileen (Member)
Aye.

0:9:49.590 --> 0:9:49.920

Struthers, James (Chair)
Aye.

0:9:49.830 --> 0:9:50.400

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)
Aye.

0:9:52.60 --> 0:9:55.800

Struthers, James (Chair)
So with that, Tom is our new Secretary for the year.

0:9:59.360 --> 0:10:3.110

Struthers, James (Chair)
So, with that matter kind of behind us...

0:10:5.240 --> 0:10:17.920

Struthers, James (Chair)

Sydney you have the next agenda item I believe, which is development of best practices document for licensed geologist/hydrogeologist to opening that discussion.

0:10:19.80 --> 0:10:43.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I do. And that's just, exactly, to open the discussion. This is an item that came out of the last Board meeting during the public comments. The Board requested that we place an item on the next agenda to discuss the potential of creating a best practices document for professional titles and licensure under the RCW and WACs, including potentially establishing a committee to address this. So.

0:10:45.620 --> 0:10:49.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Wanting to open it up to the Board for discussion on what you would like to do.

0:10:52.470 --> 0:11:0.720

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

So let me ask an initial question from the legal perspective. Typically, we have, you know, we have the statutes that prescribe performance.

0:11:2.210 --> 0:11:39.200

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And we have WACs that go into more detail. And so I just wanna be careful that we're not creating, you know, further law, so to speak, that you're going to enforce outside of the WACs. So, and I think, maybe you meant to talk about standards of practice, which is a little different than best practices. But even that would, you know, would just... It's worth a discussion, but it's, we have to make sure that it, whatever you come up with, may belong in a WAC, I guess is what I'm saying.

0:11:44.750 --> 0:11:45.230

Struthers, James (Chair)

I don't.

0:11:44.630 --> 0:11:46.660

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

This is a Board Member Tebb.

0:11:47.720 --> 0:11:48.510

Struthers, James (Chair)

Go ahead, Tom.

0:11:48.980 --> 0:12:3.130

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, we have a little construction going on at my house, so I apologize, but I do believe that the engineering case [*inaudible*]. Elizabeth, if you could give us a little bit the, if you give us a little background on that. That'd be great.

0:12:5.250 --> 0:13:10.140

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Sure. So, the engineering case was about use of title, use of the title engineer, or in this case use of the title geologist. And that remains an issue. Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending how you look at it, the Board won, but they won on standing, which means that the person didn't have standing to challenge the issue at court. So, the issue did not get resolved. And I think that what's gonna, what will be happening in the future is, you know, working, the Engineers Board working with stakeholders like, you know, the private sector as well as the public sector on how they use the term "civil engineer," for example, or "mechanical engineer" or "environmental engineer." So those types of things. It's really all about title though. Not... It did not get into the practice of engineering, what constitutes the practice of engineering. Which is, you know, a complex question that has to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

0:13:12.260 --> 0:13:12.610

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Thank you.

0:13:15.680 --> 0:13:37.550

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, I think that this topic when we brought it up was related to the, basically, a statement regarding the use of working titles relative to their respective licensures. Is that correct? Or, is that the rest of the Board's understanding?

0:13:42.110 --> 0:13:47.760

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

That's what... That's what I thought that we had talked about. It was the.

0:13:49.60 --> 0:14:17.10

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

It was the confusion in titles, particularly between, you know, government jobs and the private industry. And so we had talked about kind of defining kind of work, job requirements, and which types of work would require using "geologist" or specialty titles and the licensure behind those.

0:14:21.10 --> 0:14:33.60

Struthers, James (Chair)

So the question I would have for Elizabeth is, "Does the Board have... issuing a statement about that infringe on current law as you understand it?"

0:14:36.80 --> 0:15:20.580

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

No, I wouldn't say so. Because you do have a definition of, you know, what constitutes the practice of geology and then you know the licensure requirements. Again, the tricky thing is working with public agencies. As you know that's, that's where frequently, I think it's fairly easy if you get a complaint about someone in the private sector practicing geology without a license, that's fairly simple to, you know, figure out whether they're practicing geology and whether they should be licensed. And if they're not you issue a cease and desist for unlicensed practice. It gets trickier when you get into the public agencies. Right?

0:15:22.70 --> 0:15:30.560

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Because they have job titles and they have job descriptions and they require licensure and they don't require licensure. And it's tricky with the Boards to interact with the public agencies on those issues.

0:15:39.850 --> 0:15:54.680

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

I guess I'm trying to be really sensitive about how I say that. So I'm gonna leave that up to Sydney to address and whether or not it's a... Is it a problem? Is it a problem that you see within state government?

0:16:2.570 --> 0:16:8.90

Struthers, James (Chair)

Vice Chair Hanell, do you have any comment on that, from your perspective, inside the agency?

0:16:10.430 --> 0:16:56.40

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Sure. So from my perspective I do not see a problem as long as working titles don't reflect geologists or hydrogeologists or engineering geologists. As long as the word geologist as, kind of, described in RCW and WAC is not used in the working title for the position, then I don't I don't personally see a problem. I know it... Part of this conversation was revolving around there is a job class more heavily used in ecology that's the Hydrogeologist job series.

0:16:57.330 --> 0:17:36.690

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

And there are several levels, one through 5 I believe. And, as I understand it, and Board Member Tebb and Board Member Webb can probably speak to this as well. There's likely unlicensed people in the beginning of the series. And then the idea is, at some point, the work that they are doing requires a license, and what would drive the license requirement is the work being done. And then only a person with a license could refer to themselves, like in a working title, as a hydrogeologist.

0:17:37.660 --> 0:17:39.520

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

But I...

0:17:40.710 --> 0:17:57.560

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

That's... Within the Department of Natural Resources, we just have a natural resource scientist series. So we don't have that challenge of having a OFM, or job classification, that actually says geologist in the title.

0:17:58.540 --> 0:18:37.400

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

But that's... We use our working titles, even in the natural resource Scientist, series, you could be a natural resource scientist two, for instance, and depending on the work that you're doing, it might require a license or it might not. And then that would be reflected in your working title, either a, you know, tsunami geologist or tsunami scientist, for instance. Because it's that geologist term that's

indicating all by, you have a license and you have that qualification. So that's from my public agency experience perspective.

0:18:39.60 --> 0:18:59.0

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

So does the state have flexibility under, like your example, the hydrogeologist job classification or job class? Does the state have flexibility to assign individual titles under that job class or are people hired under that job class automatically given the hydrogeologist title?

0:19:1.280 --> 0:19:2.690

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Maybe nobody knows, but...

0:19:2.790 --> 0:19:30.800

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Well, it's been my experience... I think Casey did a great job sort of describing what happens in the Department of Ecology. You know, typically at the hydrogeologists 3 level, that's when we start requiring a license, or at least some of us do. And I think that's the problem. I think we're having some programs in the Department of Ecology are hiring hydrogeologist 3 and 4s without a license. And then we have hydrogeologist 3 [*inaudible*]...

0:19:38.970 --> 0:20:8.420

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

So now the way I would think about that would be less along the lines of like the Board having a say on you know, "if you're a hydrogeologist 3, that requires a license and if you're hydrogeologist 2, it doesn't." It seems to me that where we weigh in is based on the work.

0:20:10.20 --> 0:20:59.200

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

And if the work that the hydrogeologist 3s are doing in ecology falls under our work that requires a license, then I would say that's where we weigh in. Using the Natural Resource Scientists series example from DNR, there could, there are some Natural Resource, again, Scientist 2s or Scientist 3s that, based on their work, do require a license and some that don't. And that's a function of just the framework that we're within to classify jobs and not. But that part seems outside of what I would see as the Board scope to say, "this job class requires a license."

0:21:0.50 --> 0:21:6.840

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

I think it's, "What is the work that's being done? And does the work require a license?" That...

0:21:8.130 --> 0:21:12.800

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Does that distinction..? Is that clear what I'm attempting to articulate?

0:21:13.660 --> 0:21:40.0

Struthers, James (Chair)

I think so, Casey. I mean, I think what you're trying to say is that the Board would really rather not get knee deep in the Department of Personnel's job classification structure. I mean I know that at my former

employer Wash-DOT, you know the Engineering Geologists are actually housed under the Transportation Engineering series for some structural internal reasons that have to do with pay equity more than anything else.

0:21:41.140 --> 0:21:51.840

Struthers, James (Chair)

But at a certain, at the lower levels, they don't have the working title Engineering Geologist. They're Geologist Staff.

0:21:53.380 --> 0:22:2.140

Struthers, James (Chair)

And in order to advance to, like, the Transportation Engineering 4 portion of that, you need to you need to get your Engineering Geology license.

0:22:5.650 --> 0:22:31.580

Struthers, James (Chair)

So the question I've got for the Board is if this is a intricate enough issue, and with the boundaries between the Department of Personnel and certain interactions with private sector as well, if this is worth setting up or establishing a committee for? To kind of flesh out the contours of this, and probably come up with a draft statement.

0:22:35.760 --> 0:22:36.560

Webb, Eileen (Member)

I have a question.

0:22:37.600 --> 0:22:38.90

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Go ahead.

0:22:35.660 --> 0:22:42.60

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, this is Board Member Tebb... Oh, I'm sorry. I was just gonna support that if you [*inaudible*].

0:22:44.900 --> 0:22:49.150

Webb, Eileen (Member)

I would just like to ask. Have we received any inquiries from the public about this?

0:22:50.120 --> 0:22:56.340

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Is there anyone specifically interested that we should know about? Or...

0:23:1.630 --> 0:23:2.400

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Right.

0:23:4.820 --> 0:23:6.290

Webb, Eileen (Member)

It was pretty much Ecology.

0:22:57.370 --> 0:23:7.740

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I mean, we had all of those Ecology Hydros join our last meeting. And this was pretty much all of that conversation was about was about that. Right.

0:23:7.260 --> 0:23:9.990

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Half the agency was there? Yeah.

0:23:10.350 --> 0:23:10.750

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Yeah.

0:23:13.150 --> 0:23:14.190

Webb, Eileen (Member)

But not from...

0:23:11.380 --> 0:23:18.310

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

So I'd say, you know. Like certainly constitute members of the public, even though most of them are also licensees.

0:23:22.550 --> 0:23:27.460

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. And outside of attendance at that last meeting, staff has not received any communications from the public on this.

0:23:28.480 --> 0:23:29.510

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Thank you. That's what I was...

0:23:30.150 --> 0:23:30.610

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Thank you.

0:23:32.930 --> 0:23:41.940

Struthers, James (Chair)

This is Chair Struthers. We're... Do we need to have a motion to establish a committee or is that... Can that just be done out of hand?

0:23:43.720 --> 0:23:48.360

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I think the Board can just agree to establish a committee and appoint who they wanna be on that.

0:23:48.890 --> 0:23:55.510

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, so if we're all in agreement that this is something that we probably ought to flesh out a little bit more, and it sounds like we are, let's establish a committee.

0:23:55.630 --> 0:24:18.960

Struthers, James (Chair)

Is there..? Is there anybody that would wanna spearhead that? I mean, it sounds like it's a lot. A fairly significant issue on the Department of Ecology side. And so, I would, I would guess, posit it that, perhaps somebody, one of our Board Members that works there would probably have good insight on this.

0:24:22.190 --> 0:24:28.920

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, this is Board Member Tebb. I'd be happy to help lead this committee if that's what the Board decides.

0:24:32.530 --> 0:24:38.290

Struthers, James (Chair)

Is there any objection to Board Member Tebb leading this committee?

0:24:41.90 --> 0:24:42.90

Struthers, James (Chair)

I'm just fine with that.

0:24:39.490 --> 0:24:43.160

Webb, Eileen (Member)

No. Go Tebb! Mr. Tebb, go!

0:24:44.940 --> 0:24:48.880

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah. And I'd be more than happy to assist with that, Tom.

0:24:49.930 --> 0:24:50.290

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Thank you.

0:24:52.790 --> 0:24:56.100

Struthers, James (Chair)

As soon as Casey takes over the duties of the Chair, anyway.

