

SOUTH FORK WATER BOARD
MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING
July 26, 2023

Board Members Present: Denyse McGriff, Chair, Oregon City Mayor
Rory Bialostosky, Vice Chair, West Linn Mayor
Frank O'Donnell, Oregon City Commissioner
Mary Baumgardner, West Linn Councilor

Board Members Excused: Rocky Smith, Oregon City Commissioner
Scott Erwin, West Linn Councilor

Staff Present: Wyatt Parno, CEO
Christopher Crean, SFWB Legal Counsel (via Zoom)

Others Present: Alice Richmond, SFWB Citizens Advisory Board

General Board Meeting

(1) **Call to Order**

Chair McGriff called the meeting of the South Fork Water Board (SFWB) to order at 7:06 pm.

(2) **Roll Call**

The Board proceeded to Item 5 Portland General Electric Presentation (see minutes below).

(3) **Public Comments**

This item was addressed following Item 5.

Alice Richmond, West Linn Citizen, asked how South Fork's intake amount was being regulated or if it would be, due to the fires needing water. She also asked how this would affect water costs for households. She had been hearing things, and although the Board might not think rates need an increase now, they should not wait until the bucket is empty.

(4) **Consent Agenda**

- (A) Approval of the Minutes of the May 24, 2023 Board Meeting.
- (B) Approval of the Minutes of the June 28, 2023 Board Meeting.

Board Member Bialostosky moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Board Member O'Donnell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The Board proceeded to Item 6 Resolution 23-02 South Fork Board Employee Agreement.

(5) **Portland General Electric Presentation**

Wyatt Parno, CEO, introduced Portland General Electric (PGE) representatives, noting the biggest materials line-item expenditure was electricity at approximately \$800,000 per year, which was used to power the giant pumps that push the water up the hill from the intake and Division Street up to the Mountainview Reservoir in Oregon City. PGE was an amazing partner during the winter storm in February 2021. Ms. McDougal meets with him on a regular basis to discuss how SFWB is doing and what is needed. The PGE team introduced themselves as follows:

Tyesha McDougal, Senior Key Customer Manager (KCM), noted the key customer management team helped manage about 200 of the largest key customers within their service territory. She was a one-stop shopping resource, internally advocating for SFWB when there were questions, concerns, services, or products that would benefit them.

Kim Donahue, Senior Manager, Key Customer Management Team, stated she oversees 12 Key Customer Managers to support the 200 largest customers, who provide about 25 percent of PGE's revenue and about one-third of the load they serve.

Ken Spencer, Senior Customer Operations Engineer, noted he works with municipalities and other governmental organizations regarding all things planning and operations and was often consulted regarding operational issues of the PGE system.

The PGE team continued the presentation via PowerPoint, describing the service provided to SFWB, details about the February 2021 Ice Storm, storm preparedness and response, and the Critical Customer List created as a result of the storm.

Board Member O'Donnell asked if the treatment plant intake and pump station were on different feeders and how long it would take to perform a manual changeover. **Mr. Spencer** confirmed that at least two channels were used to supply electricity and that the primary service for the treatment plant intake and pump station was on different feeders. Three different circuits fed SFWB's facilities, and they had the ability to take a different circuit to replace one temporarily if needed. The response time on a manual changeover was weather dependent but generally was in the two-to-four-hour range, as they would have to call crew members to come in, and then the crew would have to drive to the facility to do the switching.

Board Member O'Donnell asked if they could furnish water during the two-to-four-hour transition time for fire-fighting events and if all areas of Oregon City were serviced by a gravity-fed system or if they were pump-reliant. **CEO Parno** answered they would have the ability to provide water for a fire to the extent the gravity feed was available off the storage reservoirs. They had about a day-and-a-half of storage capacity, with West Linn having a little bit less storage capacity (number and size of the reservoirs). Oregon City used some pumps due to the topography, and those areas could be unprotected for a short period of time during the transition. He was grateful for the dual-feed system because if something went down, something else would come up. He noted that during the winter storm, everything went down and asked PGE to explain what caused that to happen.

Mr. Spencer replied that it had rained and was 30 degrees for two days. Trees were coming down and shorting power lines due to the sheer volume of ice buildup after two to three days

of rain. Even though they regularly trim trees, both sides of the feed line into the Abernathy substation went down, taking down the transmission system. The storm was the biggest PGE had ever endured. **Ms. McDougal** added that one-half inch of ice added three pounds per foot of extra weight. Roughly 400 miles of transmission line needed to be repaired. A 300-foot span could get an additional weight of about 1,000 pounds. **Mr. Spencer** explained that a span was the wire distance between two poles.

