

**GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES**

Thursday, September 19, 2024

8:30 a.m.

Virtual Public Meeting

**1) Call to Order:** (Linda Kozlowski, Board Chair)

Chair Kozlowski called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.

**2) Introductions:** (Linda Kozlowski, Board Chair, and Staff)

Chair Linda Kozlowski, Vice-Chair Anne MacDonald, Board Members Diane Teeman, and Tiffany Thomas were in attendance via Zoom video/phone. Board Member Ruth Dittrich was not in attendance.

Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) Staff in attendance:

Ruarri Day-Stirrat – Director/State Geologist

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager

Lori Calarruda, Recording Secretary/Executive Assistant

Alex Lopez, Public Affairs Coordinator

Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

Laura Gabel, KPM Coordinator and Coastal Field Geologist

Nicole Ledbetter, MLRR Permit Specialist

Clayton Bowden, MLRR Permit Specialist

Others in attendance:

Diane Lloyd, Department of Justice (DOJ)

Katie Bannikov, Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO)

Kendra Beck, DAS Office of the Chief Financial Officer

1 **3) Review Minutes of June 25, 2024, and July 22, 2024 Special Board Meeting:**

2 Chair Kozlowski asked if there were any changes to the minutes as presented. No changes.

3

4 Board Action: **MacDonald moved to approve the minutes of June 25, 2024, and July 22, 2024**  
5 **Special Board Meeting as submitted. Teeman seconded. Yes Votes: Kozlowski; MacDonald;**  
6 **Teeman and Thomas. Motion carried.**

7

8 **4) Financial Report:**

9 Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer, presented the DOGAMI FY2021 Budget Status Report, as of  
10 July 31, 2024, for the Geological Survey and Services (GS&S) and Mineral Land Regulation &  
11 Reclamation (MLRR) programs. The Board Packet contained the financial actuals, graphs, and  
12 projections.

13

14 Dahlberg said DOGAMI's General Fund expenditure budget is \$7.8M with projected expenditures to  
15 be \$7.5M, resulting in the Agency being \$300,000 underbudget. Other Funds Expenditure Limitation  
16 is \$2.6M with projected expenditures to be \$2.2M resulting in the Agency being \$400,000 under the  
17 Expenditure Limitation. Federal Funds Expenditure Limitation is close to \$5.7M with project  
18 expenditures of \$3.5M resulting in the Agency being under \$2.2M under the Expenditure Limitation.  
19 Dahlberg explained that the Expenditure Limitation is not money DOGAMI has to give back, but is  
20 actually an amount it can spend up to as long as the Agency has the revenues to cover the expenses.  
21 The Federal Funds for this biennium were planned 2-3 years ago, but the federal funders did not  
22 come through with the anticipated Lidar projects, so the actual amount is less than expected. There  
23 are fourteen active federal grants, and several others that are closing out.

24  
25 The MLRR Expenditure Limitation is \$5.2M with projected biennium expenditures of \$5.7M. The  
26 Agency will ask for an increase in the Expenditure Limitation at the December Emergency Board (E-  
27 Board) to get the Program back in balance. The 6-month operating reserve is almost on target.

28  
29 Chair Kozlowski asked if there is any concern over the Federal Funds given the changes going on.  
30 Dahlberg said from a financial perspective the Agency had had staff resource projects and Lidar  
31 projects, but in the most recent round of grant proposals the Lidar projects are not there, but the  
32 staff resource projects as doing well. Day-Stirrat added that Lidar is a little soft, but the Agency  
33 continues to look for opportunities, and the other areas of the federal grants are up so there are no  
34 concerns.

35  
36 Dahlberg briefly discussed a graph showing the 2023-25 General Fund Utilized Budget, and reviewed  
37 the GS&S General Fund, Other Funds, and Federal Funds Summaries that reflect the high level  
38 numbers for the budget, actuals and projections. He stated as long as it stays green, everything is  
39 good.

40  
41 Dahlberg briefly reviewed the MLRR Other Funds and MLRR ePermitting General Fund Summaries.  
42 He stated for the ePermitting Project, the Agency is working with DAS to go through a special  
43 procurement process and is currently following steps to keep it on track since DOGAMI is  
44 wanting/planning to use the DEQ platform.

