

**From:** [Laurie Grenva](#)  
**To:** [Jordan Walker](#)  
**Cc:** [monselliott](#); [Dustin Basurto](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Mapleton Water District - Final Draft - Lead Operator Job Description  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 8, 2026 8:18:50 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[image007.png](#)

---

Hi Jordon,

Thank you for sending over the draft Lead Operator job description. Overall, I think you have done a really nice job capturing the practical expectations of the position, especially for a small district where one role often has to cover a wide range of operational, maintenance, emergency response, and coordination duties.

I reviewed this with a “glaring issues only” lens, and I do not see anything that suggests the document needs to be rebuilt. The draft is in good shape overall. I would suggest a few targeted clean-up items before finalizing it.

First, I reviewed the availability/on-call language with the distinction between “waiting to be engaged” and “engaged to wait” in mind. In plain language, “engaged to wait” generally means the employee’s time is so restricted that the waiting time is really work time. “Waiting to be engaged” generally means the employee is free enough to use the time for their own purposes, even though they may need to be available if something comes up. Based on the way this role is structured, my determination is that the District’s availability/on-call arrangement appears to be “waiting to be engaged,” not “engaged to wait.” That means the availability time itself does not appear to need to be treated as hours worked, as long as the employee is generally able to use that time for their own personal purposes and is only paid for actual call-out/work time, plus any availability pay the District has chosen to provide. That said, I do recommend softening the phrase that says the employee is expected to be available by phone “24 hours a day, 7 days a week.” Even if the District’s intent is reasonable, that phrase sounds more restrictive than the arrangement appears to be. A clearer approach would be to say the employee is expected to be available during assigned availability periods and for operational emergencies unless other coverage has been approved.

Second, I do see one item I would treat as a glaring correction: Oregon sick time should be addressed separately from the unpaid time off already listed in the draft. My read is that the existing unpaid time off language is intended to function more like unpaid vacation or personal time. That is fine as a separate benefit or scheduling practice, but Oregon sick time is its own protected leave requirement. For a very small employer, Oregon sick time may be unpaid. However, the employee still needs to accrue or frontload protected sick time beginning at employment and must be allowed to use time no later than the 91st calendar day of employment. I recommend adding a separate Oregon sick time sentence or subsection, such

as: “The District will provide unpaid Oregon sick time in accordance with applicable Oregon law, including accrual beginning at employment and use of accrued sick time no later than the 91st calendar day of employment. Oregon sick time is separate from unpaid vacation/personal time provided by the District.”

Third, I recommend clarifying the certification section. If anything is required at hire, that should be called out separately from certifications or other requirements that may be achieved after hire. This will make the expectations clearer for the employee and help avoid confusion if the District is willing to hire someone who is not yet fully certified. It may also be helpful to clarify how Direct Responsible Charge coverage will be handled if the employee is still working toward certification.

Fourth, I noticed one inconsistent title reference. Most of the document refers to the Board or Board-designated Manager, but the holiday section refers to approval by the “Operations Manager.” I would suggest using the same title throughout the document so everyone knows who has authority to approve time, scheduling, and related decisions.

As a side note, the personal vehicle language is not necessarily something I would change in the job description itself. However, the District should make sure it has a simple policy or written practice addressing mileage reimbursement, insurance expectations, and use of a personal vehicle for District business.

Again, I think the draft is in good shape overall. These suggestions are mostly about making the document clearer, separating required protected sick time from other time off the District may choose to provide, and reducing the chance of misunderstanding later.

Let me know what questions you may have or if you would like to schedule time to discuss.

Nice work, Laurie



**Laurie Grenya**

President | SPHR, CCP

[lgrenya@hranswers.com](mailto:lgrenya@hranswers.com)

[503-885-9815](tel:503-885-9815) x 220

7650 SW Beveland St. Ste. 130 Tigard, OR 97223

[www.hranswers.com](http://www.hranswers.com)



We're sure you know that all emails are subject to archiving and review. But just in case, we wanted to let you know that this email was intended solely for the person or entity to which it was addressed. If you have received this email in error, please contact us immediately and delete the material from any computer.

**From:** Jordan Walker <jwalker@mapletonwd.org>

**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2026 3:45 PM

**To:** Laurie Grenya <lgrenya@hranswers.com>

**Cc:** monsellcott <monsellcott@hotmail.com>; Dustin Basurto <dbasurto@mapletonwd.org>

**Subject:** Mapleton Water District - Final Draft - Lead Operator Job Description

Hi Laurie,

I've attached a final draft of a lead operator job description that was prepared by board members in consultation with OAWU. Could you review this for any glaring errors or omissions?



*Jordan Walker*

Office Administrator  
Mapleton Water District