Ms. McDougal continued the presentation, sharing the mileage of transmission lines, and the number of substations and poles that needed to be repaired or replaced. Both the preferred and alternate service for the Abernathy substation that feeds SFWB's facilities were brought down about 5:00 on February 12, and the service call was escalated the next day. The water intake and pump station were restored by the evening of February 14th. It took a few days to get the treatment plant back up because of the number of poles that were broken.

Chair McGriff noted emergency services restoration plans included who gets priority for service restoration, with facilities such as hospitals and water treatment plants getting priority for restoration and asked if PGE had plans of that nature. **Ms. McDougal** confirmed PGE's emergency response included seven steps for restoration, with public safety and health receiving top priority. PGE also took steps year-round for storm preparation, including tree trimming on a three-year cycle; inspections of poles, wires, and other equipment; and installation of tree wire.

Mr. Spencer continued the presentation, describing other storm preparation activities.

Board Member Baumgardner asked what the cost was for the storm cleanup and how it might have changed the budget. **Ms. Donahue** explained she did not know the cost off the top of her head, but PGE kept money in reserve for that sort of thing, and for something like this that far exceeds what is normal, they would collect all the costs from it, and then go to the commission separately and talk about how to recover that over a period of time so it's not so impactful. **Mr. Spencer** added over 400 line crews from 13 utilities came to help with recovery efforts.

Board Member O'Donnell asked if there was a pole inspection process in place prior to the ice storm and what the inspection process was. He also asked if they load it to see how much it deflects on the load. **Mr. Spencer** explained it had been in place since before he was on staff. They usually replace 2,000 to 3,000 poles a year, but this year they were on pace to replace about 6,000 poles, and within a year they would replace about 10,000 poles. The inspection was a visual inspection to check for woodpecker holes and things like that, but they also did a core sample analysis about five feet up. Each pole was inspected at least every ten years. **Ms. Donahue** added that she used to work in that department. Every time a wire was added to a pole, inspectors would do the calculations for the weighting on it to ensure that it didn't need something bigger or taller, and that it could support that weight. They also give it some allowance for ice and weighting, trying to prevent damage. **Mr. Spencer** believed they had at least 200,000 poles in the district. **Board Member O'Donnell** commented that half of one percent of that number was not so bad.

Ms. McDougal explained that the impact to SFWB and the need to escalate at the time of the event sparked changes within PGE, as they created the Critical Customer List that was now used to establish priority for restoration. **Ms. Donahue** noted that what they learned through the process was that the normal process, the bulk of the work, was two to three days. They relied on the KCM team, who works directly with the engineering team to escalate critical services. The process broke down because it was overwhelmed with 12 KCMs working with 700 crews and engineers. The process was taken offline and worked through manually to get crews to SFWB's feeder, but it raised the larger question of how they could be better prepared for the next time. The Critical Customer List came out of that. Now, when a feeder goes out, they know how many customers, including Critical Customers, were attached to it, helping schedulers and coordinators prioritize service. The KCMs could add a layer in coordinating if something needed to be re-prioritized. In the five or six storms since then, the list had been hugely helpful, with KCMs not having to get very involved because prioritization was occurring naturally where it needed to. **Ms. Donahue** confirmed that having other sources of power, such as on-site generators, would not change a customer's status in terms of being a critical customer. However, KCMs could be in contact with customers about the criticality and to keep up with their status.

Board Member O'Donnell noted SFWB has had conversations about on-site generators and understanding the peripheral equipment like storage and fuel that would be necessary to support them and the associated costs and frequency of occurrence. **Ms. McDougal** reiterated that the system for SFWB was a reliable dual feed system. Outside of the catastrophic 40-year occurrence, it worked exactly as designed in the event that if one feed or transmission line was down, they had the ability to redirect and restore power. As SFWB's dedicated KCM, she would continue to advocate for them internally and continue to work with CEO Parno on different solutions or questions that come their way to help them navigate through. She commended CEO Parno and the team on their unwavering participation in the energy partner program, as they had participated in every event this year. She believed they were on track to be as successful this year as they had been in the past.

