

Washington State Geologist Licensing Board meeting transcript

December 5, 2024

Sydney Muhle (00:00:02):

Employees, I don't always see them pop in.

Noah Dudley (00:00:06):

There was another meeting and just left and called into this one. So, thank you for your patience.

Sydney Muhle (00:00:12):

No problem. Thanks for joining us.

Carla Brock (00:00:16):

All right, let's get started. It's 10:00 AM and I called this special board meeting of the Geologist Licensing Board to order. We will provide an opportunity for public comment during the meeting. As a courtesy, we encourage everyone to mute their mics or your phone, if you've called in on your phone, when you're not speaking to reduce the background noise. And then when you do want to speak, remember to unmute. For board members to help us capture information correctly, please state your name when making comments. Okay. Alyssa, would you please take the roll call?

Alyssa (00:00:54):

Thank you, Chair. I will start with you. Chair Brock?

Carla Brock (00:00:59):

Present.

Alyssa (00:01:01):

Vice Chair Gillum?

Carrie Gillum (00:01:03):

Here.

Alyssa (00:01:05):

Secretary Struthers?

Jim Struthers (00:01:07):

Here.

Alyssa (00:01:08):

Board Member Dudley?

Noah Dudley (00:01:10):

Present.

Alyssa (00:01:12):

Board Member Hanell?

Casey Hanell (00:01:15):

Present.

Alyssa (00:01:16):

Board member Halbert? I think you're muted.

Bill Halbert (00:01:25):

Present.

Alyssa (00:01:26):

Thank you. All right, back to you, Chair.

Carla Brock (00:01:32):

All right, great. So, the first thing on our agenda for today is to approve the agenda. I'm looking. Hold on, hold on. All right. So, I would, at this time, ask for a motion to approve the agenda for today's special board meeting.

Casey Hanell (00:02:02):

Board Member Hanell moves for approval of the agenda.

Carla Brock (00:02:07):

Do I get a second?

Jim Struthers (00:02:13):

Board Member Struthers seconds that motion.

Carla Brock (00:02:17):

Great. Is there any discussion? Okay, all those in favor of approving the agenda for today's board meeting, please say aye.

Casey Hanell (00:02:29):

Aye.

Jim Struthers (00:02:29):

Aye.

Carrie Gillum (00:02:29):

Aye.

Noah Dudley (00:02:29):

Aye.

Carla Brock (00:02:34):

Are there any opposed? Okay, the agenda has been approved. The next item on the agenda for today is to approve the meeting minutes from the September 12th special board meeting. Those were provided to us in our meeting packets ahead of time. So, at this time, I need a motion to approve the September meeting minutes.

Noah Dudley (00:03:06):

I move to approve the September meeting minutes.

Carla Brock (00:03:14):

And can I have a second?

Carrie Gillum (00:03:19):

Vice Chair Gillum approves or seconds it.

Carla Brock (00:03:25):

Okay. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of approving the September 12th, 2024 special board meeting minutes, please say aye.

Jim Struthers (00:03:39):

Aye.

Casey Hanell (00:03:39):

Aye.

Carrie Gillum (00:03:39):

Aye.

Noah Dudley (00:03:39):

Aye.

Carla Brock (00:03:44):

Are there any opposed? Okay, meeting minutes have been approved.

Sydney Muhle (00:03:51):

Madam Chair, before we move on, for the participants who are joining us today, we're getting a lot of background noise. If we could ask that you please mute your microphones. It makes it very difficult for everybody else to hear what's going on. Thank you.

Carla Brock (00:04:04):

Thank you. Thanks. Okay, item 5 on the agenda is awards and recognition, which we have none of. So, we'll move on to item 6, which is old business. Thank you, Alyssa. And this is the report out from the annual ASBOG meeting, which occurred at the end of October. I attended that meeting on behalf of the board as the board delegate. And just give you a quick overview, I would say that the two things that are at the forefront of ASBOG's mind at present and that we discussed quite a lot are the computer-based testing. And I think we'll hear a little bit more about that from Sydney later when we talk about the fall exam administration.

(00:05:03):

ASBOG is continuing to try to make that better for test takers, making sure there's plenty of testing centers, making sure that the times are right, that people are getting into the testing center and getting set up to take the test during the time that it's given. So, I think that every time the test is given, which is twice during the year, ASBOG is learning things and working with the test administrator to make that a better process for everyone and to make it easier.

(00:05:44):

The second thing is just the amount of upcoming change within ASBOG itself. There's a lot of... ASBOG as an organization is embarking on a new long-term strategic planning endeavor and that is needed at this time because there are some pending retirements within the organization itself. That's the main reason, but the computer-based testing has also identified a need to change a little bit the way that the tests are developed and evaluated. And so, there's ongoing discussion about how the test development itself, it's going to have to change in the future to keep up with the computer-based testing and technology and all of the mission of having the ASBOG tests be nationally relevant and gauges of current professional practice and all of those things.

(00:06:58):

Otherwise, ASBOG's in a good place financially. They're planning and saving for big, upcoming transitions like the need to hire new folks to replace those who are retiring, which includes the ASBOG psychometrician who's a contracted employee and also includes ASBOG's executive director who's been leading the organization for as long as I've been involved, so at least the last eight years. Yeah, I think that's about it from a business perspective, from the ASBOG annual meeting. Obviously, that was a whole day of meeting, so there was a lot of other things that we talked about, but I think that gives you a good idea of the business side of the organization.

(00:07:53):

Do any of the board members have any questions? Yeah, Casey?

Casey Hanell (00:07:58):

Yeah. Thanks, Carla. I'm curious, was there any discussion about any national trends in candidates taking the tests? Is that trending up or down or just staying flat? Is there any information or discussion around that?

Carla Brock (00:08:14):

Yeah, yeah. They always give us a snapshot of the trends, I think. And I can dig that out of the meeting booklet and share it with the board members. I think, since the pandemic, the numbers have been slowly taking up. I think they were similar in the fall as to what they were in the spring. Overall, there's many more candidates taking the fundamentals than take the practical. But a lot of that, I think, is just that a lot of colleges are using it now as a gauge of whether or not their programs are preparing students for taking and passing the test. So, I think fundamentals has seen a bit of an increase. I think the practice is about the same as it has been if you compare it to pre-pandemic numbers because there certainly were a few years there where the numbers were down pretty significantly.

(00:09:27):

Any other board member questions about the ASBOG meeting?