0:24:57.840 --> 0:24:59.450

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

That's right. After this meeting.

0:25:1.80 --> 0:25:8.140

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, so with that, is there any other discussion on this before we, kind of, move on to the next thing?

0:25:11.420 --> 0:25:12.840

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, hearing nothing.

0:25:12.920 --> 0:25:17.790

Struthers, James (Chair)

Sydney, could you provide us an update on the spring exam?

0:25:18.980 --> 0:26:2.120

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely. So the ASBOG exams are scheduled for March 16th and 17th. The window was expanded to allow for greater access in some of the geographic regions for ASBOG. The analytics related to the exam will be available from the psychometrician within a few days of the exam and the subject matter experts will then take over at the COE to complete the scoring of the exams. The anticipated scores will be released around late April or early May and the Boards will be able to release the pass/fail to candidates from those from the Prometrics portal.

0:26:3.140 --> 0:26:12.310

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

ASBOG will be sending the full score information and reports to the Board as everything has progressed before.

0:26:12.800 --> 0:26:46.930

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, there was this slight issue with Prometrics. We have had communication, last I knew, from one candidate who was having a hard time getting scheduled and with the expanded dates they were able to get that set up. For your specialty exams, DOL will be hosting the specialty exams at a DOL facility here in Olympia on Friday, March 17th. We have 14 candidates registered for the EG and 12 candidates registered for the HG. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

0:26:49.470 --> 0:26:56.730

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

This is Carla. I have one question. How many testing centers do we have in Washington for the ASBOG exam? Do you know?

0:26:57.700 --> 0:26:59.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That is a good question. I am not certain.

0:27:5.80 --> 0:27:7.250

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I'd be happy to look into that and let the Board know.

0:27:9.230 --> 0:27:11.810

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I'm just curious. But I'd like to know, yeah.

0:27:13.510 --> 0:27:42.860

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, I had one question. Now that ASBOG is being administered electronically, and the specialty exams are now somewhat divorced from that process, you know, they're not, they're not held jointly anymore.

Is there any bar from expediting the release of testing information for the specialty exams ahead of ASBOG? And is that a possibility? I know that we've held back before.

0:27:44.830 --> 0:27:54.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I am going to see if any of the other DOL team members on the, in the meeting have information on that. Unfortunately, I just don't know.

0:27:57.780 --> 0:27:58.880

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

I'll go ahead and speak up.

0:28:0.180 --> 0:28:52.870

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Typically what we've done is we have waited for the release of ASBOG's results. And we've also made sure that we're coordinating with Oregon because of our joint collaboration on the HG exam. Actually, sorry, EG exam. So, I would say if Oregon is willing to release earlier, we would probably be willing to think about that, because it does take us less time to score those. We do, we typically it will be scored and then it'll also be reviewed to make sure that we're accurately getting those results. So, we can reach out to Oregon and find out what their take is. If they would like to release early, then we can definitely do that. Otherwise, we will wait for ASBOG and release all at the same time.

0:28:58.270 --> 0:28:59.620

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, that sounds good.

0:29:1.60 --> 0:29:5.500

Struthers, James (Chair)

Does anybody have any..? Is that pretty much the full update on that, Sydney?

0:29:6.730 --> 0:29:7.920

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, that was everything I had.

0:29:8.570 --> 0:29:14.460

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. So, then I believe you had a campus travel update.

0:29:15.700 --> 0:29:16.110

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes.

0:29:15.610 --> 0:29:20.220

Struthers, James (Chair)

Kind of a policy and update on travel and outreach.

0:29:21.580 --> 0:29:32.550

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, this has been action item pending with the Board for quite a while now. And especially with the

pandemic restrictions being lifted by the governor and last fall, it's been, "Are there any policy restrictions around that?"

0:29:33.130 --> 0:29:48.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I was able to get an answer on that related to specifically the pandemic portion. No, there are no related travel restrictions in place that would prohibit resuming campus or outreach visits.

0:29:55.0 --> 0:30:4.920

Struthers, James (Chair)

So you, in addition to that, had some budgetary comment on the Board's actual ability to travel at this point.

0:30:5.700 --> 0:30:6.400

Struthers, James (Chair)

Is that correct?

0:30:7.0 --> 0:30:13.290

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. And we'll be going over that here in a little bit as well.

0:30:14.110 --> 0:30:32.40

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But yes, we've learned that the travel budget for the Board has been exhausted for this year. It was under-allocated for this biennium. Unfortunately, we're not certain why that happened, but the allocation that we received for this biennium simply was not enough.

0:30:39.420 --> 0:30:42.670

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. So, we'll talk about that a little bit later down the line.

0:30:42.830 --> 0:30:46.640

Struthers, James (Chair)

So the next item is.

0:30:47.500 --> 0:30:49.450

Struthers, James (Chair)

Policy on failed examinations.

0:30:50.590 --> 0:31:0.120

Struthers, James (Chair)

That kind of... What is the..? What information do you have on, kind of, repeat test takers that failed the exam multiple times?

0:31:1.40 --> 0:31:11.530

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This was another item that came out of the last Board meeting and was requested by the Board for the number of times that somebody can, that a candidate can retake a failed examination.

0:31:13.720 --> 0:31:17.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The short answer is, they can retake as many times as needed.

0:31:19.510 --> 0:31:42.150

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The process for that is that when a candidate fails their exam, they don't necessarily need to reapply for the exam. They contact the Department of Licensing and let our staff know that they would like to retake the exam. Staff then generate the reexamination in Polaris. They go in and pay the associated fees, and then they receive the instructions on the retake from there.

0:31:43.250 --> 0:31:56.650

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There is no limit on the number of times that they can retake it, like I said. However, their initial fee is good for five years.

0:31:59.70 --> 0:32:10.150

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And, if and when the RCWS or WACs change, then their qualifications for examination are reexamined at that point.

0:32:11.860 --> 0:32:29.710

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so, I did include additional information that was provided by our licensing team in the Board packet for this meeting. So, I won't go over all of that in this meeting, but it provided really great examples of what is provided to those candidates at that time. So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

0:32:33.930 --> 0:32:38.40

Struthers, James (Chair)

Do any of the Board Members have any questions on that issue? Or comment?

0:32:43.960 --> 0:33:1.730

Struthers, James (Chair)

But it seems kind of surprising to me. It seems like if you get, you know, if you've failed it multiple times, there ought to be some mechanism where you might have to provide some kind of justification to the Board about why you should be taking it again.

0:33:3.940 --> 0:33:9.790

Struthers, James (Chair)

But apparently that would take a... Would that take a change in the in the WAC or..?

0:33:11.160 --> 0:33:12.190

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I believe so.

0:33:10.780 --> 0:33:12.200

Struthers, James (Chair)

Where would something like that be..?

0:33:14.970 --> 0:33:45.460

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, I believe that would be a rule or an RCW update. Some of our programs do have those rules in place. For example, the architects have, at this particular moment, it's in the process of changing, but they have a 5-year rolling clock to retake portions of their exam to make sure that they are testing on the most up to date information for licensing. That requirement does not exist currently for the geology program.

0:33:50.140 --> 0:34:3.470

Struthers, James (Chair)

This is Chair Struthers. I guess I would put it to the Board as, "Is that something that the Board thinks we should be pursuing?" Or is it not an issue in the Board's mind?

0:34:6.440 --> 0:34:7.40

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

This is.

0:34:8.360 --> 0:34:9.780

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Current Vice Chair Hanell.

0:34:11.840 --> 0:34:13.110

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

I can see...

0:34:14.30 --> 0:34:56.100

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

I could see maybe more concern if there was a more frequent opportunity to take the exam. You know, if examinees were taking the test every month, or, you know, something along the lines. But as it stands now, with an opportunity only twice per year, I'm curious how big of a problem it is. And also curious about limiting applicants opportunities to study more, to get more experience, and to continue trying to pass.

0:34:57.280 --> 0:34:58.30

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

So...

0:34:59.750 --> 0:35:18.720

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

With the pace of the test as they are now, again only twice a year, it seems like a small, maybe a small concern to me. But something I personally wouldn't move to try and address at this time as a Board.

0:35:23.990 --> 0:35:27.770

Struthers, James (Chair)

Do any of the other Board Members have comment on the test? Tom?

0:35:28.690 --> 0:35:35.410

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, I tend to agree with Board Member Hanell on this issue. Thank you.

0:35:40.300 --> 0:35:41.650

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

This is Carla. I do too.

0:35:48.250 --> 0:35:49.60

Struthers, James (Chair)

Board Member Webb?

0:35:51.100 --> 0:35:51.480

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Have...

0:35:50.740 --> 0:35:51.850

Struthers, James (Chair)

Any opinions?

0:35:53.400 --> 0:35:56.860

Webb, Eileen (Member)

I always have opinions. But on this one I agree.

0:35:59.820 --> 0:36:15.360

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, well that's seems pretty clear where the Board's out on that to me. So, if there's no further discussion on that, I'd like to move on to have Sydney talk about the ASBOG Task Analysis survey.

0:36:16.800 --> 0:36:25.480

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, I did reach out to ASBOG to get a status update on the 2022 Task Analysis Survey. Those results are not quite ready yet.

0:36:25.960 --> 0:36:37.0

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I the direct quote from them is, "Our psychometrician is working, or has just finished the preliminary report and the executive committee will be reviewing that over the next few weeks."

0:36:37.680 --> 0:36:49.920

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The survey report should be ready for distribution to the Board shortly after that. And as a reminder, the task will be implemented on the exam forms beginning in October of '23.

0:36:51.900 --> 0:36:54.930

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So we will bring that back once those results are ready.

0:37:0.600 --> 0:37:6.160

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. I'd like to move on now to a new topic of discussion.

0:37:7.900 --> 0:37:19.290

Struthers, James (Chair)

Board Member Brock would like to discuss the issue of communication between Board Members and licensees, which is definitely worth talking about in my opinion.

0:37:21.320 --> 0:37:24.830

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Yeah. And I can provide a little more information before we start discussion.

0:37:26.150 --> 0:37:39.720

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I think there's two separate things here. One is communication between Board Members and licensees, and one is communication between Board Members and applicants or candidates for licensure.

0:37:42.300 --> 0:38:24.300

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

You know one of my, somebody reached out to me asking a question about titles. And I felt, and it was a licensee, and I felt pretty comfortable talking directly to them about, kind of, the Board's consensus about professional titles as they relate to licensure or not. The communication that I had that I was concerned about was a candidate reached out directly to Tom and I because they had been... Their... Something in their application packet had been denied as sufficient by Board staff and so they reached out asking for assistance.

0:38:25.740 --> 0:38:56.670

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

And in this case, Board staff, I think we all know Board staff reaches out to us when they aren't sure about, you know, whether a somebody's education meets our requirements or whether somebody's experience meets our requirements or whether somebody's experience verifiers meets our requirements. And so, we provide input on those things. And I had already provided input for this particular candidate, not knowing who they were. But they described their situation, and it was familiar to me, so...

0:38:57.450 --> 0:39:1.80

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

But I had concerns about communicating directly with the candidate.

0:39:1.520 --> 0:39:16.480

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I didn't think that was appropriate, especially since I had already reviewed and provided input on their application through Board staff. So I guess that's the one that I prefer to talk about. Not the first one.

0:39:21.220 --> 0:39:26.310

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

So would you like me..? Sydney, would you like me to address that, or..?

0:39:28.380 --> 0:39:43.880

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If you would like to, I was just going to say from a staff perspective, our recommendation would probably be to forward it on to us and, you know, ask us to just continue that communication. But I'll allow Elizabeth to offer her input.

0:39:45.320 --> 0:40:12.530

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah, I'll be even more forceful on that. If any applicant comes to you for any reason, you really can't talk to them because we have, the APA prescribes how you deal with applicants when their application is denied. And that is that, you know, they're given the denial. Then they have the right to appeal that decision. And in... And we have to keep, the Board has to keep a distance from that.