45  
46 Dahlberg reviewed and explained graph details for the GS&S Grants 2019-28, stating the Agency is  
47 doing well and has a healthy outlook. The Agency works closely with the LFO and CFO Analysts on a  
48 monthly basis to keep everyone in tuned with what is happening with the Agency, where the State is  
49 looking, and any concerns.

50  
51 Chair Kozlowski said she remembered the financial reports from 3-4 years ago. The details of the  
52 reports now are impressive and the relationship with LFO and CFO has strengthened. This is a major  
53 step forward. She commended Dahlberg and the staff for an excellent job and thanked him and Day-  
54 Stirrat for providing the data to the Board.

55  
56 Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if there is any talk about having more higher resolution Lidar in the  
57 areas not currently covered on the map in the Board Packet, and if there are any potential staff  
58 limitations on the upcoming grants that may require different strategies to implement them. Day-  
59 Stirrat said the Lidar is a little soft because DOGAMI is the Lidar Consortium for the State, which  
60 requires putting together multiple funding and interest groups to come up with a collective, and  
61 USGS has stopped funding Lidar and doing the acquisitions themselves, but he does not know why.

62 This is a challenge long term for the Agency. Staff capacity right now is a challenge, as part of federal  
63 grants the Agency has to fill in current and pending staff, and senior staff are fully committed the  
64 next 1-3 years. The Agency must be creative in handling them by looking at interns, partnering with  
65 universities, or the need for limited duration (LD) staff to help complete the grants. There may also  
66 be the need to leave some opportunities on the table due to capacity.

67  
68 Teeman echoed Chair Kozlowski’s comments on the improved budget reporting and stated she uses  
69 the Agency as an example of how things can really turn around. With regards to repeat Lidar, a good  
70 portion of the State does not have high resolution Lidar, she thinks this is a good argument to go back  
71 and offer the State that higher resolution that is available now.

72  
73 Board Action: **Teeman moved to accept the Budget Status Report as presented. Thomas seconded.**  
74 **Yes Votes: Kozlowski; MacDonald; Teeman and Thomas. Motion carried.**  
75

76 **5) Agency Key Performance Measures (KPMs) Annual Update:**

77 Laura Gabel, Coastal Field Geologist and KPM Coordinator, reviewed the Agency’s Annual Key  
78 Performance Measures (KPMs), including the Annual Assessment by the Board. Day-Stirrat also  
79 provided a brief background on the KPMs and what they are for. He noted that KPM 2, Geologic Map  
80 Completion, was originally drafted to focus on mapping close to Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs)  
81 and populations, but due to interest around critical minerals, it has changed, and the Agency is now  
82 mapping in areas where no one is living. Both metrics are valid, as the total for the State is tracked,  
83 not just the relation to population.

84  
85 Chair Kozlowski stated the KPMs are critical and watched closely, and sometimes need to be changed  
86 occasionally to match the current focus of the Agency. It is important to measure what the Agency’s  
87 performance is, and the KPMs do a good job reflecting that.

88  
89 Thomas asked clarifying questions regarding the Executive Director’s performance expectations, and  
90 if they are based on the same performance criteria discussed during the review process. Day-Stirrat  
91 replied he thought the question is has the Board followed the State 360 Review Process to assess the  
92 Director’s performance, and the answer is yes because it was completed in June. Thomas stated the  
93 questions must not be forward looking but all retrospective. Day-Stirrat agreed.

94  
95 Thomas asked clarifying questions regarding the meanings of terms for the Board Questions,  
96 particularly “others”, and if it refers to internally within the Board, Department, or externally to other  
97 Departments. Day-Stirrat answered historically the Board has taken it to mean everything internally  
98 and externally to the Board, Agency, and other State agencies.

99  
100 Thomas asked if the Board had reviewed its management practices as part of the recent cycle or if it  
101 is something that is a periodic structured review. Chair Kozlowski stated her opinion is the Board is  
102 already doing that by watching the finances and working together to make sure best practices are  
103 followed. She added Thomas was asking great clarifying questions and it is important Board  
104 Members understand what they are agreeing with. A brief discussion took place, and clarifying the  
105 terminology for KPM 6, the Board’s Annual Assessment, will be done at a later meeting.