Casey Hanell (00:09:32):

I do have one additional question. Curious, was there any discussion about any states that currently don't have licensing that are on a path to have licensing in their states and/or the converse, states that have licensing that are considering dropping it as a requirement in their states?

Carla Brock (00:09:53):

Yeah, we didn't talk about any states that aren't current member states who are thinking about it. And then I know that there are a couple of states that are undergoing sunset reviews or regulatory rule reviews but that aren't really concerned that it will change anything. So, I don't think there's any anticipation that there will be new member states or member states that leave. Yeah.

Casey Hanell (00:10:29):

Thank you.

Carla Brock (00:10:30):

Yeah. Okay, there's no further questions from the board members. We can move on to new business. Sydney, it looks like all of these items have your name on them, so I'll just turn this agenda item over to you.

Sydney Muhle (00:10:47):

A lot of them do, but that's okay. Yey, with this one, I only get to introduce it. So, thank you. Good morning, everyone. We had a request to discuss the License Review Act. This is a result of House Bill 1301 that was passed by the state legislature in 2023. So, I'll be introducing the team that is spearheading that review. But I wanted to preface this, as Board Member Hanell's questions were indicating and Chair Brock also indicated, we are one of the states that is undergoing a regulatory review.

(00:11:27):

But I wanted to emphasize for the board and for the public that this is an across-the-board, top-down review of all of the business and professions programs under the DOL umbrella. So, this is not a specific targeted bill. There were no specific programs named in this. This is a

requirement that we, as the Business and Professions Division and the Department of Licensing Review, approximately 10% of our programs every year for 10 years and then the clock resets. So, if during those 10 years any of those programs go away or we add additional programs that whatever 10% of that number looks like at the 10 years that we were capturing everybody.

(00:12:13):

So, this is just to make sure that all of our programs are still valuable and thriving and necessary because we have had some programs that have been on the books for multiple decades that we've had one or two active licensees in the last 10 to 20 years. So, that's really not a good value, a good use of the state resources to maintain a program that really only has one or two active licensees. So, it's making sure that things like that are not staying on the books needlessly, but also doing a deeper dive to make sure that everything we're doing is legal and relevant. This group helps us with rule reviews, making sure we're staying up with national trends, that all of our laws are in line with current national practices. So, they're really doing that deeper dive that all of our programs can use on a pretty regular basis. This group is a big part of that.

(00:13:14):

Now, I'm going to introduce Lauren Gilmore, and I'll allow her to introduce her team and tell you guys a little bit more about what this program does and how the geologist program was tapped for review this year.

Lauren Gilmore (00:13:27):

Thank you, Sydney. Sydney gave a really good overview. I'm Lauren Gilmore. I'm the regulatory review and legislative policy analyst at BPD. My team and I are the ones putting together this year's Professional Licensing Review Act report. House bill 1301, passed in the 2023 legislative session, enacted this requirement for DOL to annually review 10% of our 37 professional licenses per year on a 10-year cycle. Each year, we kick off the project with scoping and some initial ground research on what professions we've selected. This year, our 10% is geologists, auctioneers, and tattoo and body piercing.

(00:14:13):

We then send a notice of review to the professional licenses within those professions. Geologists received a notification early November. After this initial notice of review, there was also a message about our upcoming listening session, notifying licensees and stakeholders on how they can come help us with their feedback, input and experience around licensing. So, that's my shameful plug to please come to the listening session. If you're able to attend, we would love to hear from you all. We can also take any comments on your profession or any questions or concerns you have. I'm happy to talk to you. We have an inbox. I will share that with Sydney. Make sure that you get it all.

(00:15:03):

Any additional things would just be, each year, we choose a board. So, this year, a geologist team highly recommended from the DOL team that you guys are all great and really fun to work with. So, if you have any questions or concerns, I'm happy to answer them. Happy to hear about

questions or concerns around your profession. We would love to take that and we provide recommendations to the legislature in this report on modifications to the profession.

(00:15:38):

Termination is part of the bill, but last year, we reviewed three professions and the only profession we recommended for termination is employment agencies which hasn't had a licensee in over 10 years. So, please don't come to the listening session very concerned about that. We're more looking for barriers to licensure in processing rules, WACs, things that we have the power to change and recommend and help.

Sydney Muhle (00:16:20):

Lauren, would you like to introduce your team as well?

Lauren Gilmore (00:16:25):

Thanks. Don't hate me, Ben. I'm just nervous. I have Ben Harbaugh here with me, who is the lead MA 3 for geologists, writing your report and doing the recommendations. Some of his work is he did a 50-state comparison of our rules and requirements, testing standards, and what other states do to inform where we're at. That's one of my favorite parts of the review because I feel like it gives us a basis and lets us really look and make sure that we're performing how other states are performing. He's also looked into... Will do some information on just the budget, the expenditures and revenue. We looked at the RCWs and WACs. Ben, you want to say hi? I'll stop talking.

Ben Harbaugh (00:17:24):

Hi, everyone. Yeah, just done quite a bit of initial research. So far, Washington seems pretty standard in the 50-state comparison. It'll be interesting to look at that final comparison. But yeah, thanks for having me and it's an interesting profession to look at.

Lauren Gilmore (00:17:49):

I also have Austin Koller here and Taylor Hughes who also helped support the report, but geologists are within Ben's portfolio. So, any other future stuff you might have or questions, Ben is a key point of contact on that.

Sydney Muhle (00:18:09):

And a lot of Ben's work that he's already started doing as part of this report is really going to help us with the WAC review that the board has already initiated that we'll really be diving into after the new year. And so, Ben's giving us a really excellent foundation to launch all of that work off of. So, it's been really awesome to have this report help us and give us some of those insights and give us those additional tools because otherwise, it's me and Alyssa diving in every spare minute that we get. And so, it's really nice having the additional resources with Lauren and her team. And Ben has been fantastic, diving in with geologists this year.

(00:18:51):

And so, last year, the landscape architects got to be the first ones up. They very much had the sudden panic of, "Oh no, this is sunset." And that was why I wanted to preface the introduction of this report with that because I know that that's always a fear with geologists as well. That's

something that we've been very, very careful of and that poor Lauren has had to hear me beat the drum about that "No, we're not taking away this licensure" and has worked really, really great, her entire team has, with making sure that we're reaching out to all the right people that we need to. And so, we really appreciate the work.

(00:19:29):

So, if there are any questions from the board, any of us are happy to answer. Casey?

