

OREGON STATE BOARD OF GEOLOGIST EXAMINERS

MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 02, 2022

Members Present

Ericka Koss, RG/CEG, PE, Chair
Megan Schettler, RG, Vice Chair
Cindy Bartlett, RG
Adam Reese, RG/CEG
Paul Edison-Lahm, Public Member
Ruarri Day-Stirrat, PhD, State Geologist

Staff Present

Christine Valentine, Administrator

Others Present**

Eileen Webb, RG

*Ex Officio member, did not vote on motions. ** Attendance as noted in minutes.

GIT=Geologist in Training, RG=Registered Geologist, CEG = Certified Engineering Geologist, CE = Continuing Education, ASBOG=National Association of State Boards of Geology, DOGAMI = Dept. of Geology and Mineral Industries

The Board conducted this meeting as a virtual meeting.

Meeting Opened

Chair Koss called the meeting to order at 9:04 AM. All Board members were present virtually along with Administrator Valentine in the Board office. No others were in attendance at this time.

Agenda Review

The Board reviewed the agenda. Valentine said the Board would not be joined by counsel or any invited guests. She had inquiries from two Board registrants about attending and shared details with them on how to join. No one had questions or requested changes to the agenda.

Bartlett moved to approve the agenda as presented. Edison-Lahm seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, Chair Koss called the vote, and all approved.

The Board was joined by Board registrant Webb.

Correspondence/Public Comment

There was no written correspondence or public comment submitted prior to the meeting. Webb stated she was present to listen only and representing only herself. Valentine noted for the record that no one else had joined the virtual meeting to provide public comment.

Bartlett asked Webb if she was willing to answer a few questions related to the Board's geologic and hydrogeologic report guideline documents, as Webb was a Board member in the past and had worked with these documents. Bartlett asked about why a separate hydrogeologic report guideline was created considering the Board does not have a hydrogeologic specialty. Webb stated that the Board decided to prepare the specialty report guideline in response to high profile compliance

cases involving problematic hydrogeology reports. The Board wanted to provide guidance to address short comings it was seeing in these types of reports. The geologic report guidelines were in existence prior to this. Her recollection was that the hydrogeologic geologic report guidelines underwent a high level of peer review. Bartlett thanked Webb for the information and noted that it could be possible to create one report guideline pulling information from the two existing documents. Bartlett planned to continue review of the two documents in coordination with Vice Chair Schettler.

Minutes

Chair Koss noted there were two sets of minutes for review. She asked if there were revisions requested. Bartlett noted a wording change needed in the Administrator Report section of the 09/09/2022 minutes. No other revisions were requested.

Edison-Lahm moved to approve the public session minutes for the 09/09/2022 and 10/24/2022 meetings with revision noted. Bartlett seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Koss called the vote, and all approved.

Consent Agenda/Application Review Report

➤ Consent Agenda: Valentine presented the consent agenda for Board review. For the record, the consent agenda included examination and application approvals from 08/16/2022 – 11/15/2022, debits from 08/16/2022 – 11/03/2022, and checks 5029 to 5065, and CE audits for the April – June 2022 renewals pool, with the exception of audit 22-010 which required separate consideration by the Board.

Edison-Lahm moved to approve the consent agenda. Vice Chair Schettler seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Koss called the vote, and all approved.

➤ Surrender of Registration: For audit 22-010, the registrant requested to surrender registration instead of responding to the CE audit.

Edison-Lahm moved to accept the surrender of registration. Vice Chair Schettler seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Koss called the vote, and all approved.

➤ Application Review Report: Reese thanked Chair Koss for assisting with application reviews during the time he was on an extended vacation. He also shared that Day-Stirrat recently passed the ASBOG exam and has obtained the RG registration. All congratulated Day-Stirrat on this accomplishment.

Old Business

➤ Board Guidelines Review: Chair Koss reported that she was unable to work on review of the engineering geology report guideline in the quarter but hoped to have something to share at the next quarterly meeting. Bartlett reported earlier in the meeting on the pending review of the other two report guidelines.

➤ Affirmative Action – Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (AA/DEI) Statement Update: The draft statement for 2023-2025 that was submitted for state review was shared with the Board. Vice Chair Schettler and Edison-Lahm reported on their work with Valentine to update the statement. The goals have been consolidated and refreshed.