0:40:12.610 --> 0:40:52.90

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Because if they do appeal the decision, it can go before the Board to look at it as a case and they're provided due process. So, the risk is that they go to a Board Member and discuss it with a Board Member... First, the risk is that the Board Member may not give, you know, the right information. But that's not really important here. What is important is you just need to direct them back to what their denial letter says and tell them, you know, that they have a right to appeal and that if they have more questions, they need to ask the staff.

0:40:53.150 --> 0:41:11.930

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And you will hear the case, if... Somebody will hear the case on the Board, you know, if they ask for an appeal. So that's the way the process works. And again, it can interfere with their due process if they come directly to a Board Member. So, I feel pretty strongly about that one.

0:41:16.940 --> 0:41:18.690

Struthers, James (Chair)

So it looks like Deb has some comment.

0:41:20.230 --> 0:41:59.330

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

I do. Thank you, Elizabeth. I think that helped clarify for this particular situation. But I just want to reiterate for all our Board Members, if you have any communications that come to you, your Board contacts Sydney and Susan are resources for you to go ahead and forward those communications to. And then we will make sure that we get it to the best person within our division to answer the questions. You know we're not necessarily... We are not licensing experts. We're not experts on the compliance. But we work with those experts, and we can always get that communication to them. And we'll follow back up with you.

0:41:59.850 --> 0:42:29.630

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And I would add one more really key piece that we that we work really, really hard on both in my office when we have inquiries about, say at the geology, practice of geology, and when you know, I used to

work with Rick Storvick a lot on questions that came in. And one of the things we have to be very, very careful about, everybody, the staff and Board Members, is to say "We don't provide legal advice."

0:42:29.770 --> 0:43:0.40

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

So even though you may not be comfortable saying that, a lot of times they're asking you about interpretations of a WAC or interpretations of an RCW, and you really you really can't do that. So, I mean, you could say, "This is how I personally interpret it. But, you know, I can't tell you how a court would interpret it. I can't tell you how the Board would interpret it if it came before the Board." So, you just have to be really careful about, "I can't provide legal advice on this." So, I know that sounds harsh and it sounds cold, but it is the reality.

0:43:6.830 --> 0:44:1.470

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

This is current vice Chair, Hanell. So just following up on that, Elizabeth for clarity, if you know, an individual or company or anyone had a question about, you know, "is a specific license required for this specific type of work?" or, "does this fit within this WAC or RCW?" And, you know, we're not in a place to provide legal advice. And it sounds like, you know, licensing staff are not in that place. Where is the venue for that type of question to go? And how would someone, or some entity, be able to get some clarifying guidance on those types of legal questions?

0:44:2.490 --> 0:44:19.500

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Well, those are always very, very tricky to handle. So typically, you would forward it to staff and staff might talk to you and consult me. And we would, sort of, be very delicate about how we answered the question.

0:44:20.500 --> 0:44:26.210

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

You know, sometimes we just refer back to the WAC and say, you know, "this WAC answers that question."

0:44:27.560 --> 0:44:41.440

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And sometimes we say, if it's something that's very delicate, we'll say, you know, "you're better off asking, you know, going to a private attorney and asking that question," if you can see that there might be litigation coming for some reason.

0:44:41.900 --> 0:45:43.40

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And then if you do choose to answer the question, frequently, what I say, and the language that that I recommend is, you know, "here's how the Board interprets that language. However, a court, we can't say how a court would interpret it. A court may interpret it differently. So don't rely on the Board's interpretation." And the reason I say that is because we have had instances in the past. We have had one specifically awful incident, I think it was with the Collections Board, where there was advice given and then the court overturned that, or came up with a different interpretation. And so, it put the Collection Agency Board in a very awkward position. So really, you know, it's important to say that the

courts have final say on this and all we can do is tell you how we think it might go. So that's how... It's a delicate situation.

0:45:43.420 --> 0:45:53.190

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

I wouldn't answer it off the cuff. I would, you know, bring it to staff, discuss it with staff, and come up with a good, you know, delicate answer for it.

0:45:55.520 --> 0:45:59.360

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And I don't know. Sidney does that kind of agree with your approach?

0:46:0.260 --> 0:46:1.500

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah, absolutely.

0:46:9.540 --> 0:47:20.210

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

So this one communication I had with the licensee was somebody that managed a firm and was asking about titles and I pretty much said what you just said that in general, you know, the Board wants to see people using titles if they're licensed, if they're performing the work that's described for geologists, hydrogeologists or engineering geologists in the WAC. But what I said was that they should probably consult their corporate attorney to make sure that they're comfortable with the way that the laws are for themselves. That's basically what I said.

0:46:55.550 --> 0:47:30.310

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Yeah, that sounds. Yeah. Yeah, that sounds good. It is tricky to speak on behalf of the Board. So, I would just, like if I were gonna answer that question, if you felt like it was pretty straightforward and you were comfortable answering it, just preface it with, you know, "I can't speak for the Board because this isn't a Board meeting, and we're not all getting together and answering this question together. I'll just tell you how I see it, what I believe the... how I believe the Board would interpret it. But I can't speak in..." And then I love that you referred them to their own, you know, corporate attorney. That was, that's excellent.

0:47:32.180 --> 0:47:34.680

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah. This is Chair Struthers. So what...

0:47:35.560 --> 0:47:44.290

Struthers, James (Chair)

I guess I don't have complete clarity on the route by which those types of discussions would be escalated to a full Board discussion.

0:47:45.570 --> 0:47:59.520

Struthers, James (Chair)

Is that something that the individual Board Members put forward if staff cannot resolve it, then it's put on the agenda and moved up on to a, just full discussion on the Board? Or how would that go down?

0:47:58.250 --> 0:48:18.600

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Absolutely. Yeah. I mean, that's up to Sydney and her staff. But that is a, you know, that does happen fairly frequently that some, you know, issue comes up and it's something that the Board needs to discuss. So that can happen.

0:48:20.170 --> 0:48:36.120

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

But again, that's, I think that's you and whoever the person is in Sydney, and Sydney staff to discuss whether this is something the Board needs to talk about as a group. Sometimes you can have a task force to look into it. Just depends on what the question is.

0:48:37.900 --> 0:48:38.260

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah.

0:48:37.530 --> 0:48:49.540

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah. So typically, what would happen is we would look at it and see if there's something already established. If it's really involving, illegal analysis will bring Lizbeth into that conversation.

0:48:50.10 --> 0:49:7.400

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then if it's getting to a point where it needs to go before the Board for a policy decision, or for the Board to make a determination on, then we would look at putting it before the full Board for a vote. But if there's something already addressing it in the RCWS or the WACs, then we provide a response based on those.

0:49:15.730 --> 0:49:18.760

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. Do we have any further discussion on this issue?

0:49:22.980 --> 0:49:25.240

Struthers, James (Chair)

So, not hearing any.

0:49:26.800 --> 0:49:34.410

Struthers, James (Chair)

Like to have Sydney also update us on the COE, Spring COE discussion kind of a...

0:49:37.770 --> 0:49:59.560

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The spring COE is occurring April 13th through 15th in Greenville, SC. However, like I alluded to earlier, unfortunately the Board's travel budget, well the program's travel budget for this year has been exhausted. So unfortunately, we will not be able to send a Board Member to the Spring COE this year.

0:50:11.980 --> 0:50:19.870

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

This is Board Member Tebb. I'm curious as to what the previous travel allocations may have been in previous years and, kind of, what happened here.

0:50:21.170 --> 0:50:37.750

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

I know we haven't really been traveling much during this COVID, you know, during the COVID period. So, it seemed to me that there would be a surplus, which is why I'm kind of scratching my head here as to why we're sort of out of money for travel.

0:50:37.700 --> 0:50:42.910

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Well, so it's not that the program is out of money.

0:50:44.450 --> 0:51:30.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But there, there's a difference between the pot of money that comes in and then what's allocated out of that to pay for the program expenses. And, what was allocated for this most recent biennium that we're finishing up in June, unfortunately was not enough. And, also unfortunately, none of the staff Members that work on those allocations were here when those allocations were set two years ago. So, we don't fully understand why the allocations were set at the rate that they were. Our Budget Manager is working on sorting through that and getting to the bottom of how that decision was reached.

0:51:31.70 --> 0:51:42.540

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We don't know if it was tied to the lower travel expenses during COVID or what the case was. But we're trying to get to the bottom of that and figure out why. But unfortunately that allocation has been exhausted for the biennium.

0:51:44.890 --> 0:51:55.650

Struthers, James (Chair)

You know... This is Chair Struthers. So, my understanding is that it is, that even though the budget is still sound, it's the partition that handles travel that is exhausted.

0:51:56.540 --> 0:51:57.30

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Correct.

0:51:56.670 --> 0:51:57.280

Struthers, James (Chair)

Is that correct?

0:51:57.900 --> 0:51:58.160

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yeah.

0:51:58.300 --> 0:52:1.500

Struthers, James (Chair)

And that cannot be amended by budget in any way.

0:52:3.170 --> 0:52:3.750

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

No.

0:52:3.410 --> 0:52:12.470

Struthers, James (Chair)

Usually there's a mechanism within agencies to roll money into exhausted partitions.

0:52:14.750 --> 0:52:25.260

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And we are still working on digging through that again with our Budget Manager. But the information that we have received is that that's not able to take place this here.

0:52:25.810 --> 0:52:50.570

Struthers, James (Chair)

Is it possible..? And I know that both Board Members Brock and Webb have found quite a bit of value in attendance of this process in the past. And it's kind of an important for the Board to be represented. Is that something you can look into as to what reallocation processes might be available to at least cover this expense?

0:52:59.570 --> 0:52:59.920

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK.

0:52:52.650 --> 0:53:4.630

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. And we are. We have made that question to the Budget Office. We're just waiting to hear back on if there is anything at all possible for this year. And if it is, we will certainly bring that back.

0:53:5.180 --> 0:53:12.90

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

But unfortunately just the information that's currently available is that it's not able to happen for this year.

0:53:14.270 --> 0:53:28.470

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Well, this is Board Member Tebb. I just want to express my disappointment and, I guess, feeling of unsatisfactory, you know, response here as it relates to the budget and the travel budget and the work we do.

0:53:31.700 --> 0:53:43.540

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

I'd like the Budget Manager who makes these allocations be present at the next Board meeting to describe how this process was carried out and how these allocations were made.

0:53:51.660 --> 0:53:52.610

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

This is Carla.

0:53:53.880 --> 0:54:7.340

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Sydney, you said biennium and then you also referred to year. Is this, are we specifically talking through June? Or is it for the rest of 2023 that our budget is, that we don't have a travel budget?

0:54:7.760 --> 0:54:12.190

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And I apologize. No, this is for the remainder of this biennium, which ends in June.

0:54:12.600 --> 0:54:21.460

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

OK. Are we? I don't see on the agenda, but do are we talking about budget? Will we be talking about the next biennium budget today, in our meeting?

0:54:23.70 --> 0:54:35.990

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We will not. Board doesn't have budgetary authority, so we don't bring the budget forward to the Board to set anything. But we are working with the Budget Office to make sure that that allocation is set at an appropriate level for the next biennium.

0:54:36.460 --> 0:54:51.410

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

OK. I mean, I think everybody knows that the fall meeting, the ASBOG fall meeting and COE is happening in Spokane. And we wanna get as many Board Members there as possible. And you know that's gonna take travel budget, obviously. So, if there's anything we can do to help staff get budget for that.

0:54:53.490 --> 0:55:16.930

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I mean, I know I don't know how that works exactly. But I would hope that you would reach out and help us. You would reach out and let us help you with that. It's that it doesn't happen that often, you know? So, it's a big deal that, that meeting is happening in Washington in the fall and we wanna support it. And we all want to be there so.

0:55:17.760 --> 0:55:23.180

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely. And that has been part of the conversation with the Budget Office as we look ahead to the next biennium.

0:55:24.100 --> 0:55:38.610

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

And, you know, I'll just tell you personally. These meetings are so important from, I think, a professional development standpoint, but also from an optics standpoint, that I have attended them on my own, on my own dime before.