Casey Hanell (00:19:42):

Yeah. I'm just curious at the listening session, will some of the information, background information that you're putting together, Ben, be presented as part of the kickoff? Or is the listening session strictly the other way communication, just hearing from the licensed and potentially licensed community?

Ben Harbaugh (00:20:04):

Yeah, I think the main focus is to hear from the public and the board in licensees. So, it mostly coming that way, but yeah.

Sydney Muhle (00:20:22):

And I can also share the link with the board for the report from last year so that you can see the results that were turned out by Lauren and her team and what you'll be looking for this year. Noah?

Noah Dudley (00:20:41):

Yeah, I think I know the answer to this, but I assume that that report will be made available to us. Do we have an expected timeline for when that'll be completed?

Sydney Muhle (00:20:50):

Lauren, correct me if I'm wrong, the report is submitted to the legislature August 30th of every year?

Lauren Gilmore (00:20:57):

Yes, the 31st of each year and the previous report and the next report is available right on DOL's legislative report web page, which I'm sure Sydney will get to you. It's nice and boring. I hope you all enjoy it. You can ask me questions about that also if you'd like.

Sydney Muhle (00:21:16):

I found the report fascinating. They did a great job and put together so many statistics. It was awesome. The only caveat I will add to that is that's the date that the report is submitted to the legislature. We do have to give them time to receive it and digest it a little bit so that they don't start getting rapid fire constituent calls and questions and demanding to know answers from a report that they haven't really even had a chance to look at. So, there is a little bit of a time gap. I think we had it on our website by end of September this year, Lauren?

Lauren Gilmore (00:21:47):

Yes. In the bill, they have the option to request further information and have us dive in a little bit more. Fortunately, this year, they're very happy with the report and didn't ask any follow-up questions. So, it was published pretty quickly and out back to our licensees. By beginning of October, I think, we had gotten it to everybody.

Sydney Muhle (00:22:08):

The last thing we want to do is-

Noah Dudley (00:22:12):

Thank you.

Sydney Muhle (00:22:13):

... make the legislature mad.

Ben Harbaugh (00:22:21):

I just wanted to throw out, for the WAC review, Sydney, correct me if I'm wrong, but we'll have a little subcommittee. And I've identified a couple of things that I had questions about, but I'm also really looking forward to hearing your guys' feedback about the WACs and RCWs, that too if you spot anything there. So, I'm looking forward to hearing what you guys think about where those are at. And so, please don't just rely on me. You guys probably are equal experts, probably maybe greater. So, yeah, thank you.

Sydney Muhle (00:23:02):

Yeah, that will be in all of those committee meetings with us as well. Since he already has all of that documentation, like I said, that'll give us a really great foundation to start from. Great. Were there any other questions before I move on?

Lauren Gilmore (00:23:18):

Thank you for inviting us.

Sydney Muhle (00:23:20):

Thanks, Lauren. Thanks, Ben.

Ben Harbaugh (00:23:23):

Thank you all.

Carla Brock (00:23:23):

Thank you.

Sydney Muhle (00:23:27):

All right. Well, then we'll go to item 7.2. As Chair Brock said, I think my name is on the next several items. So, this is going to be our fall examination results. Chair Brock touched on this a little bit already, but we're going to dive into some of the statistics. So, we'll start with the ASBOG exam, if you want to go to the next slide, please.

(00:23:54):

So, we did have 69 examinees sit for the FG exam, the fundamentals exam, and we had a 72.5% passage rate for that one. And then we had 33 examinees sit for the practical exam and we had a 93.9% pass rate for that one. So, definitely, on trend for us that we always see more fundamentals than we do practical. As Chair Brock already indicated, I think that's the trend everywhere.

(00:24:33):

But just as a little aside, I really love looking into this every year, Washington, our pass rate ranked eighth in the nation on the fundamentals exam and we were fifth in the nation for the practicals with that 93.9% pass rate. And of those top five, we were by far the largest number of examinees in that practical exam. So, that was really, really cool to see.

(00:25:04):

As Chair Brock indicated with her report from ASBOG, we did see a little bit of a dip during those COVID years, but it was, as you guys can see from our four-year-ish overview, our pass rates held really steady through that. So, that was really, really encouraging to see. And I think our number of examinees maybe took a slight dip through the COVID years, but it wasn't what a lot of other jurisdictions saw. So, that's been really nice to watch over the years. So, any questions on the ASBOG before I move on?

(00:25:39):

We did have one complaint. We had a testing facility that shut down and the examinee wasn't notified, but ASBOG was able to get them into another testing site within a very short time period and they've now sat for the exam. ASBOG did run into some struggles, particularly with several natural disasters that hit in other parts of the country right before the exams. So, they had a large number of people to suddenly have to reschedule, move, try and get into different states or move entire exam cycles.

(00:26:12):

So, that definitely caused a really big shift for them heading into the exam. And I think the little things that they would've normally worked out during that time, because the focus had shifted to these really big changes, some of those little things fell through the cracks, but they have now worked through those direct.

Carla Brock (00:26:34):

Hey, Sydney. Thanks. I have two questions. One is, do you know about how many testing centers there are in Washington?

Sydney Muhle (00:26:41):

Oh gosh, off the top of my head, I don't. I know the number has changed from cycle to cycle, but I can look into that and let you know.

Carla Brock (00:26:51):

Okay. And then do you know, can somebody take the test at a out-of-state testing center for... If they're approved to take it in Washington, can they take it in Idaho?

Sydney Muhle (00:27:03):

I believe they can. They just have to contact ASBOG and work that out because we do have that happen from time to time, especially with a lot of our border cities where the testing facility is right across the river. So, yeah, that does happen from time to time. They just have to make those arrangements.

Carla Brock (00:27:17):

Yeah, that's nice. Thanks.

Sydney Muhle (00:27:21):

No problem. All right, then we will move on to our in-state specialty exams. We'll start with the engineering geology. We did have a 57.1% pass rate for the cycle with seven examinees. That is a little bit lower than what we've been seeing, but on par for 2024. And we do have to have 100% pass rate from last fall skewing our statistics, but that really is a little bit of a bump from what we saw during the COVID years. And I think one of the things that we're seeing is, during the COVID years where the schools saw hits in their attendance and in their exams, now we're seeing that catch up as we're climbing out of the COVID years where it hit us a year or so later. But we are starting to see that little bit of a rebound. And then we want to go to the next slide, please.

(00:28:22):

For our hydrogeology, we had a 63.6% pass rate with 11 examinees. So, again, where we saw that slight decline right after the COVID years, we're starting to see that rebound. So, hopefully, that trend continues. And we can go to the next one.