106  
107 Thomas asked if the gap areas not covered for risk assessments is driven in part by the population  
108 needs (KPM 1: Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion). Day-Stirrat said one part is due to where

109 the Urban Growth Boundaries are located, and the second part is the Agency’s ability to secure  
110 external funding. However, hazard assessments have been done in all Oregon counties. Gabel added  
111 that county wide risk assessments do not always overlap an Urban Growth Boundary, but are  
112 included in the KPM calculation.

113  
114 Chair Kozlowski asked how the Program came up with 20% of mine sites (KPM 4: Mine Site  
115 Inspections). Lewis said it was determined that all active sites could be inspected over a 5-year cycle,  
116 given the current staffing level and activity. If activity were to increase, they would not be able to  
117 meet the 20% target. Vice-Chair MacDonald added that water quality permits typically have a 5-year  
118 renewal period, so this is a good benchmark for other related permitted activities.

119  
120 Chair Kozlowski asked why the survey responses were up for MLRR (KPM 5: Customer Service). Lewis  
121 said the Board had previously asked that the surveys go out more frequently and in different ways,  
122 which has been done.

123  
124 The Board completed their Annual Assessment by answering the required 15 questions, which  
125 included review of the Annual Performance Progress Report, also known as the KPMs that will be  
126 submitted to DAS.

127  
128 **Board Action: MacDonald moved approve the revisions to the 2024 Annual Progress Performance**  
129 **Report as presented. Teeman seconded. Yes Votes: Kozlowski; MacDonald; Teeman and Thomas.**  
130 **Motion carried.**

131  
132 **6) Presentation(s): Vertical Evacuation Structures and Customizing Evacuation Maps:**

133 Laura Gabel, Coastal Field Geologist and KPM Coordinator, presented on Vertical Evacuation  
134 Structures and Customizing Evacuation Maps.

135  
136 Gabel has been looking at tsunami evacuation and increasing survivability through vertical  
137 evacuation structures (VES) in Seaside and Cannon Beach, this specific presentation was focused on  
138 Seaside. The project is funded by the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program (NTHMP) and the  
139 focus is to improve life safety, and the number of people that can successfully evacuate from a  
140 tsunami for communities where high ground is difficult to reach. It is being done by identifying and  
141 prioritizing mitigation ideas focused on vertical evacuation, bridges and large-scale infrastructure.  
142 She explained the pilot program in detail.

143  
144 In communities where high ground is difficult to attain for many people, an alternative solution is to  
145 bring high ground to the people, but it must be a structure engineered to withstand the shaking of a  
146 Cascadia earthquake, survive the forces of tsunami waves, and people on the building surviving the  
147 event in that location. These are challenging buildings to commit to, and agree to construct and  
148 fund. She showed several examples of evacuation structures and said Washington State is leading  
149 the way on this, but they have a much different coastline that Oregon. They have developed a  
150 manual for how to build one, that includes how to move through all the steps. Oregon is currently  
151 developing a similar manual through NTHMP funding, which will be published before the end of the  
152 year.

153

154 Gabel said they worked with Seaside throughout the process to ensure the city understood what was  
155 being done, and their concerns and issues were heard. The city has been reviewing the report to  
156 ensure they can use what is in it for their future asks to FEMA for vertical evacuation structures.  
157

158 Gabel walked the Board through the detailed report results presentation, which focused specifically  
159 on the 20 minutes after the event, and showed the flow of the tsunami into the city. Gabel reviewed  
160 and discussed several scenarios and outcomes for different number of vertical evacuation sites and  
161 people who may be in Seaside on a given day. This also include the impact of the bridges surviving  
162 the earthquake. She stated this is a hypothetical exercise, and the proposed VES sites are not vetted  
163 beyond conversations with Seaside.  
164

165 Gabel added that in addition to having conversations with Seaside staff, Emergency Manager, City  
166 Planner, and City Manager, she has presented this information to their City Council. The City  
167 Manager asked the City Council to restructure their 5 year Public Safety Plan because they had listed  
168 retrofitting all the bridges as their number one priority, and the identified vertical evacuation  
169 structure with the parking garage was number four. They are now thinking of swapping them  
170 because they recognize that their dollars could be better spent elsewhere. Gabel added that Director  
171 Day-Stirrat and Jon Allan had recently presented this information to Representative Suzanne  
172 Bonamici, and they are starting to showcase this work on a broader scale to provide assistance to  
173 other coastal communities.  
174