0:55:38.970 --> 0:55:49.460

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

So I would hope that it, you know, you guys can elevate the importance of our travel budget to the budget people so that we can continue to participate in this national organization.

0:55:50.600 --> 0:55:51.170

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)
Absolutely.

0:55:51.650 --> 0:55:52.60

Brock, Carla (Secretary)
Thanks.

0:55:56.470 --> 0:55:57.110

Struthers, James (Chair)
I believe...

0:56:0.160 --> 0:56:3.870

Struthers, James (Chair)
Have, do you have something else to say, Board Member Webb, on this issue?

0:56:4.520 --> 0:56:16.280

Webb, Eileen (Member)
Yeah, thank you. I'm going to totally mimic what, you know, Tom and Carla say. But it's more important than just supporting this meeting in Spokane. We are hosting it.

0:56:17.540 --> 0:56:21.0

Webb, Eileen (Member)
So that would be just my, add that to it. Thank you.

0:56:27.530 --> 0:56:28.10

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)
I...

0:56:28.910 --> 0:56:47.240

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)
Just to help clarify. It would be really great, because we are starting to have these conversations with our Budget Office for what to allocate for our travel. If we can get a really clear idea if all Members of the Board will be attending in Spokane and for how long. Then we can start to get some really good projections.

0:56:48.560 --> 0:57:14.590

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)
Because you're absolutely correct. We do need to represent and be available in Spokane. We wanna make sure that the funding for travel will take us through the rest of the biennium and that we don't fall short again and not be able to attend one of these COE conferences. It's... We do see the value in participating. This is really unfortunate that the allocations for travel...

0:57:15.580 --> 0:57:23.390

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)
This was news to both Sydney and I when we found out. And we are still working with the Budget Office to see what can happen, what can be moved around, if there is anything.

0:57:24.540 --> 0:57:33.110

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

So we will let you know as soon as we have that conversation, and what the results of that are.

0:57:37.90 --> 0:57:37.480

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Is this..?

0:57:36.820 --> 0:57:38.810

Struthers, James (Chair)

And this is a Chair... Oh, go ahead.

0:57:39.510 --> 0:57:42.790

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

I was just going to ask. Is this a legislative allocation issue?

0:57:43.580 --> 0:57:46.740

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

It's a DOL allocation issue?

0:57:49.980 --> 0:57:50.250

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

OK.

0:57:47.950 --> 0:57:51.140

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This is a program allocation. So yeah, it's set by DOL.

0:57:51.690 --> 0:57:52.580

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

OK. Gotcha.

0:57:56.30 --> 0:58:7.460

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, this is Chair Struthers. Is it possible that if you get an update on that, you could send out notice to the Board prior to our next meeting, or whenever you get it?

0:58:9.20 --> 0:58:9.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely.

0:58:8.950 --> 0:58:14.550

Struthers, James (Chair)

I mean, it would be better to resolve this in a timely manner. Board Member Tebb?

0:58:16.510 --> 0:58:30.340

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, I'm curious as to how our Board compares with, say, other Boards and their professional travel.

Doesn't feel like to me that we do a lot of this. So, I just, I'm... I guess you know that's why I'm a little surprised that we are where we are so...

0:58:32.440 --> 0:58:41.950

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Any kind of comparisons to, are we high on the travel, sort of, spectrum? Are we low? Or are we in the middle? Would be helpful to understand that.

0:58:43.420 --> 0:58:45.900

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So I can tell you from just my experience.

0:58:45.980 --> 0:58:52.750

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The geologist program is middle of the pack with two conferences a year.

0:58:55.0 --> 0:59:5.320

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Part of what factors into that is the fall COE is a longer conference than what the spring COE is, so that does add days of travel in there.

0:59:5.530 --> 0:59:19.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We have a couple of Boards who have one conference a year that's maybe a day or two. We have others that have two to three conferences a year. And so the geologist program is kind of right in the middle.

0:59:24.400 --> 0:59:24.810

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Thank you.

0:59:26.920 --> 0:59:37.140

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

I plan to go to the fall COE in Spokane. So you can count me in for at least one night, if not two.

0:59:43.740 --> 0:59:46.200

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. Do we have any other discussion on this issue?

0:59:49.420 --> 0:59:57.990

Struthers, James (Chair)

Here hearing none, I'd like to move on to the next topic, which is establishing of the goals for 2023.

0:59:59.380 --> 1:0:3.640

Struthers, James (Chair)

And Sydney, you had some startup conversation on this, I believe.

1:0:5.270 --> 1:0:11.240

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I do. And so I'm actually going to share my screen over Susan's.

1:0:15.960 --> 1:0:20.90

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So this is just a beginning conversation.

1:0:21.130 --> 1:0:51.690

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This presentation was included in the Board's packet. And this is just a place to start. This will eventually work into being an annual conversation that we have towards the end of every calendar year so that the Board can establish its priorities and goals that it wants to accomplish over the next calendar year.

We're a little bit late in starting this this year, so we're also trying to figure out what's going to work best within Board meetings, or whether we need to look at having an additional Board meeting later in the year just on this topic.

1:0:51.810 --> 1:1:2.140

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So we're figuring our way through this. So, this will be an ongoing conversation with each of our Boards to set the priorities and the goals for the coming year.

1:1:4.760 --> 1:1:52.390

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So the process will be setting, kind of those, overall pie-in-the-sky priorities. The big picture, things that the Board would like to look at and then drilling those down to bite size three to four manageable goals that the Board can work on over the next, over the rest of this year and looking ahead to '24. The goals that the Board really wants to zero in on to look at accomplishing, understanding that we only have four set Board meetings to do that in for the calendar year, and then establishing a support structure behind that. So, whether that's going to be committees, if it needs to be a staff resource, ask what that structure needs to look like to help the Board accomplish those goals and then allowing the Board to just set those for the year.

1:1:54.300 --> 1:2:6.170

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So looking at the priorities, the areas to really, or the five areas to focus on with setting these is, what does the Board want to focus on not just this year, but also beyond.

1:2:6.970 --> 1:2:7.680

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

What...

1:2:8.900 --> 1:2:38.670

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Or, who do we need to involve in addressing these areas? What is the process to address these priorities in the correct way? How do we measure how successful these are and as these priorities progress and evolve, how will they impact the Board's work? So, for example, outreach is one that I think each of my Boards has. But each Board has a different idea of what outreach means or what their goal with outreach is.

1:2:39.150 --> 1:3:11.550

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So is it going to be reaching new candidates for licensure? Is it going to be retaining licensees that we have? Is it having conversations around issues for licensure? Or is, the Board has been talking about use of the title? Is there something going on within the profession that needs to be addressed to kind of close some of these gaps? So just looking to see if the Board has any priorities that they want to share.

1:3:24.320 --> 1:3:24.790

Struthers, James (Chair)

It is.

1:3:20.100 --> 1:3:26.860

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

I have, I have one if that's what we're doing right now. You know this this has been on our...

1:3:28.60 --> 1:3:34.830

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

This is Board Member Brock. This has been on our action items list for a long time, and it requires staff to do some work.

1:3:36.110 --> 1:3:51.70

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

And I'm a little bit frustrated that it hasn't happened yet. But I would like for us to set a priority to establish specialty exam review, a process for specialty exam review.

1:3:53.490 --> 1:3:54.850

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

We just need to start doing it.

1:4:0.280 --> 1:4:1.450

Struthers, James (Chair)

Board Member Tebb.

1:4:4.480 --> 1:4:11.860

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah, I think mine is getting this clear, you know, providing a clear policy statement from the Board on the on the...

1:4:12.580 --> 1:4:27.920

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Writing clarity on the titles of Geologists, Hydrogeologists, and Engineering Geologist. So, I think that's work that's already been assigned, per the previous discussion. But I just wanted to make sure that's on the priority list.

1:4:31.680 --> 1:4:38.370

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, this is Chair Struthers. I would pile on with Board Member Brock on the.

1:4:39.850 --> 1:5:3.0

Struthers, James (Chair)

Establishing a review process for test review as being a fairly important and also an area where there is some exposure to the Board on, kind of, the validity of the test. If they haven't been reviewed in a long, long time, that's not a not a great situation. We should act to resolve it or get a process where that's not really an ongoing thing anymore.

1:5:4.120 --> 1:5:9.700

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, and staff does have an update for that under reports. So, we will be providing an update.

1:5:12.430 --> 1:5:13.390

Struthers, James (Chair)

Board Member Webb.

1:5:14.950 --> --> 1:5:25.370

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Yeah. Thank you. I just wanna come off of a topic we've just finished talking about, is make it a priority that we participate in the Council of Examiners, when they occur.

1:5:27.210 --> 1:5:33.770

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Just, we need to make sure that... I mean, we don't control our own budget, DOL does. So, it's really difficult for the Board to have a stronger voice.

1:5:35.750 --> 1:5:43.460

Webb, Eileen (Member)

But this is one way to, maybe, get that across, is this priority list. So those two things.

1:5:45.650 --> 1:6:5.90

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Also, and completing a charter so that we have solid direction in our procedures in what we do, and just help us answer the questions. Like, you know, we kind of stumbled a little bit this morning on the elections. And that, sort of that, that kind of thing would be covered in that. And I believe it is.

1:6:5.800 --> 1:6:6.250

Webb, Eileen (Member)

So.

1:6:9.110 --> 1:6:9.650

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Thank you.

1:6:11.290 --> 1:6:12.220

Struthers, James (Chair)

Vice Chair Hanell.

1:6:14.460 --> 1:6:35.520

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Yes, this is Vice Chair Hanell. I would just voice support for that top bullet as well. That has been brought up a couple times about the process for specialty exam review and how we're going to go about that. I think that is a high priority and has been for this Board for a while.

1:6:37.940 --> 1:6:39.70

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

So, speaking to that.

1:6:44.150 --> 1:7:0.530

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah. This is Chair Struthers. Is there any dissent from the Board, or further discussion, that at..? This is a reasonable list of priority items, kind of, what we have up there, the four that have been raised in this discussion?

1:7:1.640 --> 1:7:5.530

Struthers, James (Chair)

Or they're sort... Are there others that we should be throwing into the mix?

1:7:9.370 --> 1:7:33.410

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, as staff, if I could ask the question. The master action item list for this Board does have a couple of items on it for outreach. So, from a staff perspective, it would be very, very helpful for us to help support the Board and to move any outreach initiatives forward if we understood what the specific priority around outreach was.

1:7:36.610 --> 1:7:37.410

Struthers, James (Chair)

Board Member Webb.

1:7:45.690 --> 1:7:45.920

Struthers, James (Chair)

No.

1:7:39.190 --> 1:8:13.500

Webb, Eileen (Member)

I'd like to ask is there some deadline that we have to, like, sit here now and just to..? Good. So I'd like to request that if, as, you know, Board Members in the coming days, weeks think of something "ah-ha," who would we send our recommendations or request to add to? Or does, do we have to agree to this list as a Board? And, if so, that would be next meeting, probably, if there were add-ins. So, if I would just request folks send in things that, as you think about them, or maybe, if you hear some from your peers that we didn't think about today. Thank you.

1:8:14.720 --> 1:8:52.410

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

As I said, this will be an ongoing standing item that we can update and work on and kind of fine tune the process throughout the year. So yes, please, if you do have any additions that you would like added myself and Susan, you can send those to both of us. We'll add them onto the list. We'll note them as additions to bring back to the Board for discussion to see if there's a consensus or if that's not one that

the full Board is willing to take on and allow you guys to have that conversation. But yes, we can bring this back at the next meeting.

1:8:51.530 -->

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That is the little one.

1:8:51.550 --> 1:9:8.20

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Might I... Thank you. Might I request that this become a standing agenda item is to have a quick review? It's sort of like having our action items review. Make sure our priorities are still our priorities and which ones we've checked the box for. And let's move one up, one down.

1:9:9.260 --> 1:9:17.70

Webb, Eileen (Member)

If, you know, it's not up to me. It's up to the group to request that. But that's just coming from me to have it as a standing agenda item henceforth.