(00:28:42):

And this is just our four-year overview of the last several exam cycles and you can really start to see where those trends went down right around '22, '23. And now, we're starting to see that climb back out. So, that's very encouraging to see. I think one thing that all of the board members who have been helping us out with the exam reviews can say for certain is that this is definitely a tough exam, but it is a very valid exam. And so, that has been a really good process for us to work through and give us some of the peace of mind that the board has been looking for the last few years. Any questions on that? All right, well, thank you very much.

(00:29:33):

So, our next item is actually going to be a business item for you guys to adopt the 2025 meeting dates. Let me get to the right page in my notes. We have four proposed meeting dates for next year as the board is aware, but for members of the public who don't know, every year at the last meeting of the calendar year, the board sets their meeting schedule for the following calendar year. So, for 2025, we have March 13th, June 12th, September 18th, and December 11th. Alyssa, if you want to go to the next slide, please.

(00:30:12):

And that's what those dates look like on the calendar for us. We are still waiting on the final date for ASBOG, but almost always the end of October. And then we are also proposing that the

board continue to meet at 10:00 AM. So, our dates did get shifted a little bit this year across all nine of our boards and commissions just due to how holidays fall in 2025, but relatively the same weeks that you guys met this year. So, are there any questions on that?

(00:30:43):

All right. Well, if not, I will turn it back over to Chair Brock so that we can have a motion for approval.

Carla Brock (00:30:55):

Okay. Can I please have a motion to approve the 2025 board meeting calendar dates?

Casey Hanell (00:31:03):

Board Member Hanell moves to approve the 2025 meeting calendar dates.

Carla Brock (00:31:11):

Can I have a second?

Bill Halbert (00:31:11):

Halbert seconds the motion.

Carla Brock (00:31:14):

Okay, is there any further discussion? All right, all those in favor of approving the dates, please say aye.

Bill Halbert (00:31:21):

Aye.

Carrie Gillum (00:31:21):

Aye.

Casey Hanell (00:31:21):

Aye.

Noah Dudley (00:31:21):

Aye.

Carla Brock (00:31:25):

Are there any opposed? Okay, the meeting dates have been set for 2025.

Sydney Muhle (00:31:32):

Great, thank you. And we will get those calendar invites out to all of you here in the next couple of weeks. So, please look for those, but we try to send them to you as far in advance so that you have those locked on your calendars.

(00:31:49):

All right, and then we'll move on to item 7.4, which is just taking a look at the board's goals and priorities that have been previously established. I try to bring this to all of you once a year just to make sure that the priorities that the board has set is still the direction that the board wants to go and that the goals that we set each year are still in line with those and see if there are any additions that we need to make. So, Alyssa, do you want to go to the next one, please.

(00:32:20):

Here we go. And I apologize, I caught the typo of 2023 this morning, of course, 15 minutes before the meeting started. So, these are the priorities that the board has previously set to establish a process for the specialty exam review, which is already well underway, establishing a clear policy statement on the work titles of geologists, hydrogeologists and engineering geologists by non-licensed individuals. That has been an ongoing struggle that we may need to revisit how we're approaching participation in the COEs. It has been a priority and we've made sure that the agency is aware of that priority for the board and renewing focus on outreach activities.

(00:33:07):

So, the goals that were set, this really was 2024. The goals that were set last year for this year were WAC review and update, particularly focused on the specialty license requirements. And I think we can extend that now based on the board's previous discussions to also emphasize education, requirements and requirements for initial licensure.

(00:33:36):

The specialty exam review and update has been ongoing. I know that has been a very big project for all of you. It's been a very big project for us. We are at the finish line with the engineering geologist exam review. That has been the bigger mountain for us to climb this year because, as the board is aware, but for members of the public, that exam is co-owned by the State of Oregon. And so, anything we do within that exam has to be done in cooperation with Oregon.

(00:34:06):

We encountered some scheduling challenges in getting that review done, but that review has been completed and we're just now finishing up, making sure it's tracked in all the proper places, and then that one will be done. We can shift to the geology exam, which has had a different set of challenges with board members terming off. And so, we'll be able to shift the staff's focus to getting that one done, but I don't believe that we'll have the same struggles that we did with the EG.

(00:34:42):

Participation in the ASBOG conferences and COEs, again, we made sure that that priority and that goal is well known to the agency and that has become a budgetary priority as well. And then outreach with newsletters, campus visits and events, Chair Brock and Vice Chair Gillum were able to participate in a really great hydrogeology symposium hosted by UDub earlier this year. And so, just continuing to look for all of those opportunities. So, with that, if the board has any additional priorities or goals that they would like to see for the coming year, we would love to hear them.

(00:35:21):

I'm seeing a lot of no's. And this is not end of the discussion. This can be brought back up at any time, like I said, with the WAC review, understanding that the education components and things like that have now been added to those discussions. So, we can revisit this anytime the board wants.

(00:35:56):

Okay, thank you very much. And Madam Chair, do you want to introduce the reports or do you just want me to roll right into it?

Carla Brock (00:36:06):

No, you can just keep going.

Sydney Muhle (00:36:08):

Okay. Well, we will roll into item 8 for reports. We'll start with our committee and task force reports. I already pretty much covered the engineering geologist exam review, but that committee was able to meet and meet with representatives from the State of Oregon at the end of September. They hung out in a room with us the entire day and huge thank you to Casey and Jim and the representative from Oregon for... I know it's not easy to get a full day on your guys' calendars, so we really appreciate that.

(00:36:44):

They went through all the versions of the exam and made the necessary changes. So, again, I'm just going through and finalizing, making sure that the changes that they made, I think they maybe changed it, they swapped out a couple of questions but it was very, very minor and they were ones that we had already flagged during previous years, and then made a couple of minor changes to verbiage, making sure that we're using the most current terminology or just words that didn't quite make sense, minor changes like that. And so, that has now been completed.

(00:37:29):

I'm just going through making sure that the changes that they did are all reflected in all the right places, and then it will be shipped off to Oregon for their final review inhouse. And then we will be good to roll that one out, hopefully, for the spring exam cycle. And so, unless Jim and Casey have anything to add, I can move on to the HG exam review. Yeah.

Jim Struthers (00:37:59):

Yeah, this is Member Struthers. I just want to thank the staff and Sydney for all the work that you guys put in on making that happen. That was a pretty big lift and really appreciate it.