175 Chair Kozlowski said the data provided is so amazing, and has had a huge impact on Seaside since the  
176 focus has been on investing on the bridges, which is a stark difference in terms of where the best  
177 investment would be in VES. The access to get out of the inundation zone is really challenging.  
178

179 Vice-Chair MacDonald said this a great first start, but should also include the day visitors and the  
180 capacity of the structures. This information is good for prioritizing which is the best bang for the  
181 buck, but not good for setting community expectations, as people tend to latch on to numbers and  
182 not context. It is important to set some expectations for survivability and the inverse casualties, and  
183 if it is a parking structure, what is the realistic capacity for additional people and what would the cost  
184 be to design it. Gabel said the capacity of existing structures is 1,000 people, and they are talking a  
185 minimum of 4,000 people, which does not include the potential 10,000 to 20,000 day visitors that will  
186 predominantly be clustered in that area. There are companies designing the structures that are  
187 thinking about those challenges.  
188

189 Thomas asked if there are any existing structures in the model that are tall enough, that could be  
190 retrofitted for stability to survive a tsunami. Gabel said just a few hotels that might, but they have  
191 not been assessed for their ability to withstand a tsunami or what it would cost to do so. Thomas  
192 asked if the parking structure is still preliminary or currently being planned. Gabel said she had  
193 distinct impression they are not moving forward with the parking garage at this time, but may in the  
194 future. Thomas added this is really cool work. Gabel replied she loves the work she does and is  
195 extremely rewarding to work closely with the users of the data.  
196

197 In Gabel's next presentation, she reviewed evacuation maps. DOGAMI has been making different  
198 evacuations maps for a long time, and believe that visitors/tourists are at a disadvantage over locals  
199 at the Oregon coast, but recognize the need to meet people where they are in order to have them  
200 willing to get the information they need. There is an online viewer that can be accessed by phone,  
201 with routes that show the way to safety. There are evacuation maps, but they are meant for a single

202 location or section of town. The Coastal Team has been working with hotels to assist guests get to  
203 safety quicker, and have now developed an automated way to generate evacuation maps for any  
204 location/specific point of interest, not just a specific area, that provides the route to the nearest high  
205 ground from that location. It includes how far the walk is and how many minutes you have to walk it.  
206 She showed an example for the La Quinta Inn, stating the hotel plans to print these on hard plastic  
207 and place them on the back of every hotel room door like a fire escape map. The new automated  
208 ability makes it really quick to make and share them, and they have been creating them for several  
209 hotels. Gabel has been handing them out to people at City Hall as outreach material. The ultimate  
210 goal is to make the tool available online for people to use for themselves and take DOGAMI out of  
211 the equation of generating the maps. The Coastal Team is excited about this new ability and she  
212 gave kudos to Fletch O'Brien for the work he has done to make it an efficient and doable process.

213  
214 Chair Kozlowski asked when this would be available to use on cell phones. Gabel said technically  
215 there is an online viewer on Oregontsunami.org that you can use now, but the routing information  
216 does not get included in the final PDF it generates. There is also a phone app for the online tsunami  
217 zone viewer, but it does not have the capacity to do routing and is hosted on an outside platform so  
218 it is limited. DOGAMI has been having conversations on how to bring some of it in house and make it  
219 available on its own servers.

220  
221 Vice-Chair MacDonald thought McMenamins and other brew pubs would be great partners on this.  
222 Gabel stated they are doing their best to get out there to reach out to hotels, in addition to their  
223 other work. MacDonald suggested contacting the GIS Program at Portland Community College to  
224 have them produce some of these maps, as the Capstone class does public interest projects.

225  
226 Teeman said there has been a lot of work done archaeologically and with the indigenous  
227 communities on the coast around tsunamis and their behavior that is reoccurring. She asked if there  
228 has been any work done to incorporate the additional oral history and utilized in the modeling.  
229 Gabel answered yes, that has been incorporated into the modeling along with modeling DOGAMI did  
230 in 2009-2013, which ultimately led to all the maps they work with today. She said they do reach out  
231 to the Tribes in the areas they are working in and invite them to come to the table to discuss tsunami  
232 evacuation. Some have joined to specifically discuss evacuation of Tribal lands and what is important  
233 to them in the context of tsunami preparedness and evacuation.