Edison-Lahm mentioned the idea raised by Valentine about updating application forms and the database to allow expanded capture of gender identity. He asked if this work was being

implemented. Valentine said she had not moved forward with this project as she was wanting to obtain input on whether having gender identity on application forms might have the unintended consequence of allowing for bias in the review process. The consensus was that the benefits of supporting gender equity would outweigh the potential risks of bias. Staff could redact the gender information from applications before sending for review, similar to what is done for other sensitive information. Valentine said she would proceed then with implementation of this change. A minor database update would be required first, followed by updates to the Board's application forms.

Compliance Report

➤ Open Complaint Cases: Valentine reported that there were no open cases and no potential cases for the Board's consideration.

➤ Joint Compliance Committee (JCC): The JCC had not met since 09/06/2022. The outcomes of that meeting were shared with the Board at the 09/09/2022 meeting.

Administrator Report

Valentine addressed the following topics from the written report:

➤ ASBOG Updates: The 10/07/2022 exam results were released prior to Thanksgiving. The aggregate results were shared: 16 passed, 7 failed the Fundamentals of Geology (FG) and 13 passed, 2 failed the Practice of Geology (PG). Oregon candidates again had higher passing rates than the national average. While not an ASBOG exam, Valentine shared the engineering geology exam results of 1 passed, 1 failed. The primary application deadline of 12/07/2022 for the March 2023 exams meant that applications were still coming in. The deadline for resubmittal applications of 01/01/2023 extended the application period. Staff felt the rate of applications seemed slow, but often the majority of applications arrive right before or on the deadline.

An updated ASBOG meeting calendar was shared with the Board. The 2023 annual meeting and fall exam review will be held in Spokane, WA. A 2022 report from ASBOG's psychometrician about the exam was also shared with the Board.

Valentine and Schettler attended the ASBOG annual meeting virtually and shared the following updates from the meeting with the Board:

Examination:

- ASBOG is on track with the conversion to computer-based testing (CBT) for 2023.
- ASBOG has released a new Board administrator handbook, and staff are using it already.
- ASBOG will soon be releasing a new candidate handbook.
- ASBOG is working with a contractor on development of a new FG study course with anticipated release sometime in 2023, likely in time to be accessed by candidates for the fall exam. The goal is to provide this at a very low cost to candidates. The course will be module based so that it can be customized to a candidate's needs. Each module will be on a topic area covered on exam. There will also be a module that covers each exam in general. The format will be video with example questions.
- The ASBOG task analysis survey (TAS) was completed and was under analysis at the time of the meeting. The ASBOG psychometrician said the survey indicated there is not a lot of change in what is important to know for practice. This means that the exam blueprint is not expected to change much. The correlation between the 2015 and 2022 task analysis surveys results was very high. Any changes in the exam blueprint would be implemented in fall 2023. There was a reminder given that ASBOG uses input from practitioners and academicians to

determine the FG content but only practitioner input to determine the PG content. Overall, ASBOG received a lot more responses in total this time using an e-survey.

- ASBOG announced a new project for 2023 to build up the exam item banks. The goal is to eventually have enough questions to offer the FG and PG 3 times per year. The project will include a review of the entire item bank and determination of where more questions would be ideal. Participation in this project might be an opportunity for Board registrants to earn some CE hours. The Board might want to consider informing registrants of this opportunity to volunteer with ASBOG. Webb added that the ASBOG exam committee is taking on this project and that she inquired with ASBOG staff about how to get information to registrants. Also, ASBOG has new exam writing guidance that will be used in this effort. The Board asked Valentine to see if ASBOG will share that guidance and to gather information that might support sharing information on this volunteer opportunity with Board registrants.
- ASBOG's long-time psychometrician is finally retiring in 2025. This is a big change, as ASBOG has used the same firm since the exam was developed.

Financials:

- ASBOG in good shape financially, even with CBT and TAS initiatives in 2022.
- ASBOG has seen growth in exam revenues so has not needed to ask member boards for more fees.
- ASBOG recognized and was sensitive to state boards seeing declines in revenues as geologists retire and demographics adjust.