Sydney Muhle (00:38:12):

Thank you and thank you Board Member Hanell, both. I know that there've been a lot of times that we've had to draw large chunks of your calendars and that is not easy particularly with the two of you to do. And so, I really appreciate you guys and all the work you've put into this. All right.

Casey Hanell (00:38:34):

Well, before we move on, I will, this is Board Member Hanell, echo Board Member Struthers on just a huge thanks to Sydney and staff that helped out. It's been a topic on the board's priority list for a long time. And so, to be at the finish line on it just feels really good to have that kind of workload and that peace of mind that Sydney was speaking to. So, huge thank you to Sydney and board staff for making it happen. Thank you, I appreciate it.

Sydney Muhle (00:39:03):

All right. So, now, the counterpart to that with the hydrogeologist exam review, unfortunately, that one slid into the back burner slightly because of the challenges that I've already discussed with the EG exam. Like I said, that was just a little bit of a bigger mountain for us to climb. With the hydrogeologist exam because we are the sole owners of that, it makes it a little bit easier as we're trying to schedule those reviews.

(00:39:31):

So, Chair Brock and former Board Member Tom Tebb had completed their initial review and we were just waiting to go back through and finish the process. But since then, with Board Member Tebb terming off, Board Member Halbert is stepping into that space. And so, I just have to set up time with him to allow him to complete that review and then we'll be ready to set aside. I don't think it'll take us a full day the way it did with the EG exam, but I'll work with both of you and gauge exactly how much time we think we'll need, and we'll go through and make any changes that we need to for that. Chair Brock?

Carla Brock (00:40:17):

I wonder if it makes sense to also have Carrie do that review only because I'm terming off in May and we wouldn't want to have to start over if we don't get through the process by then. Just something to think about. We maybe don't have to decide today, but that's something to keep in mind.

Sydney Muhle (00:40:36):

Yeah, Vice Chair Gillum, if you're willing to, we can certainly add you to this committee and I'll schedule time with both you and Board Member Halbert to conduct that review.

Carrie Gillum (00:40:47):

Yeah, I'm open to that.

Sydney Muhle (00:40:49):

Okay, great. We will add you to that committee. Thank you. All right, so are there any questions on the HG exam review before I move on?

(00:41:00):

Okay, so the Application Requirements Verification Committee, we've still got to finalize a title for the committee, but that has been Board Member Struthers and Vice Chair Gillum. They've been fantastic making time to meet with us, particularly as we're working into the exam cycles in the spring and fall, really doing a lot of heavy lifting, reviewing a lot of education requirements and a lot of individuals who are maybe not the cookie cutter template that we would normally

see applicants have. We are seeing a lot of non-traditional applicants come through. And so, they've been doing a lot of those reviews, as well as reviewing a lot of our experienced verifiers.

(00:41:50):

And so, they've been wonderful giving us as much of their time as they can during those exam cycles. And believe it or not, we're already at the midpoint for the spring exam cycle. So, we will be reaching out and contacting them as well. I did want to see if anybody, any other board members were willing to serve on this committee. I know Board Member Struthers is needing to free up some space on his calendar, so he's indicated a need to drop off of this committee. So, if anybody else is willing to serve on this one, that would be great.

Noah Dudley (00:42:26):

This is Board Member Dudley. I'm happy to serve on it. Been very little work so far on the WAC Review Committee, so to pull my weight a little bit here.

Sydney Muhle (00:42:37):

All right, I appreciate that. And we can have up to three so if anybody else is just really, really clamoring to get in some committee work, you're welcome to join it. All right, well, thank you, Board Member Dudley. We will make sure you are added to any future meetings for that.

(00:42:55):

The Working Titles Committee, this is one I'm going to need a little bit of feedback from the board on. This was a committee that was established. It was former Board Member Tebb and Board Member Struthers, but with Board Member Tebb terming off this past year, it has lost some of that momentum. I know it is still a concern for the board, but a lot of the initial indications that we have, and we've had some preliminary discussions with our advising attorney general, and there's just a limited scope on the board's influence on this.

(00:43:36):

There are some things that I have been seeing and trying to work through on the backside. So, if the board would be amenable to it, I'd like to see if we can suspend this committee for the time being and see if there are things that staff can work through on the backside with some of our peers across the state. A lot of this was tied specifically to use of the titles geologist, hydrogeologist and engineering geologist for non-licensed individuals, particularly those employed by the state.

(00:44:13):

I know there've been indications that this also happens in the private sector, but my hope is that if we can find where some of these pain points are that are leading to this on the government side of things that maybe we can then create a space for the board to put out some guidance from there for the rest of the industry. So, I wanted to get the board's thoughts and opinions on that right now.

Bill Halbert (00:44:53):

This is Board Member Halbert. Can we add a descriptor like staff hydrogeologist that designates it as something other than having a license?

Sydney Muhle (00:45:14):

I think that's part of the struggle that we were seeing when this topic first came up is there were, and the board members can correct me if I'm wrong or if I misunderstood, but I think some of the concern was use of those specific titles indicates that level of licensure and the professionalism and the experience that comes with that. And that was where we were running into some issues, is it seemed that a lot of work was being done by people who had these titles but didn't have the licensure to go with that and trying to work through how best to do that.

(00:46:00):

So, I don't know that we've discussed a descriptor, but I think the overwhelming opinion that we had heard so far was trying to see if there's a way to steer people away from use of those titles altogether and find a different title altogether.

(00:46:20):

Member Struthers?

Jim Struthers (00:46:23):

Yeah, I believe that current practice, at least at Washington State Department of Transportation, is unlicensed individuals are referred to as engineering geology staff as opposed to the other way around, which would have a stronger implication that they were actually licensed.

Sydney Muhle (00:46:49):

Chair Brock?

Carla Brock (00:46:50):

Yeah, I was just going to provide a little more background. This is something that we've gotten comments on, the board has gotten comments on the entire time that I've been on the board, so the last seven and a half years. And I think a lot of it is also questions from licensed individual about where the lines are between what constitutes hydrogeology versus what constitutes engineering geology versus what constitutes geology. And there's always been a lot of gray area in between.

(00:47:22):

I think that licensees in particular have looked to the board for some additional specific guidance or explanation of what those expectations are in those gray areas. So, that has also been, I think, part of this discussion about trying to further clarify roles and responsibilities under each of those three titles, which is already described in the WAC but also left up to some interpretation. So, that's all.

Sydney Muhle (00:48:06):

Vice Chair Gillum?