1:9:20.890 --> 1:9:28.730

Struthers, James (Chair)

This Chair Struthers. I think that's an excellent idea, for if we could add that to the agenda as standing item. That'd be great.

1:9:29.570 --> 1:9:30.160

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Absolutely.

1:9:33.500 --> 1:9:33.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK.

1:9:33.270 --> 1:9:46.850

Struthers, James (Chair)

So, if there's no further discussion on this issue, and if there is, please speak up, I'd like to have Sydney launch into a series of reports.

1:9:47.730 --> 1:9:49.980

Struthers, James (Chair)

Report outs on task force.

1:9:52.60 --> 1:9:52.790

Struthers, James (Chair)

And such.

1:9:54.140 --> 1:10:41.560

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. So like I said, we do have a small update. It's not the big update we were hoping we would have for the EG/HG Exam Review Committee. That group has met since the last time the Board met and just had some preliminary discussions. Came up with an initial plan to have each individual Board, at least on the

EG side of things, each committee for each of the Boards between us and Oregon to come in and, kind of, look at the exam and just get a feel for how the exam is. We also put in a resource request for DOL staff to take a look at and analyze some of the data that we have around the exam.

1:10:43.20 --> 1:11:40.940

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The staff member who was, who has been working on that does have a preliminary list together and has those statistics, kind of, outline showing the questions that are always right, the questions that are pretty consistently wrong, or that are that are pretty consistently answered wrong, I should say. And so, she's compiled that data. We've taken an initial look at it, just on the staff side. That just occurred a couple of days ago. And trying to wrap our arms around just how big this is. So, we will be bringing that committee back together here within, hopefully, the next few weeks. We're trying to get some additional information on anything else that staff is able to work toward, or to work on, to bring back to that committee, to help start moving that forward.

1:11:44.250 --> 1:11:45.660

Struthers, James (Chair)

Secretary Brock.

1:11:43.770 --> 1:11:45.700

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I see that Board Member Brock has a question.

1:11:46.810 --> 1:11:50.940

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Yeah, I thought the exam review committees included Board Members.

1:11:51.970 --> 1:11:55.80

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

But I haven't been asked to join any committee meetings.

1:12:2.560 --> 1:12:2.860

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Ohh.

1:12:4.70 --> 1:12:4.430

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

OK.

1:11:56.510 --> 1:12:32.710

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

It does. This is, so far, we've been focusing on the EG side. And I believe you had volunteered on the HG side. And so, we wanted to... Understanding where we were at with the EG exam, and knowing that we would probably need a parallel process on the hydrogeology, we went ahead and made that resource ask within our agency to go ahead and take a preliminary look at those questions and put some of that analysis together that we can bring back. So, we will be scheduling those meetings. But like I said, unfortunately that data just became available to us a couple of days ago.

1:12:34.100 --> 1:13:18.590

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

OK. And then I just had one comment. You know, those of us who have participated in the COE, which is maybe just me since Eileen is migrating out of migrating out, migrating off of the Board. You know, we've done this many, many times for the ASBOG exams. So, you know, feel... I mean, I'm happy to provide some input on, you know, the best way to go about reviewing test questions or reviewing comments, or you know whatever, however, or just overall how we should be approaching reviewing the exams. You know, if I've done it a lot, I feel like with ASBOG. So, happy to provide some input if you if you like.

1:13:24.600 --> 1:13:25.180

Struthers, James (Chair)

Uh, Deb.

1:13:28.120 --> 1:14:2.910

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Thanks, Carla, for offering up that expertise too, because that's really helpful. I think one of the things that we're also exploring is whether or not we can be in a place to hire a psychometrician to help assist with this lift. You know, the expertise in exam writing is really nuanced and we wanna make sure that we're doing it well and that we have a defensible exam at the end of this process. That's the last... Last thing we wanna do is go backwards.

1:14:4.260 --> 1:14:14.460

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

So, we're working on an RFI. There was originally, before the beginning of the pandemic, there had already been a contract. So, we've got something to start from.

1:14:15.80 --> 1:14:19.100

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

And then we'll be working out there from that point.

1:14:23.20 --> 1:14:39.460

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Is this the exam..? And maybe I'm misremembering. But, is this the exam that you've, kind of, designed together with Oregon and shared the costs of a psychometrician? Or is that a different exam? This is that exam.

1:14:40.540 --> 1:14:41.970

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This is that exam, yes.

1:14:43.630 --> 1:14:44.640

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

So.

1:14:46.220 --> 1:15:7.360

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Is that still an ongoing option? Or..? because there was, in that... I remember in the agreement between

Oregon and Washington that they would, both sides would provide, you know, people to get together on a on a task-force type group and work on this together. So, I don't know if you're still doing that or not.

1:15:8.80 --> 1:15:12.930

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. On the engineering geologist exam, yes.

1:15:13.20 --> 1:15:43.300

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And they've been very involved in, kind of, walking through how this review needs to take place so far. With the cost sharing, the information we've received from Oregon, the money that they had allocated for a psychometrician when this discussion first began at the beginning of the pandemic, the funding that they had allocated for that has been swept by their state. And so, it's no longer available.

1:15:43.570 --> 1:16:13.360

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

They are working on seeing what they need to do for a resource ask, or for funding ask. But we don't know what that timeline looks like for them, or if it will be approved. So, we're, we have continual conversations with their Board administrator and looking at what that needs to be for them. But as far as their participation, they're willing to travel to offer their expertise.

1:16:14.40 --> 1:16:24.400

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So the work will not just fall on the Washington Board. But as far as a psychometrician and funding at this particular point, Oregon does not have that available to them.

1:16:26.590 --> 1:16:27.590

Struthers, James (Chair)

Secretary Brock.

1:16:33.500 --> 1:16:33.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Right.

1:16:29.180 --> 1:16:49.180

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Yeah, I was just gonna say, we have, we're talking about 2 exams. One we share with Oregon, one we do not. And I think it's great that we're looking into a psychometrician I think, you know, one easy thing we can do is, after each exam is administered in the fall and the spring, we can review comments and questions from candidates.

1:16:50.620 --> 1:17:24.210

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

They have the opportunity to provide specific feedback on specific test questions. And we can decide, based on our review of the candidate feedback, whether or not it's appropriate to score those questions. That's an easy thing that the Board Members can do. I imagine that the Oregon Board would

be willing to join us in doing that for the engineering geology exam, and we can do it for the hydrogeology exam. But that's one thing that we can do that would be quick and easy to implement.

1:17:25.450 --> 1:17:54.140

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

That would give us a little bit of...

1:17:29.500 --> 1:17:54.140

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

It would. It would show... It would show candidates and licensees that we're doing what we can sooner to make sure that these exams are valid and accurate in what they're trying to do. Rather than waiting for, you know, some budget, hiring somebody, going through the statistical analysis part. Which, I mean, even once we hire somebody, that's going to take significant amount of time.

1:17:55.770 --> 1:18:5.820

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

So, I mean, this is part of, I guess, our goal setting and getting things moving. But I think there's things we can do in the meantime, you know, to get started on this process.

1:18:6.690 --> 1:18:38.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes, absolutely. And so we'll be, we'll be calling, or we'll be reaching out to each committee. The other piece is that we have to be careful of quorum issues. And so we've been trying to look at, you know, how best to go about it. And so, we'll be reaching out to the group for the hydro geo exam, as well as the engineering geo exam, and working on setting those up. We just want to get a couple more pieces of information to bring to the Board that we know are going to be questions.

1:18:39.260 --> 1:18:58.810

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So if we can bring that information to those committees at that time, we would rather, you know, hold off an extra week to make sure we can answer those questions rather than pushing it out another month after that meeting to bring back those answers. So, as soon as we have those answers, we'll be looking at setting up those meetings and getting the committee moving forward.

1:19:1.510 --> 1:19:2.0

Struthers, James (Chair)

Deborah.

1:19:3.970 --> 1:19:22.940

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

And, just to piggyback on something that Carla said. We are compiling all the comments that we receive for both exams. And that was one of the things that we looked at as we were starting to do this analysis, is what comments and what were coming up consistently.

1:19:25.140 --> 1:19:47.860

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

So, the management analyst that we have working on that, she has compiled these into a really great spreadsheet. So, we've got going back, as far as we could find on our records, the comments that we

were getting per exam question and looking for some of those patterns. Because there are definitely areas that you see a question is not performing very well, and the comments definitely reflect that.

1:19:48.610 --> 1:19:52.620

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

So I think in the in the committees that we work with, we can share those comments.

1:20:5.330 --> 1:20:13.500

Struthers, James (Chair)

Does anyone have any additional comments on the exam test, exam committees at this time?

1:20:19.630 --> 1:20:24.630

Struthers, James (Chair)

Hearing none, Sydney, could you move on to complaint status report?

1:20:25.690 --> 1:20:31.600

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes. Right now, we have four cases in management review.

1:20:33.140 --> 1:20:47.740

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Two, and I'm not entirely sure how Chair Struthers and Secretary Brock ended up tied to both of those cases together, but we have two under review with them and two under review with Board member Tebb.

1:20:51.340 --> 1:20:53.940

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, Susan, if you wanna roll to the next one.

1:20:55.70 --> 1:20:56.920

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Our licensee counts.

1:20:57.20 --> 1:21:13.260

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

For this meeting, we have a grand total of 2,271 active geologist licenses.

1:21:15.530 --> 1:21:32.630

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Engineering geologist specifically, we have 244. Engineering and hydrogeologist, having both, we have 95. And hydrogeologists we have 447. For a grand total of 786 specialty licenses.

1:21:33.820 --> 1:21:34.240

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So yeah.

1:21:35.920 --> 1:21:38.380

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Are there any questions on those before we move on?

1:21:44.290 --> 1:21:57.530

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

All right. So normally I would let Susan review the master action item list, but this one got a little chaotic on us. So, I'll go ahead and take it. The exam review committees we just went over. Those are in progress.

1:21:58.790 --> 1:22:6.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We do have the clarification on the campus updates, or on the campus outreach, I should say.

1:22:8.100 --> 1:22:18.110

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The program funding structure presentation, we are talking to our Budget Office on what that needs to look like and are hoping that it can come back here soon.

1:22:21.190 --> 1:22:48.760

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The specialty exam frequency to administer the cost, the budget we have placed on hold for now, waiting to see what that's going to look like now that ASBOG has moved to the computer-based. Previously all of that was kind of tied in together, so we couldn't really separate out the cost. So now that we are only hosting the specialty exams, that'll give us a much more complete number on what we're looking at as far as frequency, cost, and the budget for it.

1:22:49.760 --> 1:23:4.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The charter review is in progress. We did have a couple of items come up at the end of last year on the staff side that we wanted to make sure were included. So, we are finalizing those and I hope to have it back for the Board at the next meeting.

1:23:6.130 --> 1:23:16.700

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And the strategic plan for outreach, I don't know if Chair Struthers or Secretary Brock have anything to add on that.

1:23:19.300 --> 1:23:28.70

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The issues with verifying candidates, we are working on bringing back an answer and we'll hopefully have that question answered at the next meeting.

1:23:28.950 --> 1:23:36.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We did complete the policy for the failed examination retakes, so that action item will be coming off for the next meeting.

1:23:36.780 --> 1:23:43.740

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I the exam Feedback Review Committee, again, working on looking at all of that.

1:23:45.30 --> 1:23:54.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Scope of practice, we talked about today. So, we'll be updating that item with the information that's been provided today and the direction from the Board.

1:23:54.820 --> 1:24:5.510

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The outreach planning, again, in progress. And the Task Analysis survey results are on hold, pending ASBOG.

1:24:11.310 --> 1:24:12.640

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Are there any questions on that?

1:24:15.910 --> 1:24:28.560

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK. One thing that's been requested by each of our Boards is kind of a snapshot before and after of what the support staff within DOL for each of our programs looked like.

1:24:29.230 --> 1:24:33.860

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Before versus after the strategic or before the functional alignment.