Association of Environmental and Engineering Geologists (AEG):

- They are coming back to Portland for the annual conference (09/19 – 09/24 2023). They are returning since the conference during the pandemic had to be very limited in scope.
- AEG is now hosting exam preparation sessions (unclear if this is by chapter or national).
- AEG has a Student & Young Professionals Committee that might be a connection to explore for future outreach efforts. Reese mentioned the Oregon Chapter has a student chapter at PSU. Sometimes students from other universities also get engaged. Edison-Lahm mentioned coordinating with the student chapter on a prior outreach event.

American Institute of Professional Geologists (AIPG):

- They are interested in exploring a records program for licensed geologists, similar to those run by the exam providers for other professions. But in this case, it would not be ASBOG as exam provider running it. AIPG has staff and mechanisms in place that could support a records program whereas ASBOG does not. The proposal is in early days, and the Board should stay tuned for how this idea evolves. Some boards were concerned about whether they could accept documents from a professional organization vs. an exam provider organization in which they were a member.

Association of American State Geologists (AASG):

- The organization is partnering with AGI on DEI efforts.
- The representative mentioned that for graduate students, 36% of jobs are in state/federal government followed next by the mining industry.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):

- They are encouraging their geologists to pursue state licensure.
- Cost can be an issue for entry level geologists due to low salary with federal jobs and so far, lack of reimbursement since registration is encouraged but not mandated.

Miscellaneous:

- All groups participating in the annual meeting acknowledged the importance of DEI efforts and how partnerships are needed to carry out these efforts. In relation to this, there was a panel discussion about undergraduate curriculum changes and the impact of more universities moving to non-traditional degree programs. The panel discussed finding a balance between requiring core geology coursework and flexibility for students. For non-traditional degree programs, there was a question raised about how to educate student advisors about how coursework links to future licensure. Alternatives to traditional field camp were discussed due to impacts of cost and schedule on some students. Webb added that the CA board did research into geologic coursework with universities as part of a review of its education requirements. She offered to send the CA report to the Board. Outreach to faculty about licensure requirements was mentioned as important since most faculty have never worked outside of academia so may not have much understanding of licensure.
- The pros and cons of CE were discussed. Some were concerned that inconsistencies between states could be problematic. Others felt that CE could help the profession overall be more on par with other professions and be viewed more positively in some circles. Differences between older and younger licensees as to acceptance of CE requirements were mentioned. Vice Chair Schettler mentioned how some states saw a loss of licensees in first few years of CE implementation before levelling out. One more state added CE as a requirement of licensure. A new law went into effect 07/01/2022 in Indiana. The Indiana state board has 2 years to build the CE program, with audits starting after 07/01/2025. Now 11 of 32 ASBOG states have CE requirements as part of licensure.

Chair Koss called for a break at 10:35 AM. She reconvened the Board at 10:46 AM.

➤ Board Membership in 2023: Valentine shared a board roster showing terms. Vice Chair Schettler and Edison-Lahm will need to apply for reappointment in early 2023. Reese will finish his term in late 2023 and is not eligible for reappointment. Bartlett will term out in early 2024. The Board should be thinking about these two transitions now as the process of recruiting registrants to apply is often challenging. The Board may want to consider diversity on the board in terms of demographics, lived experience, and practice expertise. Valentine said she would reach out to the Governor's Office in 2023 to discuss the reappointments and see what else could be ascertained about future recruitment goals of that office.

➤ Quarterly or Annual Budget/Investments Update: Valentine provided an overview of the quarterly report:

- Revenues: Staff continue to monitor renewals vs. non-renewals as these trends have the greatest impact on revenues. Staff also are watching applications for exam and registration. There is still an expectation for deficit spending in FY 2.
- Expenses: Nothing unexpected has come up with expenses. The Board was on track to spend less in FY 2 than budgeted. This will help to counter any further downturn in revenues. The Board has a separate item to consider about compensation. The Board will need to cash out another CD early in the New Year. This is not unexpected as the budget included spending from reserve. This will be the 2nd CD cashed out in the biennium, with the other closed in June 2022. The Board will have 4 CDs left going into 2023-2025. As a reminder, the Board also had to use funds out of its money market account this biennium.

➤ Quarterly Renewal/Non-Renewal Report: The non-renewal rate so far in FY 2 has not slowed compared to FY 1. The big question is whether non-renewals related to retirements or dislike of new CE requirements will slow going into calendar year 2023.