234  
235 Chair Kozlowski said OEM had a program to reach out to the hospitality industry and asked if they  
236 have reached out to Althea about any partnership. Gabel said OEM has not been doing outreach  
237 since the pandemic but they are starting to reach out to County Emergency Managers to rebuild  
238 connections. They came up with a 15 minute online training in English and Spanish, called the  
239 Tsunami Safe Module, to help staff know what they should do in the event of a tsunami. The Coastal  
240 Team would really love to share with businesses the customizable maps and encourage them to have  
241 staff take the training.

242  
243 Vice-Chair MacDonald said it sounds like a project for the Scouts, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts.

244  
245 Chair Kozlowski stated it was a great presentation and she loved the graphics. She thinks since it is  
246 post COVID and people are starting to re-engage, this is a good time to have this information out  
247 there. Kozlowski said she would like to work with Gabel for hospitality outreach in her area.

248  
249 Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296

7) **MLRR Update:**

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager, provided an update on MLRR. Lewis stated the Board Packet contained a wealth of information about the MLRR Update. The map in the packet is the same one that appeared for the MLRR KPM. It shows all the mine sites across the State, blue means current permitting activity, yellow are sites that have submitted their renewal reports in the last 3 months, and green are site visits done in the last 6 months.

Permit Status Summary

Lewis stated permit numbers are stable, there are 84 applications, which is two more than last quarter. These numbers are point in time metrics when the report was pulled, and could be different now. She reviewed the overview of the last 3 years of applications received and permits issued. The average processing time for an applications last year was around 12 months. There are two applications that took over 2 years to permit, which can skew the numbers. Since the last Board meeting, MLRR received eleven new applications and issued four permits. The packet included the DOGAMI Mining Permit Application Process and Workload that shows where the applications are in the process. At some point some applications will be removed due to information not being provided or the applicant is not moving forward with due to permit requirements.

Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if there will be tracking of the applications being withdrawn, as she thinks it will be helpful on ePermitting. Lewis said she has grand plans for the chart and explained her future vision.

Lewis introduced two new Permit Specialists, Nicole Ledbetter and Clayton Rowden, who were hired in early summer and on today's call. In addition to the staff hired in early 2024, they are all making a difference in site inspections, application reviews, and general support of the Program. She is hopeful that site inspections will increase over next 12 to 18 months.

Lewis added the Summer Newsletter, which was not ready at the time of the June meeting, was in the packet and the Fall Newsletter will be going out next month. This issue reminds people about the permitting timeline, announced new staff members, provided an overview of the Program's procedures around protecting cultural resources, and discussed inspections and offered some tips.

Grassy Mountain

The Project Coordinating Committee met on September 12, 2024 and heard a presentation from MLRR's contractor on the Environmental Evaluation, the land use findings, and the coordination with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on their parallel process. As part of that, the Environmental Evaluation has been put out on the Agency website for the 14 day public comment period. The comment period closes September 22, 2024. The comments will go to the Technical Review Team (TRT) and DOGAMI, with a planned meeting on October 3, 2024. The TRT will consider accepting the Environmental Evaluation as complete, which would start the 225 day clock to write draft permits for the project. Lewis will report back on the decision at the next Board Meeting. She added that MLRR has a web page dedicated to the Grassy Mountain Project where all the materials, comments and meetings are posted.

Chair Kozlowski asked if they are getting a lot of questions/comments. Lewis said they have received one public comment so far.

297  
298 Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

299  
300 **8) GS&S Update:**

301 Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist, provided the GS&S program update. The Board Packet  
302 contained the extensive report on all the activities for GS&S.

303  
304 Publications: There are 11 publications so far this year, with another 17 publications on deck but  
305 expecting it to be closer to 20 by the end of the year.

306  
307 Grants:  
308 Day-Stirrat highlighted a new program called the US Geological Survey (USGS) National Landslide  
309 Hazard Program. It has a small amount of funding nationally at the moment, but DOGAMI was  
310 successful in receiving a first grant, which is a new landslide funding mechanism into the Agency.  
311 Part of the project requires offering training opportunities for young scientists, DOGAMI will be hiring  
312 two interns from Portland State University (PSU) to work on this grant. This is part of Agency's  
313 Strategic Plan, and this action advances it.