1:24:37.160 --> 1:25:26.780

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We did a great job of providing you guys with information about each of those units but realized that a hole was just seeing how the change happened. So, this is what our structure looks like now under the functional alignment. Previously, the regulatory boards were all wrapped up together and all of the functions for the regulatory reports, excuse me, were also wrapped up together in that unit. So, reporting and analytics, contract management, board functions, the licensing services, the regulatory compliance, and the investigations were all housed within the Regulatory Board section under DOL. Those have all been broken out according to their function now.

1:25:28.260 --> 1:25:54.500

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So we do have Central Services, who handles the reporting, analytics, and contract management. All of that is now housed together so that they are all sharing those responsibilities and those programs. So, it's expanding their expertise in each of those. Under the Board and Outreach Support section. That is our unit, and we are the front facing, the Board facing group that you guys see most often.

1:25:55.210 --> 1:26:18.190

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Our administrator is out of date. We did have Mike George, who had come to us from the licensing unit. And, unfortunately, he was stolen by another agency. So, in the interim, we have Bill Dutra, who came to us from the Investigations unit. And he has joined us as our interim Administrator for the foreseeable future.

1:26:19.870 --> 1:26:36.640

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so, as the name suggests, we handle the Board and Commission support. And then, we are also working on adding an outreach engagement system that will cover all 39 programs within the Department of Licensing's Business and Professions Division.

1:26:38.570 --> 1:26:47.910

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Under our Licensing Support team, they handle the customer support, issuing the licenses, managing the renewals. They are the ones that review all of those applications for relationship that come in.

1:26:49.170 --> 1:26:59.20

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And they'll be the group that reaches out to each of the Board Members when they have questions about whether or not somebody qualifies for examination.

1:27:0.130 --> 1:27:15.480

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Regulatory Compliance unit, that is the group that when a case moves forward for charges, they put together all of the legal documents. They work with our prosecuting attorneys to put all of that together to reach an agreement on the charges to move forward.

1:27:15.880 --> 1:27:42.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then, we present their work product to you. But they are the group that puts all of that together. And then, our Centralized Investigations and Audits team handles our complaint intake case investigations and our audits. We also have Prorate and Fuel Tax tied in with us, but they don't work directly with the Board. Susan, if you could go to the next one.

1:27:44.40 --> 1:28:15.30

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So this is what our team looks like now. As I said, Mr. Dutra has taken over as our interim Administrator. He's still supported by our Administrative Assistant, Alisa Woods. We still have Ms. Debra Allen-Bâ as our Assistant Administrator. And then, you have myself and Susan Nieves supporting the five regulatory Boards. So, in addition to Geologists, we have the Architects, Funeral & Cemetery, Collection Agency, and Landscape Architecture boards.

1:28:15.140 --> 1:28:26.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then our counterparts are Sandy Baur and Saundra Schaefer. They support the advisory boards, which are the Cosmetology, Real Estate Appraisers, Real Estate, and Home Inspector boards.

1:28:29.560 --> 1:29:1.890

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So this is just a little snapshot. I will let the Board dig in on the details of it. But this is what we looked like previously. So, before you had the Administrator, Assistant Administrator, two Administrative Assistants, and then you had the Investigators, the Management Analysts, all of those specialties housed

within this one unit. So now those have broken out and provide a wider amount of expertise available to the programs as needed.

1:29:2.800 --> 1:29:5.620

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, are there any questions on that before I move forward?

1:29:8.810 --> 1:29:16.40

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That was a ask that we've had from a couple of our Boards, just to kind of see what that before and after picture looked like. Mr. Tebb.

1:29:17.900 --> 1:29:31.900

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Yeah. Thank you. That was excellent. I wasn't sure that I saw where the budget division is housed relative to the support of these functions. Did I miss that?

1:29:33.0 --> 1:29:38.930

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

You did not. The budget is actually housed within our Assistant Director's purview.

1:29:41.20 --> 1:29:42.230

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

OK. Thank you.

1:29:49.700 --> 1:29:59.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

All right. And then, I don't believe I had anything else to add for the Board Executive's report. So we can move into the Board training if the Board is ready.

1:30:3.720 --> 1:30:22.50

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK. This is hopefully going to be a relatively quick and painless training that we provide to you. Part of why this came about is, we had a request for the certificates that we have to issue, that each Board Member has to sign and we have to issue for receiving Open Public Meeting's Act training every four years.

1:30:22.330 --> 1:30:58.350

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And when we dug in, we found that we didn't have those on record. So, we don't know who's received what, when, and how often you all have had them. So, we just figured better to take a few minutes out of your day and provide it all at once at a Board meeting and get you guys all up to speed. So, we will be covering Open Public Meetings Act, Parliamentary Procedures, State Ethics Law, and Public Disclosure. I apologize.

1:30:58.850 --> 1:31:10.730

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And I will bust through them as quickly as I can, because I know that these are so dry you could probably start a wildfire with them. But if you have any questions along the way, please stop me and let me know.

1:31:11.610 --> 1:31:34.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So the purpose of the OPMA is that the legislature finds and declares that all public commissions, boards, councils, committees, subcommittees, departments, divisions, offices, and all other public agencies of the state and subdivision exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of this chapter that actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

1:31:36.670 --> 1:31:37.140

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Excellent.

1:31:38.450 --> 1:31:55.530

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The OPMA exists to maintain the public sovereignty, for the public to delegate their authority while retaining their individual rights, for the public to retain control over the instruments they have created, and to keep informed of government operations and how these functions impact them.

1:31:59.190 --> 1:32:16.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Under RCW 42-30-030, all public meetings of the governing body and of a public agency shall be open to the public, and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the governing body of a public agency.

1:32:19.200 --> 1:32:19.670

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

That's right.

1:32:20.660 --> 1:32:41.50

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Governing body is defined as any multi-member board, commission, committee, council, or other public policy, public policy or rulemaking body of a public agency. This also applies to any committee thereof when the committee acts on behalf of the governing body, conducts hearings, or takes testimony, or public comment.

1:32:43.280 --> 1:33:20.920

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

I'd like to just pop in there because that's something that I think a lot of people don't understand. So, when you create like a task force within the Board, and even if you don't have a quorum, there are times when you could still be considered subject to the open Public Meetings Act. For example, if you bring in people from the outside to provide perspective, that's a tricky piece of the open Public Meetings Act that has caused problems with Boards in the past. So, I just wanted to let you know that that's an important one and often overlooked.

1:33:22.890 --> 1:33:44.420

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Thanks, Elizabeth. So, a meeting is defined as any meeting of that public agency at which action, or of the public body at which action takes place. It does not need to be titled a meeting in order to qualify as a meeting. This can also apply it to retreats, workshops, and study sessions if actions are taken.

1:33:48.720 --> 1:33:49.890

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Oh. I think we went too far.

1:33:53.90 --> 1:33:54.890

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Final action is just.

1:33:57.10 --> 1:33:57.780

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Going too far.

1:33:56.910 --> 1:34:4.970

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

I think you just define action first because action is the key element of this of this statute.

1:34:5.700 --> 1:34:6.130

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK.

1:34:7.540 --> 1:34:11.280

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Susan, if you wanna go back to action.

1:34:15.340 --> 1:34:33.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So action means the transaction of the official business of a public agency and includes, but is not limited to, public testimony, deliberations, discussions, considerations, reviews, evaluations, and final actions. The requirements for OPMA are triggered whether or not the action taken is in fact final.

1:34:34.270 --> 1:35:3.20

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And that's why I think this action is so important. Because really everything that you talk about, even if, you know, other than things that don't have to do with Board business. But that discussions piece right there turns any, basically any, meeting is, needs to be a public meeting. Because people think of action as in like what final action is. But action is just talking about something under the statute. And it seems odd, but just talking about something is an action.

1:35:7.410 --> 1:35:26.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And final action is the collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the governing body or by its committee. This action must be taken in public, even if the deliberations were part of an executive session. And voting by secret ballot is not permitted.

1:35:31.40 --> 1:35:58.380

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

A quorum is required for a meeting. And a quorum is simply defined as the majority of the members of a public body. So as a seven-member Board, the quorum for this group is four. Vacancies do not reduce the number of members required to meet that quorum. And if there is not a quorum, there can be no action taken. If there is a quorum, the gathering is automatically considered a meeting, and therefore it's subject to the OPMA, even if you happen to run into each other at Starbucks.

1:35:59.500 --> 1:36:12.660

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Meetings do not have to occur in person to be subject to the OPMA. As we've learned through COVID, meetings can also occur through telephone, e-mail, online chat, or any other electronic media.

1:36:14.320 --> 1:36:35.470

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

And again, I want to emphasize with the emails situation. If an e-mail chain starts and one person emails another person, who emails another person, that can create a quorum that is subject to the Open Public Meetings Act. So that's why we ask you not to e-mail each other about Board business.

1:36:38.790 --> 1:36:39.430

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Oh, sorry.

1:36:36.570 --> 1:37:7.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

We are getting into that right here. An exchange of emails could constitute a meeting if a quorum of the members participate in the e-mail exchange or discuss agency business. Simply receiving information without comment is not a meeting. But please do not "reply all" and even with a three-member board, replying all can be risky. Use caution when you're emailing fellow Board Members such exchanges, and subsequent discussions among Board Members, could rise to the level of board action.

1:37:8.780 --> 1:37:21.190

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And so typically best for those communications to go through staff, because that helps us keep an eye on the OPMA requirements and help keep you guys out of those violations.

1:37:22.40 --> 1:37:32.250

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Separate offline business discussions between board members without a quorum could also be considered a violation due to splintering the quorum.

1:37:32.850 --> 1:37:53.0

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This type of action deprives the public of its right to listen to the deliberations on topics that may be presented to public body for discussion. It removes the discussion and decisions from the public view, and it undermines the public's confidence in decision making. So what splintering the quorum is kind of like Elizabeth was describing.

1:37:53.620 --> 1:38:19.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If Chair Struthers sends something to Secretary Brock, and then Secretary Brock sends it over to Mr. Tebb, and then Mr. Tebb sends it over to Vice Chair Hanell, even though the four of you were not together discussing something, you weren't sitting down for coffee, having that discussion, that serial chain of discussions could be considered a violation because it did occur between a quorum.

1:38:25.100 --> 1:38:56.230

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So likewise, comments and/or side conversations that occur in a virtual meeting chat feature could also be construed as a violation of the OPMA because members of the public may not be able to see them and therefore witness them. We actually had perfect examples of this with Funeral & Cemetery Board just a couple of weeks ago. We had a number of members call in. We also had a number of members who found the technology to be very challenging. And so, they were struggling to see everything that was going on.

1:38:56.530 --> 1:39:31.940

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Adding that chat feature in, people who had called in don't have the ability to see any discussions happening in that chat. And same thing when people are struggling with the technology that chat can be invisible to them. Those chats are also not recorded for the minutes or in the transcript of the meeting. There's really no way for staff to capture that. And they are also just distracting to the orderly conduct of a meeting for Board Members and for the public. And so, for that reason, board staff has disabled the chat functions for all meetings for 2023.

1:39:33.20 --> 1:39:54.810

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I don't think it was ever an issue for this Board. But we did have several boards where, a lot of times, the discussion would move from Board Members having it between each other verbally, where they were supposed to have it, to having it in the chat and then it never actually making it into the meeting portion. So, there was a whole other set of deliberations happening that played into their discussion that nobody ever really saw.

1:39:59.500 --> 1:40:18.520

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, meeting only qualifies as a regular meeting if the date and time are set in statute or rule. And special meetings are really just every other meeting that we have. So, this is the regular meeting for this board because this is the one that's prescribed in statute. And you'll notice that the rest of them for the remainder of the year are titled as Special Meetings.

1:40:26.780 --> 1:40:50.130

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Every year, a public agency must file a yearly schedule with the Code Reviser's office. We must post a notice and agenda to the agency website within 24 advanced hours of the meeting. We try to shoot for two weeks to make sure that the public has plenty of notice to attend. We also do post the date and time in advance for the calendar year once that calendar has been set by the Board.

1:40:50.870 --> 1:40:59.860

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And we submit regular meeting schedule changes to the state register at least 20 days prior to a rescheduled meeting date.