CEO Parno confirmed they participated in programs that reflected savings. **Ms. Donahue** added the energy program was essentially a virtual power plant. It was important to PGE and the community, as it helped them avoid building a new power plant. For the first time last summer, they called on all of their customers to conserve energy at the same time when temperatures reached 115 degrees outside. At 5:00 that day, 80 megawatts dropped off the system. The energy program was important for grid stability, decarbonization, and keeping prices low for customers.

Chair McGriff asked what PGE would do differently to have a backup for the dual system, given that they were going through a cycle of unknowns regarding heat, cold, or floods. **Mr. Spencer** replied that they were hardening the system to stand up better. For example, they had done pre-emptive shut offs in fire-prone areas, primarily up on Mount Hood. They had put in iron poles and fiberglass crossarms instead of wooden parts and installed reclosures to preemptively shut off power in certain areas. Regarding transmission lines, as they replace insulators and poles, the poles were bigger and sturdier.

Board Member O'Donnell asked if PGE had portable generators. **Mr. Spencer** confirmed PGE does have portable generators, but they were not of sufficient size and were really used to help customers, such as an elderly person with a long driveway whose overhead power line was on the ground for three miles up the road. They did not have generators of a sufficient size to help commercial customers, but they could be rented from another source. **Ms. McDougal** added that during the storm, PGE did run down generators for critical customers.

Ms. Donahue noted there were companies that would put emergency agreements in place for generators. PGE had considered creating a program to do that, but she was not sure if that was something they would actually do. **Mr. Spencer** added that another step to building resiliency in preparation for the next event was to construct a new operations center. It was built to a Seismic 4 standard to withstand a big earthquake and had onsite generation to allow them to run things from it, including storm response. The operations center gave them a place that allowed them to do what needed to be done in the event that everything else was falling down.

In response to Member O'Donnell's question, **Mr. Spencer** confirmed the Warner Milne site in Oregon City was a maintenance site that had four or five crews doing normal daily tasks. They had purchased the property next to it intending to construct a more resilient building. Most of the line centers would be replaced within the next 15 years. **Chair McGriff** noted the sign was put up prematurely because the zoning was wrong for the site to allow them to do what they wanted to do, but City Staff was working with PGE on that. The church was zoned residential, but some of it beyond that was zoned commercial.

Vice Chair Bialostosky stated he had toured the Integrated Operations Center (IOC), and he encouraged everyone to tour it.

Chair McGriff asked what categories, besides water treatment plants, would fall into the 200 key customers, and **Board Member O'Donnell** asked what the criteria was to be a key customer. **Ms. Donahue** replied that the following types of companies were key customers: semi-conductors, hospitals, food processing, water treatment plants, data centers, lumber and sawmills, about 15 of the larger cities, including West Linn, Portland, and Oregon City, and then many smaller customers. The criteria did not have hard and fast rules, as it was really about the need. KCMs tended to manage customers that averaged at least 1 megawatt of usage. These customers also tended to have more complex distribution systems and more robust needs.

Board Member O'Donnell asked if PGE was ever approached by people asking them to purchase appliances that had failed. **Mr. Spencer** answered that did happen occasionally through the claims process, where they would be asked to replace items in the freezer or replace appliances. Sometimes those requests were approved, but many times they were not because everything inside the house or downstream from the meter was the customer's responsibility. PGE encouraged people to put a surge protector on the panel in the garage to have two levels of protection, one in the plug strip and one upstream from the plug strip, which would catch most of it.

The Board returned to Item 3 Public Comments at this time.

(6) **Resolution 23-02 – South Fork Water Board Employee Agreement**

This item was addressed after Public Comments.

CEO Parno reported he went through the agreement with the employees, and the only ask was that the weekly on-call pay be increased from \$250 to \$400 per week. The pay had not been adjusted for 17 years, and the total cost would be about \$7,000 or \$8,000 over the course of the year. The agreement had been rolled over three years ago, and laws had changed in that time. Legal counsel reviewed the agreement. Mr. Crean’s law firm has an employment specialist in-house, who added some language related to unpaid leaves, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), drug testing, and new rules from the State about sick leave and health insurance. There were minor title and date changes as well. The packet included the entire agreement and a redline version. The only material changes were making sure they were legally compliant with Federal and State laws and the on-call pay adjustment. CEO Parno recommended approving Resolution 23-02.