Carrie Gillum (00:48:12):

I guess what I am trying to hear from you, Sydney, though is when you're saying you want to suspend this, it doesn't mean that we're not discussing it. It just sounds like we don't have a

path right now because you guys have talked to legal. Am I understanding that there is not a feeling of a very strong step for us to be able to, it sounds like, enforce what ultimately we have in our WAC of what describes what these different things are: a hydrogeologist, a geologist and an engineering geologist? Am I correct?

Sydney Muhle (00:48:49):

So, not so much of an enforcement struggle. We can absolutely do that. It's what had been sought previously was to issue a formal policy statement and that was where we were running into some struggles with how to do that within the board's authority without overstepping, particularly because a lot of this involved other state agencies and it's one of those that we can't necessarily dictate to a state agency what they can and can't do. We can help point them in the right direction and help cite the RCWs and the WACs that do have to be followed by anybody conducting this work, but it's just a really fine line for us to walk.

(00:49:34):

And because Board Member Tebb has termed off, and as I indicated before, Board Member Struthers needing to free up some space on his calendar, the committee piece of this is just at a standstill at the moment, but I'm going to skip Board Member Hanell for a second because I see Elizabeth has her hand raised as well and she can probably help answer that question a little bit.

Carrie Gillum (00:49:58):

Yeah, I also then, to follow this, I also wondered does this create issues with maybe other boards like the Engineering Board, Professional Engineers Board and stuff like that because I know that there has been some back and forth on that too of work done by engineers that also overlap with geologists and does that create an issue? Because I think that that's where also these working titles thing may come in as well.

(00:50:26):

So, I keep hoping that the work would move forward because, as being a licensed person, I've also run into this issue of, well, who stands in what area and can do what work? Even though I'm sitting on the board as well, the question still lies there. So, I was hoping there would be some additional work, but I can also... Therefore, I'm trying to understand where we may be stuck, and it sounds like it may be more just having personnel dedicated to be able to do the work at this point.

Sydney Muhle (00:50:58):

And Elizabeth can address that a little bit more.

Carrie Gillum (00:51:01):

Okay.

Elizabeth (00:51:03):

First of all, I just want to make sure I'm understanding the nuances of what we're talking about. So, it sounds like, at first, we were talking about licensure titles when you're licensed and using the same title when you're not licensed or a similar title and that would be misleading to the

public. So, that was one issue, it sounded like. And I could be totally wrong about this, but one issue is that. And then the second issue is who needs to be licensed in what in order to do the work, or what work falls underneath the three, engineering geologist or hydrogeologist or what works? So, are they two different questions? Are we talking about two different questions?

Sydney Muhle (00:51:50):

No, you're on the right track. So, within several of our state agencies who employ, for example, hydrogeologists, we have job classifications for hydrogeologist I through V, but a lot of those agencies won't require hydrogeologist licensure until you hit a hydrogeologist III or IV even though the work being done is all tied to hydrogeology and they may not even require geology licensure for those positions.

(00:52:21):

And so, the concerns that came up were, one, as you indicated, Elizabeth, the confusion of the public by use of those titles at all, but also what work is being done at those lower levels and should it require licensure? That was what we were running into and understanding it is a multi-pronged issue and that there are enforcement things that can be done if we discover that somebody is conducting or is performing the practice of hydrogeology without the proper licensure, but also understanding that this is probably going to impact a very large number of individuals and wanting to take a more proactive approach rather than penalizing somebody through an enforcement action if there's a more proactive way to attack this because it is such a bigger issue.

Elizabeth (00:53:14):

Okay, so thank you for clarifying that. It is a very similar issue that the Engineers Board is facing because people, they're using the title engineer and then they're also practicing engineering sometimes without being licensed and that is because of the job classifications, for example, as I'm sure you know, at DOT. So, that's one of the big problems, is they have these job classifications and it's really hard to change them. It's not like that DOT can go out and snap their fingers and say, "We're changing all of these engineer positions into, we're going to call them engineer techs or something to indicate they're not licensed."

(00:54:04):

So, the difficulty, I think, when dealing with state agencies is just that they have these job classifications and it's really difficult to change them. So, the Engineers Board has been struggling with do we require them to stop using the title engineer unless you're licensed? They've been struggling really hard with that and trying to talk to the agencies, but there's no easy solution to that.

(00:54:34):

I do think that if somebody is practicing in engineering, in the engineering case, if you're practicing engineering but you have somebody overseeing, if you have a licensed engineer overseeing the other sort of engineering work, then there's nothing wrong with that under direct supervision. But if somebody is performing engineering or geology or hydrogeology and there is no direct supervision, they're signing off on things and nobody's looking at it, then I think you do have an enforcement issue there.

(00:55:10):

So, I'm not saying you can't go after engineers or non-licensed engineers, but it's hard to change those job classifications. And the Engineers Board, they've been doing some outreach, but they don't have the appetite right now to go out and try to make those changes with state agencies.

Sydney Muhle (00:55:34):

And I think that's the struggle that we're up against, is which side of this particular apple do we try to bite? But one thing that we're seeing internally with staff with a number of applications and different questions that we've had come through lately is that we're seeing an uptick in cases where what we believe is happening, we don't know for certain because these haven't been investigations cases, but what we believe is happening based on the questions that we get is that there's been a prioritization of education or what's on somebody's resume over licensure for positions that do require licensure even in the state job classification.

(00:56:16):

So, we are seeing more and more of that. And I think that an additional layer and struggle of this is that emphasis is being placed by individuals outside of the board and outside of our department. And so, okay, are there ways for DOL staff to maybe work staff with those other departments and bring some awareness that, okay, that emphasis, we understand that in the hiring process. However, in practicality, in order for this person to perform this work legally, they have to have a license. And so, that's the direction I'm asking the board to consider, is to see if we can have some of those discussions and maybe start making some headway there if that's a viable option for us to start with.

(00:57:13):

Board Member Hanell?

Casey Hanell (00:57:13):

To that question, Sydney, that you just posed, I think that is a good approach to have staff do some additional background and pull the issue together a little bit more and then see what kind of education and outreach we might want to do to state agencies. For me, as I'm hearing the discussion, I was hearing it more in what Elizabeth was initially articulating, that there are really two issues. One is really related to state agencies and OFM job classifications that say hydrogeologist I through V, that that's a job series at OFM.