1:41:4.170 --> 1:41:36.300

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Most board and commission meetings are classified as special meetings, known as must be given of these at least 24 hours in advance. Special meeting notice must be, or must specify the date, time, location, and agenda. And notice it is not required when these special meetings are called to deal with an emergency, though, I don't think that that actually really occurs very much for our boards. Those typically refer to things like act of god, where the public body is having to take action to address an emergent situation for the public.

1:41:39.650 --> 1:42:0.960

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Meeting agendas must include notice of the date, time and location of the meeting, and only items listed on the agenda may be discussed, considered or decided. If an item comes up that is not listed on the agenda, it cannot be discussed. And the best practice is to refer that to the next meeting when it can be properly listed on the published agenda so that the public knows you're going to be discussing it.

1:42:4.290 --> 1:42:25.600

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Public comments are required by law for regular meetings. We also include them on our special meetings. The public, or the public body may impose a reasonable time limit. We usually use three minutes, although if for some reason you have a really large group and you ask them to cut that down into two minutes for time's sake, that option is available.

1:42:26.310 --> 1:42:36.840

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And comments must pertain to items, or must pertain to matters within the Board's jurisdiction. So somebody wanting to complain about an architect can't come to the geologist Board and complain about them.

1:42:41.440 --> 1:42:54.800

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

In response to public comments, the Board can request that the matter be referred to the next agenda for discussion, which we had happened a couple of times at our last meeting. It can be referred to staff for research and potential response.

1:42:55.360 --> 1:43:3.90

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The Board can state that the comment is not within the Board's jurisdiction. Or the Board can remain silent. You certainly don't have to respond.

1:43:4.230 --> 1:43:15.830

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The Board may not engage in a discussion or deliberation on the matter. They may not converse with the member of the public on the matter. And they certainly cannot take action on the matter.

1:43:20.380 --> 1:43:31.840

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Minutes of a public meeting must be promptly recorded and open to the public for inspection. minutes are not required for an executive session and there is no format for these minutes specified by law.

1:43:35.630 --> 1:43:49.80

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, in summary, the OPMA exists to ensure that the public's business is conducted openly and publicly. It applies to any meeting of a public body or it's committees where deliberations and actions are occurring.

1:43:49.930 --> 1:44:2.460

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

This includes verbal discussions or electronic communications among a quorum of the public body. So, the bottom line is always err on the side of conducting business as openly and publicly as possible. So, are there any questions on OPMA?

1:44:6.870 --> 1:44:7.360

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK.

1:44:8.10 --> 1:44:8.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Oh.

1:44:9.860 --> 1:44:10.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Secretary Brock.

1:44:12.540 --> 1:44:22.100

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

This is maybe not directly a question about OPMA, but it's kinda related. And I don't, maybe we can't talk about it today. But maybe we can add it to the agenda for the next meeting.

1:44:30.930 --> 1:44:31.130

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Mhm.

1:44:23.40 --> 1:44:40.710

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

You know, we have you. You said that a quorum for our board was four because we have seven board member positions. So, a quorum is four. With Eileen's term ending, we're only gonna have four board members. And so, I'm concerned about having a quorum in future meetings without the appointment of new board members.

1:44:42.610 --> 1:44:54.90

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

So, I guess, I would appreciate an update on that. If we need to hold it for the next meeting, that's fine. Although, certainly, I'm concerned about having a quorum at the June meeting since there's only four of us now. So that's all.

1:44:53.640 --> 1:45:9.30

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, really quickly. We are reviewing applications for the vacant positions, and we'll be requesting the positions be filled here shortly. So, hopefully, the update at the next meeting will be welcoming new Board Members.

1:45:9.360 --> 1:45:10.830

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Great. Thanks.

1:45:13.900 --> 1:45:32.350

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK, if there are no other questions, we will move on to Parliamentary Procedures. OPMA and Parliamentary Procedures are the two bulkiest presentations. So, thank you for hanging with me. The remaining two will be quick after this. This presentation is based on Robert's Rules of Order. It's been adapted to suit our needs and our procedures.

1:45:33.190 --> 1:45:53.690

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

A parliamentary procedure is simply a set of rules for conduct at a meeting that allow everyone to be heard and to make decisions without confusion. It's important because it's a time-tested method to conduct business at meetings and public gatherings. It can be adapted to suit the needs of any organization, and it is important so that everybody knows the basic rules.

1:45:57.640 --> 1:46:30.90

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So you will notice that we did have some slight changes to our agenda order from what it has previously looked like. We did that to try and consolidate and remove some of the confusion. We had several different items for reports and then a big bulky one for reports and it was it was causing a lot of confusion for the public, for staff, for some Board Members. So, we made some updates and some changes to consolidate and put it in an order that seemed to make a little bit more sense. So, the call to order, roll call, approval of agenda, and approval of minutes remain the same.

1:46:30.960 --> 1:47:1.170

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

When we have them, awards and recognition will occur toward the beginning of the meeting. The reason for that is, we were finding that when we held that to the end of the meeting, we had board members who were showing up to receive laudatories, or to be recognized for their service, and then were hanging out for an entire meeting. We had one meeting with a different board where the individual ended up hanging out with the board for an additional three hours, which they were not a Board Member for.

1:47:8.290 --> 1:47:9.960

Lagerberg, Elizabeth E (ATG)

Your call has been forwarded to an [inaudible].

1:47:1.340 --> 1:47:31.880

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And by the time we went, we got to their recognition, they were already on a ferry, heading out into the sound and lost service. So, they were not able to hear anything that was going on when they were being recognized. So, in an effort to make it a little more fair to them, we figured put them in the first five minutes of the meeting, that way they can go on about their day. So, when we have those, you will see that it's an agenda item. Then we have old business, new business reports, public comments, if and when applicable.

1:47:32.430 --> 1:47:55.200

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then the conclusion will look a little bit different. We will have announcements, a request for future agenda items section where the Board can request items for the next meeting that they would like to have on there. That is not the only place to do that. I'm sure the Board is well aware. Feel free to send us an e-mail when things come up. But just a place where, "Something came up in the meeting. I want to make sure it's on the next agenda." That's a really great place to add that as well.

1:47:56.460 --> 1:48:4.30

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then we will be going over all of the action items and the items for the next meeting that have been added.

1:48:6.170 --> 1:48:12.280

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then when we have cases that need to go before the Board for review, that will occur after new business.

1:48:14.840 --> 1:48:15.180

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Next one.

1:48:19.470 --> 1:48:38.990

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So the life of a motion is pretty simple. You make a motion. Somebody seconds the motion. The Board discusses the motion. And then there is a vote on it. According to Robert's Rules, you will see three different types of motions. But the main one that we will use is the main motion. This is just simply introducing an item before the membership for consideration and vote.

1:48:41.570 --> 1:48:42.360

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Board Member Webb.

1:48:43.780 --> 1:48:55.720

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Yeah, I'm just curious. These processes are drafted in the Charter, and just wanted to, kind of, bring that up.

1:49:3.670 --> 1:49:4.240

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Yes it will.

1:48:57.950 --> 1:49:4.990

Webb, Eileen (Member)

If that is going to be, you know, if the Charter is going to survive and live, would this be part of it? But go ahead. Thank you.

1:49:5.430 --> 1:49:5.960

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

It will.

1:49:9.710 --> 1:49:18.160

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So, motions that are presented by obtaining the floor. Wait until the last speaker has finished and get the Chair's attention.

1:49:19.840 --> 1:49:24.970

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Nice and easy in this digital environment. We just get to raise the digital hand.

1:49:26.240 --> 1:49:47.480

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Make your motion. When you do, speak clearly and concisely. Always state a motion in the affirmative. So, "I move that we..." rather than "I move that we do not..." So, if you are looking at denying something, instead of saying, "I move that we do not approve that..." you would say, "I move that we deny..." and stating it in an affirmative way.

1:49:48.750 --> 1:49:51.970

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then avoid personalities and stay on your subject.

1:49:52.720 --> 1:49:55.620

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

After you make your motion, wait for somebody to second it.

1:49:56.100 --> 1:50:1.330

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

After, if there is no immediate second, the Chair will call for a second.

1:50:2.120 --> 1:50:3.370

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And we can go to the next one.

1:50:6.140 --> 1:50:27.30

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If there is no second, the motion dies and is lost. If there is a second, the Chair should restate the motion, "It's been moved and seconded that we..." and then open the item up for debate. If there is no further debate, the motion moves to be voted on.

1:50:32.680 --> 1:50:48.10

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

A motion can always be expanded on. A lot of times as discussions occur, things change, the Board realizes we need to expand this motion. And they can always be expanded on at that time.

1:50:48.830 --> 1:50:55.710

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And then, once all of that debate has occurred, the Chair will put it before the group for a vote.

1:51:1.440 --> 1:51:7.110

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

There are two ways to vote, although we only use the vote by voice.

1:51:8.600 --> 1:51:16.650

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If something occurs that we need a roll call vote, we can address that at that point. But I don't think we really have too many issues with that.

1:51:22.450 --> 1:51:50.80

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Other commonly used motions are a motion to table. The item needs additional consideration, needs additional information. You can always use that motion to table to that later date. Or you can do a motion to postpone indefinitely. You've reached the end of the item and it doesn't really need to go anywhere. It doesn't need an approval. It doesn't need a denial. It doesn't need to move forward. It's just kind of dead. Then you can use that motion to postpone indefinitely. And that is the end of the item.

1:51:53.0 --> 1:52:16.850

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So in summary, parliamentary procedure is the best way to get things done at your meeting, but it only works when used properly. Only allow motions that are in order. Have members obtain the floor properly. Speak clearly and concisely. Always obey the rules of debate. And most importantly, be courteous. I don't think we have any, an issue with that on any of our Boards, but always a good reminder. So, are there any questions on parliamentary procedures?

1:52:18.450 --> 1:52:18.720

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK.

1:52:21.610 --> 1:52:30.60

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

All right. Ethics in Public Service. This is one that was specifically requested by our boards when we started putting these trainings together, so we are providing it to everyone.

1:52:30.840 --> 1:52:47.740

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Board and commission members should not have a financial interest or engage in business or professional activities that conflict with the performance of their official duties. They should not use their state position to secure special privileges or exemptions for themselves or for others.

1:52:48.800 --> 1:53:5.210

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

They should not receive compensation for, or from another source, other than the state of Washington, for the performance or nonperformance of their official duties. And they should not receive a gift if it could be reasonably expected to influence the performance or nonperformance of your official duties.

1:53:6.950 --> 1:53:15.610

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I know this will be overly familiar with those of you who are state employees. But going over it for everyone just to be safe.

1:53:16.390 --> 1:53:21.120

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

A conflict of interest involves a concept of benefit and bias.

1:53:22.110 --> 1:53:41.360

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Questions to ask yourself when evaluating potential conflict of interest include, "will your interest benefit as the result of your official action?" and "would it be, or would a reasonable person conclude that a private or personal interest impairs your independent and impartial judgment in the exercise of your official duties?"

1:53:44.680 --> 1:54:9.790

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Some conflicts are very clearly defined, such as acquiring, or acquiring a benefit or financial interest in a contract or transaction that is under your authority or supervision as a board or commission, or accepting compensation from someone else who is, or who has benefited from your actions or inactions as a Board Member.

1:54:12.40 --> 1:54:32.510

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Other types are not so obvious and are determined on a case-by-case basis. These include non-financial interests, professional or business activities or obligations that conflict with the performance of your official duties, and the use of your official position to secure or convey a special privilege or exemption for yourself or for others.

1:54:35.640 --> 1:54:56.430

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

As representatives of the state, you may not accept gifts, gratuities or favors if the gift, gratuity or favor could reasonably be expected to influence your performance or nonperformance of your duties, or if the gift gratuity or favorite could be considered part of a reward for action or inaction of your official duties.

1:54:59.680 --> 1:55:18.10

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

You may accept gifts if neither of the prior conditions are met. However, there are some limitations. You may accept a gift of up to \$50.00 in value, per calendar year, from a single source, or a single gift of up to \$50.00 from multiple sources.