Chair McGriff noted Page 17 of the original agreement stated, “Any day designated by the President of the United States...” and asked if that language covered Juneteenth, which was not listed. **Mr. Crean** confirmed Juneteenth was covered under the quoted language. **Chair McGriff** suggested adding an asterisk after “holidays*.” in SECTION 1, HOLIDAYS, and replacing the box symbol before the “Any day designated by....” statement with an asterisk and then right justifying the asterisk to line up with the box above. She noted that with this three-year contract, any potential changes to the agreement should be considered in Year 2 next cycle, especially if any increases needed to be included as part of the budget process.

CEO Parno noted that he would make the change and that it was a good idea to review potential changes in Year 2 before the next budget cycle.

Vice Chair Bialostosky moved to approve Resolution 23-02, the South Fork Water Board Employee Agreement as amended. Board Member Baumgardner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

(7) **CEO Evaluation Process**

CEO Parno summarized that the Board had previously discussed the importance of having a structured evaluation for the CEO. Chair McGriff and Vice Chair Bialostosky had set up meetings with Human Resource (HR) staff from Oregon City and West Linn. West Linn sent over some information, and they met in July with Patrick Foiles from Oregon City. They agreed to make things more effective in accordance with what the Board suggested by doing the following:

- Provide a 360 review with SFWB operations staff and some people from outside the organization,
- Have a questionnaire to be filled out as part of that 360 review,
- Ask the CEO and Board members to fill out the questionnaire.

CEO Parno reported they had also discussed a timeline. Vice Chair Bialostosky had edited Oregon City’s City Manager questionnaire to make it applicable for South Fork. Currently, the

evaluation was scheduled to take place in June, but that was right after the AWWA conference and during the budget process, making it harder to focus on the evaluation. Chair McGriff had suggested moving the timeline so that the administrator would send out the 360 questionnaire in September and the Board would conduct the evaluation in October.

Chair McGriff stated that the busiest time for the plant was also in June, July, and August, compressing the schedule. Neither the Board nor Staff needed the additional stress. **Board Member O'Donnell** asked if the timeline would give Board members several weeks to review survey results. **Chair McGriff** confirmed the Board would have several weeks between the completion of the survey and the ultimate review to review responses.

Vice Chair Bialostosky reviewed the timeline, noting the questionnaire would be sent out in September, giving people a month to fill it out, and Mr. Foiles would send out a reminder if someone hadn't filled it out. The Board would get the responses in early October, and the Board meeting would be the third Wednesday of October, giving them about two weeks to review the responses.

CEO Parno stated that Chair McGriff had asked Mr. Crean to draft a resolution that would allow them to have an amendment to the agreement stating they could do the evaluation in October instead of June. The packet included a list of questions, which had been edited by Board Member Bialostosky and an organization chart in response to Member O'Donnell's comment at last month's meeting about 360 evaluations starting with the organization chart.

Chair McGriff explained that the two things they needed to accomplish tonight were getting comments about the proposed questions and approving the change to the contract. She would follow up with Board Member Erwin and Board Member Smith.

Discussion continued about changes to the draft questionnaire, focusing on having separate sections for internal and external relationships.

Chair McGriff discussed that benchmarks could be measured. She said Human Resource Departments measure the number of exit interviews performed. Board members stated that they could not have criteria for something that was not required.

Chair McGriff reminded that they would have to advertise that they would go into an executive session to do the evaluation.

Board Member O'Donnell asked what comparable compensation packages for this position in this area were. **Chair McGriff** replied they would need to rely on one of the city's HR staff to do a salary study. Mr. Foiles had done one for Oregon City's City Manager, listing several cities, the City Manager's compensation, and other data points. **CEO Parno** confirmed they had a listing of other water providers that was included in the CEO contract when it was agreed upon. They still had that list, and Clackamas River Water (CRW) was a good comparable. He noted that comparing duties is interesting at times, because he manages fewer people but wears more hats. **Chair McGriff** agreed with Mr. Parno about wearing multiple hats and noted she would talk with Mr. Foiles about assisting with comparable information, since he already knows how to do it.

Chair McGriff summarized the agreed upon changes to the questionnaire as follows:

- No changes on Items 1 through 5 or Item 8.
- Item 6: “~~Commission~~ **Board** Relations: How satisfied are you that...” to address internal relations.
- Item 7: Leadership and Public Image: “How satisfied are you that the CEO maintains a positive, professional reputation in the communities and cultivates effective relationships with *professional and community* partners?”
- Items 9 and 10: Delete the last name, “CEO ~~Parno~~”.