(00:57:58):

And adding to Jim's comment about how DOT is handling it, there is the option, you have your job series title, but you have a working title, and that working title can be different. And the current practice at the Department of Natural Resources is we're all natural resource scientists. We don't have a job series that has that title in it, but our working titles are differentiated. If it requires a license, then it may have the term "engineering geologist, hydrogeologist or geologist." If it's not, it has a different working title, that could be landslide specialist or tsunami geoscientist or something along those lines. But those three terms seem to be clearly called out in our RCW as if you have this title, you have this license.

(00:59:02):

And I think there's not a lot more than education and outreach on suggesting to state agencies about using that working title well. I think changing OFM job classification series is not where our efforts would be best spent. I think hydrogeologist I through V is probably going to be a thing, but at whatever agency is using those, your hydrogeologist I, IIs and wherever the cutoff is are usually the ones that are working under a licensed hydrogeologist. So, their working title would be something that was appropriate but didn't reflect hydrogeologist in the title itself on the business card or whatever.

Sydney Muhle (00:59:48):

All right. And I do see we have a member of the public who has raised their hand. This is normally an item that we would wait to hear from the public until the public comment period here in just a couple of minutes. So, unless the board is interested in allowing them to use their three minutes, at this point, we would be asking that individual to wait until the public comment.

Carla Brock (01:00:14):

Yeah, I think it's appropriate to ask them to wait until the public comment period.

Sydney Muhle (01:00:18):

Okay.

Carla Brock (01:00:20):

Thanks.

Sydney Muhle (01:00:21):

Thank you. All right, Board Member Dudley?

Noah Dudley (01:00:25):

Board Member Dudley here. Board Member Hanell got essentially everything I was going to say. I think if we were to give the agencies guidance, it would be just guide them in direction of not using those job classifications like in email signatures, letterheads, business cards, everything. I think just general practice at DNR is that we don't. It'd be really odd to use our HR job classification in our email signature, for example. It feels very much it's like an internal just job series thing. So, it's not really something I particularly have too many concerns about as long as they're not listing hydrogeologist on reports or their signature when they don't have a license.

Sydney Muhle (01:01:16):

Okay. Well, then with the board's permission, if we could move the working titles issue off of our committee list, suspend that committee for the moment and move that into our master action item list, that's something that I can work internally with a number of members of our staff and see if we can reach out to some of those agencies and work through a lot of the issues we've been seeing, a lot of questions we've been getting from those agencies, and see what we can do from there and then report back to the board.

(01:01:59):

Seeing a lot of head nods. So, okay, that is what we will do. Thank you very much.

(01:02:04):

Okay. And our last one, a very short report because we haven't gotten to meet yet. That is on me. It's the WAC Review Committee. Unfortunately, I've just had scheduling challenges. I've been out for a chunk of time this past quarter, so I haven't gotten to do a meeting yet with the WAC Review Committee, but we will be working on that for January. Try and see if we can get one initial meeting in before Christmas, but I think more likely plan on January. But for those committee members, we will be reaching out to all of you here in the next couple of weeks to get something scheduled.

(01:02:39):

All right, so we will move on to our next report, I think you get a break from me after this one, and that is our centralized investigations and audit unit report. Our investigation supervisor, Grace Hamilton, sends her regrets. Unfortunately, she was not able to join us today due to a scheduling conflict. So, I get to provide her report. And then we do have centralized investigations and audit unit team members if you have any questions beyond that. But your guys' report is always super easy because you don't get a whole ton of complaints.

(01:03:10):

So, we have two cases that are currently in management review, one that has been closed and one that is in the NA status that could be either a new one that has come in or one that when it came in was initially reviewed by staff and it was one that we either didn't have jurisdiction over or didn't have enough to move forward with an actual investigation. And so, for grand total of four, and the complaints that we have received this calendar year is two. So, two of those on that report are from 2023.

(01:03:53):

Are there any questions on that? Okay, then we will move on to the licensing and customer support services report. Oh my gosh, I lost it today, and you guys actually get to see Julia Manley present that one. I haven't seen Julia here in a while.

Julia Manley (01:04:10):

Hi, everybody. So, for the licensees, as you can see, we've got it broken down into age groups and broken down into fully licensed versus our geologists in training. So, you get a little bit of a view into your pipeline of what's coming. And as you can see, our largest group are the 55 and over group. Total licensees right now is 2,267. That does include your inactive and retired geologists. Any questions on that one?

(01:04:56):

Okay, our next is our specialty licensees, total 759. Our highest count is the hydrogeologists. And again, we've got it broken down by age group, largest group being over 55, but we do have a nice grouping between 35 and 54. So, you still have some people in the pipeline there. And then our new licensees since the last meeting, we've had mostly the reciprocity because the exam was completed, the fall exam was completed. And then last but not least, you can see the

trend over the year of how many renewals, how many people have renewed versus how many new licenses we have issued.

(01:06:03):

Any questions on any of those slides? Looks like Casey has his hand up.

Casey Hanell (01:06:12):

Yeah, just on the applicants that just passed the practice of geology exam, when will they show up on the report?

Julia Manley (01:06:24):

That'll be at the next meeting, they'll show up.

Casey Hanell (01:06:28):

Gotcha. Perfect. Thank you.

Julia Manley (01:06:29):

Yeah, this report was just pulled before they were issued. Great, thank you.

Sydney Muhle (01:06:45):

Thanks, Julia. I was really excited when Julia said she was going to present this time because you guys haven't gotten to see her in a while. All right, so then our last report is just to review our master action item list. We have the Exam Review Committees; we've already talked about that. Working to check on the specialty exams, frequency to administer it, exam cost, budget, all of that. That has been on hold while we worked through a couple of exam cycles.

(01:07:16):

Once ASBOG moved to computer-based testing, that changed how we did it. So, for anybody who isn't aware, prior to ASBOG's move to computer-based testing, we, as DOL, hosted all of the exams in one location because that was a very large number of examinees. We would have to rent a facility in Tacoma. And so, there were costs associated with that, transportation of our staff to man the exams, the multiple iterations of the exam throughout the day. So, we had a large number of staff transported to Tacoma. Because it started very early, they would have to go up the night before, things like that.

(01:07:55):

And so, when ASBOG moved to computer-based testing, that eliminated the need for that. We were able to shift and host the specialty exams at a DOL facility in Olympia now. So, I think we have two full years of that under our belt now. Now that we have that, it's a little bit more for us to really be able to break down those costs and figure out what the costs would be to administer that more frequently. So, we can look at finally taking that off of hold and get some progress for you guys on that one in early 2025.