➤ Miscellaneous Updates:

- Compensation Decision – Early COLA: OSBGE discussed this issue with its HR Business Analyst from DAS at the 09/09/2022 meeting. OSBGE did not make a decision then, wanting to first obtain input from the Oregon State Landscape Architect Board (OSLAB) since compensation costs are split between the boards. OSLAB discussed the issue at its 11/01/2022 & directed staff to inform OSBGE that it had no objections or concerns with an OSBGE decision to align with the State of Oregon on the COLA issue. OSLAB understands that its cost for staffing services would increase if OSBGE decides to retroactively grant the COLA early. Chair Koss recalled there was general agreement at the last meeting about staying aligned with the rest of state government. She asked if anyone wanted to discuss further or offer a motion.

Reese moved to implement the retroactive COLA adjustment. Edison-Lahm seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Koss called the vote, and all approved.

- DOGAMI Governing Board: Two Board registrants were recently appointed to this board. Day-Stirrat noted how challenging it is to find Board members. In this case, the positions were for geologists. There was some concern expressed by industry stakeholders about the candidates being from the public sector, but the candidates were well qualified and ultimately approved.
- Portland State University (PSU) Recruitment: PSU is looking to add back an engineering geology faculty position.
- American Geosciences Institute (AGI): AGI has made updates to its CE platform. Board registrants may be able to find CE opportunities here. AGI also shared data showing continued decline in geoscience program enrollments and degrees granted through 2021. Valentine shared that this topic was discussed in a recent AGI webinar titled “The Enrollment Cliff and the Geosciences”. The webinar explores the drivers of the undergraduate enrollment cliff and some of the specific challenges the geosciences face with this generation-level event.

Committee/Coordinator Reports

➤ Budget Committee: Valentine presented a draft budget for the Board’s consideration and highlighted key input points:

- Assumptions about revenues, i.e., # of registrants, applications, non-renewals
- Assumptions about expenses, specifically if any special projects need to be added into the budget or other approaches to manage expenses should be investigated
- Fee schedule adjustments to address the projected gap between revenues and expenses

Valentine gave an overview of the background materials provided to explain the fiscal picture and how the budget was developed. These materials included:

- Detailed notes about how revenue and expenses were estimated
- Details about the cost of personnel services showing all aspects of costs for staff, i.e., salary, benefits, taxes, and administration.
- Information about management of Board reserve funds, including how the target reserve fund is estimated, where the reserve fund balance is estimated to be at the end of the current and next biennia, and the recent history of reserve fund use.

- Information showing the increasing gap between revenues and expenses on a quarterly basis for two biennia.
- The financial impact of a declining registrant pool.
- The financial impact of rising operational costs.
- Fee history, showing increases implemented in 2007 and 2017.
- Several fee scenarios, using phased and flat increases
- Data on fees charged by other boards in the western region, although it was not yet known if these boards would also be implementing fee increases.

Chair Koss inquired about what the Board needed to do with the budget at this meeting. The timeline for budget rule adoption was reviewed. Valentine was looking for input to guide development of a final draft. The Board would need to be ready to approve a final draft for public review at its first quarterly meeting in 2023.

The Board had an in-depth discussion about the fiscal situation and how this would impact the budget and fees for the 2023-2025 biennium. There was acknowledgement of the need to raise fees in the next biennium. The Board will likely not have sufficient reserve funds to cover another biennium of deficit spending. The Board discussed various ideas for how to structure an updated fee schedule, including whether to consider a tiered or flat fee approach. Valentine explained that the Board was being hit by a combination of declining registrations and increasing operational expenses since the last fee increases were implemented in 2017. Other geologist licensing boards are reportedly also seeing registration declines, with these declines thought to be based largely on changes in age demographics. However, increases in operational costs over the last 3 biennia have had the largest impact on the Board's finances. The Board has continued to share staff and office space with another board as one way to control expenses. Operations are kept as lean as feasible, with most of the expense from staffing. The new CE program (effective in 2021) may have contributed to some of the registrant decline since 2017 but certainly not all of it. The CE program has not increased Board operational expenses as the additional work for auditing and other aspects of the program has been absorbed by staff and volunteer Board members.

Board members expressed support for remaining an independent board, even though this means that operational costs must be covered by the small community of Board registrants and those working towards registration. Board members also noted that maintaining professional staff was critical, and there was a need to offer competitive compensation compared to similar Oregon boards. The Board wanted to develop messaging around the fee increases to explain the Board's overall fiscal situation, how funds are managed by the Board, and the need for the increases.