1:55:22.930 --> 1:55:36.140

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Gifts maybe given to family, or gifts given to family members may also be subject to this \$50.00 limit, unless that family member has an independent family connection, personal association, or social relationship with that gift donor.

1:55:39.260 --> 1:56:5.170

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Resolution of conflicts rely on disclosure and recusal. If you find that you have a conflict of interest that could benefit you, or could benefit from your official actions or might bias your judgment, it's best to recuse yourself and abstain from participation and discussion or consideration and in any voting on the matter.

1:56:9.850 --> 1:56:27.980

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The state ethics law also limits the use of state resources for, outside of the use of, for official state business. Resources include equipment, office or conference space, vehicles, supplies, postage, time, and personnel.

1:56:34.420 --> 1:56:56.100

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Each, or personal use is considered to be de minimis only if each of the following conditions are met: has little or no cost to the state, the use is brief, the use occurs infrequently, it does not interfere with the performance of any state official or employees official duties, and does not compromise the security or integrity of state property, information systems, or software.

1:56:59.560 --> 1:57:21.540

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Personal use is considered de minimis only if each of the following conditions are met: It is not for the purpose of conducting business uh outside business, in furtherance of private employment, or to realize a private financial gain, and is not for supporting, promoting the interests of, or soliciting an outside organization or group.

1:57:25.240 --> 1:57:31.960

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I know I went through that pretty quickly. Are there any..? Oh, sorry. You can go back Susan.

1:57:33.770 --> 1:57:42.40

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And finally, maintaining confidential information. As you all know, our regulatory boards do have access to confidential information.

1:57:43.360 --> 1:57:56.280

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And if you have access to that confidential information, as a reminder, this information may not be disclosed unless provided for by law. And confidential information may not be used for personal benefit or for the benefit of others.

1:57:57.60 --> 1:57:58.140

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

So are there any questions?

1:57:59.840 --> 1:58:3.560

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK. Last one. Public Records Disclosure.

1:58:4.710 --> 1:58:11.70

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Again, I know this is a repeat for a lot of you. But for those of you, it is not...

1:58:12.300 --> 1:58:31.290

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Why does it matter for board and commission, or a board or commission to care about public records?

Well, state agencies and boards are required to have available for public inspection and copying any records, such as procedural rules and statements of general policy and other records, written or electronic, pertaining to board business.

1:58:34.980 --> 1:59:3.870

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

The RCW defines this as any writing that is prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local government agency, and which pertains, which contains information that relates to the conduct of government or the performance of any governmental or proprietary function. This does include traditional written documents, emails, audio recordings, text messages, photographs, and online content including websites, social media, tweets, etc.

1:59:7.360 --> 1:59:12.220

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Not everything is disclosable such as personally identifying... Oh, Board Member Webb.

1:59:14.440 --> 1:59:30.150

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Hi. I would have chatted through to our Chairperson, but I need to leave. I've got another appointment at 12 and I was hoping... Thought this meeting was over at noon. But I really apologize. I do have another obligation at 12. So sorry, gotta go.

1:59:31.410 --> 1:59:32.20

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Bye.

1:59:32.400 --> 1:59:33.330

Struthers, James (Chair)

Goodbye. Take care.

1:59:33.870 --> 1:59:34.550

Webb, Eileen (Member)

Thanks, bye.

1:59:38.100 --> 1:59:56.820

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

OK. Personally Identifying Information is not disclosable. This includes Social Security numbers, driver's license numbers, residential addresses, financial information, including credit or debit card information, emergency contact information, and personal information about employees, appointees, or elected officials.

2:0:0.140 --> 2:0:22.910

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If your records are requested, the requests are submitted through the Department of Licensing. Staff will coordinate with you on getting anything that is under that request. And then we'll coordinate the fulfillment of the request, including handling any legal reviews and making sure that any information that needs to be redacted is.

2:0:28.480 --> 2:0:38.230

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If you are contacted by a member of the media, we included this with public disclosure because this is sometimes where it occurs.

2:0:38.710 --> 2:1:18.410

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

If you happen to be contacted by a Member of the media, the best practice is to communicate that request with your board and commission staff, to coordinate with our communications team for input and tracking, anticipate community interests around any particular item, including industry and public events, and keep your focus on the business of the board or commission. What not to do is to share personal opinions or air grievances, lobby for any legislative action, answer questions you don't know the answer to or are not comfortable with asking, or risk your personal integrity, the integrity of others, the integrity of the Board, the profession, DOL, or anyone else by making thoughtless or unwarranted remarks.

2:1:21.0 --> 2:1:22.510

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

And are there any questions?

2:1:24.110 --> 2:1:38.590

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

I know I flew through that. This information is in your packet for you to reference back to. Thank you for hanging with me. I know that that was a few extra minutes out of your day, but just helped us make sure that you were all up to speed with the rest of our boards.

2:1:43.390 --> 2:1:51.530

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, so with that, I'd like to move on to public comment. It looks like we do have somebody from the public out there.

2:1:52.360 --> 2:2:0.970

Struthers, James (Chair)

And so I'd like to open the floor to anybody who may want to speak. Jennifer Saltonstall, I believe.

2:2:1.640 --> 2:2:2.620

Struthers, James (Chair)

Did I get your name correct?

2:2:4.470 --> 2:2:16.40

Saltonstall, Jennifer (Public)

Hi. Yeah. Jennifer Saltonstall. I'm here as a licensed Hydrogeologist from my company. We have a question on titles, professional titles.

2:2:16.710 --> 2:2:46.860

Saltonstall, Jennifer (Public)

Our company has business cards that list our name and our practice and our staff classification. So, for example, Mr. Smith has a Bachelor of Science degree in geology but hasn't taken the ASBOG fundamentals or otherwise. Can they be called a Geologist on the business card and e-mail signature? My understanding is no. And then, if Geologist is not allowed, is Geoscientist allowed?

2:2:47.60 --> 2:2:52.980

Saltonstall, Jennifer (Public)

Or is that considered a synonym for a Geologist? Thank you.

2:3:3.30 --> 2:3:12.880

Struthers, James (Chair)

So I think that we're not necessarily allowed to respond or answer the question directly is my understanding.

2:3:14.730 --> 2:3:15.400

Struthers, James (Chair)

But.

2:3:17.150 --> 2:3:24.830

Struthers, James (Chair)

I think we're going to be writing a little bit of clarification on working titles, kind of pursue it to some of the discussion in this meeting.

2:3:26.90 --> 2:3:39.450

Struthers, James (Chair)

So I would refer you to both the WAC, and if you need additional clarification on that, please reach out to the staff and the Board will respond accordingly.

2:3:46.990 --> 2:4:1.100

Struthers, James (Chair)

And I do not believe there's any other public, members of the public here. So, like to move on to conclusions. And are there any announcements by the Members of the Board or staff at this time?

2:4:3.170 --> 2:4:4.610

Struthers, James (Chair)

Secretary Brock.

2:4:6.900 --> 2:4:12.730

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Well, it's unfortunate that Eileen had to get off early because I just wanted to thank her for her eight years of Board service.

2:4:13.890 --> 2:4:16.60

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Hopefully the Board can pass that along to her.

2:4:18.310 --> 2:4:44.870

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

You know, I know that she can stay on until we replace her, and I don't know if she has a desire to do that. But she's been a very valuable Member of the Board for the last eight years. And I think everyone who has been on the Board with her for a long or a short period of time appreciates her participation and work on the Board. And I'm sure we'll continue to see her, as she is involved in ASBOG. So that's all, that's all I wanted to say.

2:4:45.400 --> 2:4:50.140

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, definitely. I second that sentiment. It's so unfortunate that she had to duck out.

2:4:52.700 --> 2:4:53.10

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Um.

2:4:53.400 --> 2:4:53.800

Struthers, James (Chair)

Deb.

2:4:55.630 --> 2:4:56.270

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Can you hear me?

2:4:56.980 --> 2:4:57.450

Struthers, James (Chair)

We can.

2:4:57.920 --> 2:5:15.860

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

OK, good. I wasn't getting any feedback. Thank you for bringing that up, Carla. We will make sure that

we have recognition for Eileen at the next Board meeting. We'll have a certificate and a plaque to present to her. So, I think our understanding is that she has one more Board meeting to attend in June.

2:5:17.470 --> 2:5:22.80

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

If I got that wrong, we will make sure that we reach out to her and provide her with that.

2:5:25.500 --> 2:5:30.460

Struthers, James (Chair)

Yeah, I think my understanding was that she was not going to be at the next meeting.

2:5:31.290 --> 2:5:33.380

Struthers, James (Chair)

So I think you will have to reach out to her.

2:5:36.410 --> 2:5:45.390

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

We will definitely do that then. Thank you for bringing that up. And I'm sorry. We didn't realize this was her last meeting or we would have made sure to publicly thank her as well.

2:5:49.40 --> 2:5:59.450

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK, moving on. I believe it's over to you, Susan, to kind of talk about future agenda items and review action items for the meeting.

2:6:0.350 --> 2:6:1.20

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

Yeah.

2:6:3.280 --> 2:6:23.260

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

So I have, from the 6.2, for the HG, the LG/HG best practices: set up a committee for the draft statement, potentially with Secretary Tebb and Board Member Struthers.

2:6:24.900 --> 2:6:52.560

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

There was a question from Vice Chair Brock about the spring exam, and Sydney will check into the numbers from the exam. And there was also a question from Board Members Struthers about releasing the testing information with ASBOG, and Deb said that she would check into, check and see if Oregon will release their testing information earlier.

2:6:55.310 --> 2:7:7.400

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

There was another action item brought up about the budget asking for a reallocation so that there can be attendance, allowance for attendance for the COE.

2:7:8.180 --> 2:7:12.990

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

And then we will have a standing agenda item for the establishment of Board goals.

2:7:13.880 --> 2:7:19.330

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

And an action item for an update for a new Board Member, like the status of it.

2:7:21.770 --> 2:7:25.820

Nieves, Susan (DOL)

And if I've missed anything else, you can let me know, I'll add it to the list.

2:7:34.390 --> 2:7:34.950

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK.

2:7:36.20 --> 2:7:45.20

Struthers, James (Chair)

Does anyone on Board or staff have any additional comment for this meeting, or additional things to say? I know we're a little bit overtime.

2:7:49.730 --> 2:7:55.20

Struthers, James (Chair)

And with that, the time is 12:09 and... Oh, no.

2:7:55.390 --> 2:7:57.40

Struthers, James (Chair)

Board Member Tebb.

2:7:59.380 --> 2:8:0.100

Struthers, James (Chair)

No, you're fine.

2:7:57.900 --> 2:8:12.570

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

I apologize. Not to keep us any longer. In regards to the training we just received, you mentioned something that we needed to sign, some document or some sort of certification that we received the training. Is that something that will take place at the next Board meeting?

2:8:13.650 --> 2:8:21.990

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

No. Susan will be emailing that out to you guys either later today or tomorrow morning. And then we'll just need you guys to sign that and send it back and we'll keep it on file.

2:8:23.120 --> 2:8:24.80

Tebb, Thomas (Member)

Alright, thank you very much.

2:8:27.640 --> 2:8:36.190

Struthers, James (Chair)

OK. With that, the time is 12:09 and this meeting is adjourned. The next Board meeting is on May 11th at 10:00 AM.

2:8:37.290 --> 2:8:44.270

Struthers, James (Chair)

And it will be virtual. So, like to thank everybody for attending and providing, providing your input.

2:8:48.830 --> 2:8:49.540

Allen-Bâ, Debra (DOL)

Thanks so much.

2:8:49.730 --> 2:8:50.130

Muhle, Sydney (DOL)

Thank you.

2:8:48.920 --> 2:8:50.640

Brock, Carla (Secretary)

Thanks everybody. Bye.

2:8:49.830 --> 2:8:51.60

Struthers, James (Chair)

Bye. Take care everybody.

2:8:52.460 --> 2:8:53.110

Hanell, Casey (Vice Chair)

Take care.