314  
315 Day-Stirrat did not go through all the grants, but stated there are a lot of awards pending. He said  
316 the US Dept of Energy is extremely backlogged with their awards decisions and it is taking a long for  
317 the review process. One award recently announced is called *CaRBTAP*, which is a large project with a  
318 total funding of \$6.25M. It is led by a company called Carbon Solutions LLC out of Michigan, and  
319 DOGAMI is partners with the Washington Geological Survey, Idaho National Lab, Pacific Northwest  
320 National Lab (PNNL), and several other entities. This project will be discussed with the Board at a  
321 later date.

322  
323 Regarding staffing, GS&S successfully hired a permanent NRS 2 Landslide Mapping Geologist – Jessi  
324 Wilder. Wilder has a M.S. degree in Geology from the University of Iceland.

325  
326 For the Geological Society of America (GSA) Annual Meeting, there are 12 abstracts from Agency staff  
327 in the meeting, typically it is 3 to 5 abstracts, which is showing long-term productivity of the GS&S  
328 staff.

329  
330 Day-Stirrat finished by saying the Program is in good health. It is also matched by productivity on  
331 delivering on promises made to funding entities.

332  
333 Vice-Chair MacDonald stated she is happy to see all the GSA presentations and that staff are  
334 attending.

335  
336 Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

337  
338 **9) Director's Report:**

339 Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist, provided a brief update on the Agency.

340  
341 Agency Update



342 Day-Stirrat said quite a few number of staff are going to GSA, the Agency will have a booth in the  
343 exhibit hall, and updated outreach materials have been completed. There will also be a video  
344 promoting the work the Agency does as well. It was filmed on the Coast and in eastern Oregon to  
345 reflect the vastness of the State of Oregon in terms of its geology, and several staff members were  
346 interviewed. A preview will happen at the next Board Meeting.

347  
348 Day-Stirrat said the Agency is busy partnership building. Some of the project now being proposed are  
349 large in nature and cannot be achieved solely by DOGAMI, the Agency is actively partnering with  
350 national labs and universities to advance its work. The U.S. Department of Energy has effectively  
351 mandated that successful grants must be part of an integrated team. This is part of the Strategic Plan  
352 as a way the Agency will operate in the next few years.

353  
354 The Agency is going into the regular grant writing phase. These are the more normal proposals that  
355 are very difficult to write, but more common for the Agency to do. As part of this, the Oregon  
356 Geologic Mapping Advisory Committee (OGMAC) will be meeting on September 30, 2024 to decide  
357 the mapping direction for the next year to write the STATEMAP proposal to USGS.

358  
359 There has been no changes since DOGAMI submitted its Budget, and the Agency is waiting for the  
360 Governor’s Recommended Budget (GRB ) to see the to see what Policy Option Packages (POPs) are  
361 moved forward.

362  
363 Lopez showed the updated postcards and provided more details on the process of creating them, and  
364 gave kudos to Jon Franczyk for all his work on them. Most of the photos came from the Oregon  
365 Scenic Images Archives, which is the Oregon Repository for scenic images of the State.

366  
367 Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

368  
369 **10) Confirm Time and Date for Next Quarterly Meeting and Board Retreat/Special Meeting (October**  
370 **15, 2024:**

371 Chair Kozlowski stated the next DOGAMI Board is currently scheduled for Thursday, December 12,  
372 2024 at 8:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in Portland or via Zoom. She confirmed this date is still acceptable for  
373 the Board.

374  
375 The Board Retreat and Special Meeting are currently scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2024.

376  
377 Vice-Chair Macdonald stated she was signed up for the Symposium on Critical Mineral Resources, she  
378 wanted to make sure there would not be a quorum if other Board Members attended and have it  
379 construed as a meeting. Lloyd said as long as Board Members do not discuss Board business, there  
380 should be no concerns.

381  
382 **11) Public Comment:**

383 Only written comments received prior to or by 12:15 p.m. on the day of the meeting were to be  
384 accepted. Chair Kozlowski asked for any written public comments. No public comments.

385  
386 **12) Board Adjourn:**

387 Chair Kozlowski adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.

388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394

APPROVED

  

---

Linda Kozlowski, Chair