Mr. Crean suggested not approving the questionnaire until they received input from Board Members Erwin and Smith in case their input led to other changes. **Chair McGriff** suggested getting comments from Board Members Erwin and Smith no later than August 3rd. She asked CEO Parno to send the revised questionnaire to the entire Board, and she would follow up with Board Members Erwin and Scott to get their input.

Vice Chair Bialostosky asked if there was sufficient authority to send out the questionnaire if it was not approved tonight and if they had to formally approve it. **Mr. Crean** clarified that they could say “these were presented to the Board tonight for discussion,” and then the questionnaire could be sent to anyone they wanted. It could then be brought back to next month’s meeting for approval with any changes.

Chair McGriff reminded they were not meeting in August, which was why she wanted to approve it tonight. If comments were received from Board Members Erwin and Smith, they could incorporate those into the questionnaire and continue to move the process forward.

Chair McGriff and Mr. Crean continued discussion about when to approve the questionnaire and who should follow up with Board Members Erwin and Smith. **Chair McGriff** believed that since this was for the CEO’s evaluation, the Board should follow up rather than CEO Parno. She also felt more comfortable passing a motion so they had a record of it. **Mr. Crean** was concerned that they did have a record of her comments, and they could be incorporated here and approved by the Board tonight. They would not have a record of any comments from the other members, so they would not be able to change what they approved tonight absent a subsequent meeting and approval by a majority of the Board. He stated they had a quorum tonight and could approve the process they just decided.

Vice Chair Bialostosky noted he wanted to make sure they were able to move forward without having to call another meeting because they were not scheduled to have one in August or September. He asked Mr. Crean, as parliamentarian, what kind of motion the Board could make to approve the questions with an opportunity to make changes in the future. **Mr. Crean** noted that if the questions were approved by the Board tonight, they could not be subsequently amended without action by the Board.

Chair McGriff suggested approving the questionnaire tonight, as Board Members Erwin and Smith had received their packet and would have had an opportunity to review it. She would reach out to them and let them know it had been approved.

Mr. Crean noted if there was something they did not catch tonight, they could hold an emergency meeting to fix it.

Vice Chair Bialostosky moved to approve the questions for the CEO evaluation as amended. The motion was seconded by Chair McGriff and passed unanimously.

(8) Resolution 23-03 – South Fork Water Board CEO Contract Amendment

CEO Parno summarized that this resolution would change Section 4 of the contract to change the performance evaluation from June to October.

Chair McGriff added this was specified because of operational constraints, and it was a slower time of the year.

Board Member Baumgardner moved to approve Resolution 23-03. It was seconded by Board Member O'Donnell and passed unanimously.

(9) Business from the CEO

1) Operations Update (Summer Schedules, Certifications/DRC, Aluminum Sulfate Savings)

CEO Parno provided an operations update, noting employees were working longer shifts on the summer schedule. As the agent of record, the State required him to appoint a Direct Responsible Charge (DRC), the expert in water who would be held accountable if something went wrong with the municipal drinking water system. Mark Cage filled that role, which required him to be on call at all times. As a Level 3 operations plant, the DRC had to be at least a Level 3 or Level 4. Although they had lost a lot of experienced employees due to retirement in the last couple of years, Ruth and Geoff were now Level 3. He and Mark would meet with Ruth and Geoff tomorrow evening to discuss backup plans for DRC so Mark could take time off.

He commended Mark because Pete Kreft, who had designed the filters and other parts of the plant, called Mark to tell him another company was no longer using aluminum sulfate as their coagulant, and they were willing to ship it to SFWB for half the cost. Instead of paying \$6,000, they paid \$3,000 for the alum. Mark was careful to include a chain of custody, so everything was safe. He noted South Fork had reviewed all of the chemical contracts last year and saved money there as well.

Things were going well in the summer, although they were not quite operating at full capacity except when it gets extra hot.

2) Board Meeting Follow Up (Website Search, Basin Tour, Quality Control, Night Safety)

CEO Parno provided updates on the following items that were discussed at the last meeting:

Regarding Ms. Richmond's comments about the website not coming up in a Google search for South Fork, if you search for "South Fork Water" or "South Fork Water Board," the website comes up, but searching "South Fork" would bring up many other sites, since they had no control over how search engines worked, but the website was working fine.