(01:08:29):

For outreach, we've been working on a strategic plan, student outreach, best practices. Again, we've already talked about this. We have developed a handout for our outreach events. We may be bringing that to you guys early next year to see if there are any additions, changes that you guys want to that. But I felt like the handout came out really, really well and it seemed to be really well received earlier this year. So, we'll be looking at that, as well as any other outreach opportunities as they progress.

(01:09:01):

We've already discussed the scope of practice, the working titles. And so, we'll adjust how that one is worded, but that's what that item is for. Reaching out to California to learn how they have dealt with specialty licensure for hydrogeology regarding code statutes, we did that initially. We didn't get a whole lot of response back, but we will try and initiate that conversation one more time.

(01:09:32):

Scheduling the WAC Review Committee, we've already talked about. And then reviewing our licensee count data to determine if there's been a decrease in licensees, we did take a look at that. I will make sure that a report with the actual data comes to the board at the next meeting, but I think we had one at our last one as well. But we'll make that more of a standing report so you guys can see that year-over-year trend. And we did not see a huge decrease in licensees. You guys were one of the ones that actually held fairly steady through COVID where a lot of our other programs did see a dip.

(01:10:07):

So, are there any questions on any of that? Okay, I think you guys are done here for me for the day.

Carla Brock (01:10:19):

All right, we'll move on to agenda item number 9, which is the public comment period. The public may address the board on matters within the board's jurisdiction either verbally during the meeting or by submitting written comments in advance. Sydney, have we received any written comments?

Sydney Muhle (01:10:35):

No, ma'am.

Carla Brock (01:10:36):

Okay. Verbal comments are limited to one three-minute comment. In response to all public comments, the board response is limited to either requesting that the matter be added to a future agenda for discussion or directing staff to study the matter further. So, public comments cannot be discussed during the meeting today. Inflammatory comments and language will not be permitted.

(01:11:05):

So, if there are members of the public participating in the meeting today that wish to make a public comment, please raise your hand and I will call on you in the order that your hands are

raised. And it looks like we have a little clock timer to monitor for the three-minute period. So, the first person, there is one public member with their hand raised, and that is Olu Ekororo. Please feel free to give us your comment.

Olu Ekororo (01:11:40):

Hi, everyone, esteemed board members. My concern is regarding the ASBOG exam. Several of us, which I know that I'm talking on behalf of some people, graduated from colleges over 20 years ago. We came here to apply for LG license and at one sitting, we passed our PG exam. But of course, FG is always hard to pass. And we are now wondering if there's another pathway for some of us that has graduated 20 years ago and we've passed our PG exam one time and we have license from, let's say, for somebody like me, I'm a licensed PG in Canada. So, we've actually passed through all these processes. If we can get reciprocity for that, at least after passing our PG exam.

Carla Brock (01:13:33):

Thank you. So, I think the question is, are there alternative pathways to licensure through reciprocity?

Olu Ekororo (01:13:53):

Yes, because online, it's vague, but it's specifically there on your article there is a pathway, but however, the candidate must be able to diligently present himself as a qualified candidate. So, I have written PG exam, I passed one time. I'm a licensed geologist in Canada and I've written all these exams in the past. Just because there's some field that I do not work on and those fields, of course, most of the exams, actually most of these questions are actually abstract. So, it is that pathway for somebody like me that I'm talking about.

Carla Brock (01:14:59):

Yeah. Elizabeth?

Elizabeth (01:15:01):

So, a couple of things. Excellent questions, unfortunately, it's not on our agenda today to discuss. So, what we can do, a couple of things. One, the board, I mean the staff could get back to you, and I could assist, on the legal elements. And then on the agenda for next meeting, you could discuss alternative pathways, what the WAC says now or the law, and whether or not you want to make adjustments. I know that there's a waiver. The Engineers Board went through a long process to change the law, so that they could waive the FEE exam for the engineers for people that have been licensed in another state or another jurisdiction for a certain number of years. So, I haven't looked at the law on this topic and we're not really supposed to discuss it. So, my suggestion is to talk about it at the next meeting.

Sydney Muhle (01:16:13):

I was going to say we are actually working through this exact question under very similar circumstances with another applicant. So, sir, if you would like to email the email that's on the screen, the DOLBoards@dol.wa.gov, I will get you in touch with the right people and we can work through what those requirements would be.

Olu Ekororo (01:16:41):

Okay.

Carla Brock (01:16:43):

And we'll also add it to the next meeting agenda so we can discuss it further.

Sydney Muhle (01:16:48):

Yes, absolutely.

Carla Brock (01:16:49):

Great. Okay, I don't see any other public members that wish to comment. So, we can move on to the conclusion of the meeting. The next agenda item is announcements. Are there any board members that have announcements that they would like to share? Are there any board members that have agenda items to add to future meeting agendas?

(01:17:41):

All right, Alyssa, can you review the action items for the next meeting?

Alyssa (01:17:50):

Okay, thank you. So far, I have that staff will provide a link to the 2023 license review data for reference. I also have that Sydney will find how many testing centers are within Washington to share with the board. Board staff will work with Board Member Halbert and Vice Chair Gillum to finalize the hydrogeologist review. And Sydney will move the working titles to the master action items list. And then the WAC Review Committee will schedule a meeting no later than January. And I don't know if I've missed anything. Sydney, if there's anything else?

Sydney Muhle (01:18:41):

You captured everything I did. So, unless Sandra who's in the background captured something else.

Sandra Schaefer (01:18:51):

Nope, that's everything I got too.

Alyssa (01:18:53):

Okay, awesome. And then was I also reviewing the future agenda items as well?

Sydney Muhle (01:19:03):

Yes.

Alyssa (01:19:04):

Okay, sorry. For the future agenda items, I had just put down to discuss the alternative pathways to licensure, and I'm not sure if there were any others that had been mentioned.

Sydney Muhle (01:19:22):

That was it.

Alyssa (01:19:24):

Okay, thank you.

Carla Brock (01:19:27):

Thank you. All right, I think we're finished unless... Okay, I think we're finished. The time is 11:20 and this meeting is adjourned.

Bill Halbert (01:19:44):

All right, thanks everybody.

Elizabeth (01:19:44):

Thank you, everyone.

Jim Struthers (01:19:44):

Thanks, everybody.

Casey Hanell (01:19:44):

Thanks everybody.

Noah Dudley (01:19:44):

Thank you.

Julia Manley (01:19:44):

Have a happy holiday.