Board members spent time examining the various costs faced by examination candidates, GITs, RGs, and CEGs. Those earlier in the pipeline will generally be impacted more by fees due to career level. The Board's time investment in reviewing applications also increases for those later in the pipeline. There was discussion about how to reflect these realities in an updated fee schedule. The Board expressed interest in exploring some degree of tiered fees by registration type.

Chair Koss called for a lunch break at 12:03 PM. Webb left the meeting at this time. Chair Koss reconvened the Board at 12:36 PM. The Board returned to discussion of the 2023-2025 budget.

The Board gave the following direction to Valentine for development of a revised draft budget:

- Use a flat-registration approach for 2023-2025.

- Focus on determining expenses for the upcoming biennium only as there is too much uncertainty about revenues and expenses to project out further.
- Look for ways to reduce financial burden on those trying to enter or newly in the workforce, i.e., examination applicants and GITs. This could include bringing back some form of combined application for the ASBOG FG and the GIT, at least giving the option to candidates to request this upfront with only one application fee applied. GIT #s would only be assigned to those indicating intent to obtain the GIT registration upon passage of the examination and then paying the GIT registration fee after passing the examination. Also develop a tiered fee schedule with the GIT paying a lower renewal fee than for the RG and CEG.
- Reflect in the application fee charged the amount of work that is required by the Board to review, e.g., lower fee for ASBOG FG/GIT applications and more for ASBOG PG, RG, and CEG applications. There may be differences also in review process for initial vs. comity applications for registration that could be reflected in the application fee.
- Set the senior renewal fee for each the RG and CEG to be the same as the GIT renewal fee.
- Restoration fees can no longer be held flat. Apply the same % increase to these as to renewal fees.

Chair Koss called for a break at 2:00 PM and reconvened the Board at 2:11 PM.

➤ CE Coordinator Report: Vice Chair Schettler and Valentine presented a proposed approach to granting credit to HAZWOPER refresher training. Registrants are listing this as an 8-hr. training on logs without providing details about geologic content. The Board previously determined that credit for this training would be limited as the geologic content of the typical refresher course is generally minimal. Setting a defined credit amount should help clarify the Board's position. If a registrant wanted to seek more credit, then supporting documentation to support such a request could be kept by the registrant and submitted to the Board if selected for audit. The Board agreed with the proposal. Valentine would work on updating the Board's guidance materials.

The Board also discussed whether there are other trainings commonly completed by registrants that should be considered for a similar approach if defining a standard credit amount. Several trainings were mentioned but a wait and see approach was decided upon.

Vice Chair Schettler and Valentine next presented an interpretation about scholarship body review in relation to the Board rules for CE. The Board rules did not seem to support this as being a qualifying CE activity. There was consensus on this. There were two audits in the quarter where scholarship committee work was listed on logs, but in both cases the registrants did not need these hours to meet the 8-hr. requirement.

Valentine was assigned to randomly pull audits for the quarter.

➤ Outreach Committee: Valentine led a report to the Board on outreach committee activities for the quarter. Outreach to all 4 universities with geologic science degree programs occurred. Specifically, the outreach was via email exchanges with the PSU department head, virtual meetings with University of Oregon (UO) and Western Oregon University (WOU) department heads, participation in an on-campus event at Oregon State University (OSU), and participation in a virtual career fair at OSU. The OSU events were done in coordination with DOGAMI, and the ongoing support from DOGAMI staff (Alex Lopez, RG) was very appreciated and helpful. Vice Chair Schettler and Edison-Lahm provided support in various ways, including but not limited to attending the events with OSU.

Valentine explained that she asked the department chairs from the 4 universities for ideas on how the Board might best reach students and do so in a way supportive of university efforts. She summarized some of ideas generated through those discussions for the Board's consideration:

- The Board showing up once every 4 years on campus to speak to students and faculty is probably not the best model anymore. The Board may have greater success by finding ways to meet each university where they are at, such as by connecting into existing classes, programs, clubs, events, etc. More nimble approaches that can be customized to each university are likely to be more successful. This would also make the Board more responsive to differences between the universities and potentially reduce burden on the Board by not requiring all members to attend on-campus outreach events.
- The Board might consider developing and providing to Board members, Board volunteers, and the universities a toolkit about geologist registration and relation to careers in the geosciences. This could support a "train the trainer" type approach, perhaps even allowing for a trained speakers group. This might be a way to reduce the burden on individuals that have been helping in last few years and to support sustainability of efforts.
- There may be information that the Board has not traditionally considered providing to university department chairs that could be helpful to their efforts to support training of students about geologist registration and related careers. The Board could consider periodic outreach related to the ASBOG Curriculum Performance Assessment Program (CPAP), investigate what information can be shared about registrants who are alumni of these universities, consider whether data about type of employers could be shared, and possibly share more information about specific duties registrants perform in their jobs.
- The Board might need to shift focus from upper class undergraduate and graduate students (i.e., those most likely to qualify to start the ASBOG examination) and also include some outreach geared towards first and second-year undergraduate students. This could support university-based efforts to retain and attract students into geosciences. Perhaps there might be opportunity to have a dynamic approach where information can be adjusted to level.
- The Board might look into whether there are ways to infuse information about national trends/issues into Board outreach. For example, what data might the Board be able to access and share related to potential job openings, fields with most opportunities, DEI, etc. The Board would need to partner with other organizations who might have this kind of data.

Valentine said she shared information with Vice Chair Schettler and Edison-Lahm about a state board (not a geology board) that has a scholarship program. This program required state legislative action to obtain authority to collect, manage, and use funds for this purpose. In this case, the board started with a significant sum in reserve to seed the fund. It was unclear how viable this approach could be for the Board due to questions about where the funds would come from, who would support this type of legislative change, and how the Board would manage the fiduciary work. Edison-Lahm mentioned that finding seed money vs. building up a fund over time may require different approaches. There might need to be a corporate sponsor, and perhaps a scholarship program would be best managed by a professional organization.

Valentine explained that she did not research further the issue of financial support for volunteers. Prior counsel input indicated a high level of legal difficulty and risk associated with finding a way to provide financial support to volunteers. If the Board wanted, she could define very specific questions and seek further legal advice. But another approach might be to consider finding a way

to provide CE credit, although the Board would need to confirm possibly via rule that this type of activity qualified as CE.

➤ Engineering Geology Examination Committee: A meeting was scheduled for the following week to revisit this project with representatives of the WA Geology Licensing Board and their support staff in the WA Dept. of Licensing. The effort has been on hold waiting for the WA team to be ready to work on this effort. With both sides facing budget challenges, the discussion will likely involve exploration of how to conduct a limited exam review.

➤ Rules Advisory Committee: Valentine shared the rule filing for rule amendments adopted at the 10/24/2022 meeting. There were no other activities related to this committee. She said there was no other rulemaking activity ongoing. The next rulemaking would be for the 2023-2025 budget.

➤ Legislative Committee: Valentine said there was no activity to report for this committee. Day-Stirrat noted this was a time of transition in state government, with Governor-elect Kotek working with a transition team and review of proposed stated budgets ongoing.

New Business and Announcements

➤ Administrator’s Performance Evaluation Update: Chair Koss shared that the evaluation was completed, and the next annual evaluation will be due next fall.

➤ Annual Officers Election: The Board has been on a December election cycle for some time now. The last election for annual officer posts was conducted in December 2021. Chair Koss and Vice Chair Schettler were willing to continue serving as the officers.

Reese moved to re-elect Koss and Schettler as Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. Edison-Lahm seconded the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Koss called the vote, and all approved.

No changes were made in committee and coordinator assignments. However, Vice Chair Schettler said she would appreciate some help with audit reviews during heavier quarters. Reese volunteered to assist.

➤ 2023 Quarterly Meeting Schedule: Chair Koss invited input on proposed dates for quarterly meetings in 2023. After consideration of input offered, she selected the following dates: 03/03/2023, 06/02/2023, 09/08/2023, and 12/01/2023.

➤ Miscellaneous: Edison-Lahm shared that the Geological Society of Oregon Country (GSOC) started a scholarship fund for student engagement. Four students were being supported at this time. GSOC has a year-end wrap up meeting scheduled for 12/31/2022.

Adjournment

Chair Koss adjourned the Board at 3:21 PM.

+++++

The minutes for the 12/02/2022 quarterly meeting were approved as presented at the 03/03/2023 quarterly meeting.
Christine Valentine, Administrator