The Clackamas River Water Providers would have a bus tour of the upper basin area the first week of October. Capacity was limited, but Board members had priority.

He discussed quality control issues with Pump Dynamics, who reported having a better system in place. SFWB wound up making money on the deal because Pump Dynamics covered the cost of the separate project for divers to replace the screens after doing the dredging work.

CEO Parno reported he had talked with the night safety crew, particularly Ruth, regarding how they felt about safety. He learned they did have the "I've fallen and can't get up" buttons at one point, but they did not work well. Ruth carried her phone everywhere and did not do inspections at night. **Chair McGriff** noted the Apple Watch would now call 911 if someone falls. **Board Member O'Donnell** suggested checking the price of the Apple Watch, as it would be a small expenditure to provide safety for crew members.

3) Oregon Health Authority Water System Survey

CEO Parno reported the Oregon Health Authority Water Survey review was conducted last week. He believed they did an amazing job and hoped to have an outstanding rating. He shared the two issues that came up during the review. Prior to his tenure, in 2021, there were two excursions on the pH levels due to a new operator not averaging and rounding properly. That has been corrected and should not be an issue this time. They opened all the vents on top of the clear wells to make sure they were sealed so critters could not get in. They were sealed, but one of the vents had a hornet's nest right under the lock. They have cleaned those out, and the inspector asked them to send him pictures.

Board Member O'Donnell asked if there was a checklist at shift change for the operators to follow. **CEO Parno** replied that the plant has several checklists that are required by the state as well as internal checklists. The pH check is performed over multiple shifts and uses an averaging, so it is important for the operators to do the math averaging correctly, since the final pH could easily be adjusted. Further, it was interesting because the State requires that pH always be rounded down.

He and Mark had discussed checklists for the turbidimeter readings recently because Mark suggested a cost savings could occur if the operators performed the calibrations versus having an outside consultant do it. He asked to understand whether there was benefit, under the law or with respect to survey reviews to have an outside consultant versus in house calibration. The staff are also building an annual calendar with a checklist of all the things that need to happen because checklists hold people accountable. Also, at some point, Mark will retire, and newer employees were still learning. They had already lost institutional knowledge with retirements last year, and having checklists would help.

4) Summer Meeting Schedule (Barbeque in August, Meeting Needed in September, Cyber Audit)

CEO Parno reported the chemical feed building was out for bid. They would receive bids on either the 15th or 17th. There had been a lot of interest, with at least six companies contacting him. He was hopeful the bids would come in within budget and be awarded in September. However, he was concerned about costs due to the state of the economy, and that the Board might have to review the project if costs are too high.

Board Member O'Donnell stated he needed to take his time with the contracts, as they would need to check to see if they would take exceptions to the bid and if they match the criteria. It was not an overnight process.

Chair McGriff believed they needed to have a meeting in September, especially now that they would be doing the evaluation.

CEO Parno reminded there would be no Board meeting in August, but they would have a barbeque with the employees on August 24th from 11:00 am to 1:00 pm. The next meeting would be on September 27, 2023.

(10) **Business from the Board**

Board Member O'Donnell reported the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) would conduct a grant writing workshop. He emailed the information to CEO Parno in case there was anyone he wanted to have attend it.

CEO Parno gave a shout-out to Beery, Elsner & Hammond, adding Ashley had put on procurement training, and Mark and other employees had watched it to get up to speed on contracting rules.

Chair McGriff asked how the cybersecurity audit was going. **CEO Parno** replied that it was very important and would be initiated after the summer season. He would be contacting Michael at Oregon City to work on it.

Chair McGriff reported the 9th Circuit Court struck down a law prohibiting undercover recording. They now no longer had any expectation that somebody would inform that they were recording. They could do it whether you know it or not, including over the phone. **Mr. Crean** clarified that Oregon has been a one-party consent state for a long time, so the ruling really did not affect Oregon. If there were two people on a call, one could record the call without the other person's consent or knowledge. **Chair McGriff** added that the rule now included in-person conversations.

(11) **Executive Session –Adjourn regular meeting and convene Executive Session if needed.**
No Executive Session was held.

A. To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(f).

B. To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(h).

(12) **Reconvene Regular Meeting if needed to take any action necessary as determined in Executive Session.**

Chair McGriff adjourned the regular meeting at 8:52 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, LLC.
for Wyatt Parno, SFWB CEO