

Rob Harris: ...talks to four DUI people in diversion court. That's totally different than being appointed for DUI trial level cases. So, is there a way to code your information to indicate that? From what you're telling me, the Southwest number is largely high because it sounds like what they did was, I'm not saying like a mass docket, but early case resolution for a lot of the appointments. Have you considered doing that?

Jessica Kampfe: Yes, we have considered it. That particular early resolution docket, it was a driving crimes docket, and we did continue to provide representation for a number of the people that did not resolve their case that day. So, we, I believe, are still closing out some of the cases from that docket. So, it wasn't the same type of an early resolution docket that Judge Guptill described. It was more of a hybrid, but I will defer to Maddie about the coding question and whether or not we could pull that information out of our overall numbers.

Rob Harris: Thank you. I think actually what Chair Nash mentioned was probably more relevant is tracking the time on this. Because obviously, if you have some sort of a really good early case resolution where things like conditional discharge are being offered, you're going to resolve a lot of cases. And if you're doing 10 cases in an afternoon, the per case time commitment is going to be reflected in that, where it's not reflected in just a flat appointment level. So, as we get more data, I think this is going to become more clear. So, thank you.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Brook? [Inaudible 00:01:43].

Brook Reinhard: Yeah. So, I'm glad to hear the utilization rate that you guys were able to take cases. My question is would there be the ability to explore in the future or soon some sort of change in policy for vacancies when the Trial Division hires contractors from my office, consortium, or something? Because as it is, I just had somebody hired away with about 30 days' notice and being able to replace that person within the 60 days is very hard, particularly when we're talking about one county to another. So, this is, I suppose, a very thinly veiled complaint. I don't like losing people to higher salaries that I can't match, but given that that's somewhat of a reality with the Trial Division until we get pay equity, is there a way to explore contractors not losing positions at 60 days given that it's robbing Peter to pay Paul? So, that may be rhetorical unless you have an answer now, but curious about that.

Jessica Kampfe: I don't have an answer right now. We have our vacancy policy. If that's something that the commission wants to review the vacancy policy, we can bring that policy back in front of the commission for review. It's something that the commission previously adopted.

Chair Jennifer Nash: And it has some flexibility built into it for circumstances where it's difficult to fill vacancies. So, I think there is some flexibility there, but certainly we can review it if this becomes an issue. I think that would be appropriate.

Jessica Kampfe: And did I see Commissioner Smith's hand up?

Addie Smith: I just wanted to get clarity on the concern, Brook. Are you saying more lead time would be helpful? So, having some type of fill policy as opposed to vacancy policy almost, so not that you want to prevent people from being able to move, but that there's an ability to give a larger number of days of notice so that that can be accounted for?

Brook Reinhard: Yes, I would either like the agency to give me more notice if they're hiring someone away and give maybe a 60-day lead time before hiring that person, so we don't need to change the vacancy policy, or more flexibility on things. Like I would have loved to set a bunch of trials with this attorney, but I didn't think it was reasonable to ask a Medford attorney to take Eugene cases. So, either of those things would be wonderful.

Addie Smith: Yeah, thanks.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Okay, Director Kampfe, you can continue with your report.

Jessica Kampfe: Thank you. Next slide, please, Maddie. So, this is a breakdown of the types of cases that the offices are accepting appointment on, along with where those cases are. So, 81% of the cases taken by the state trial offices have been in-custody unrepresented, and that excludes the Southwest special set cases, which were all out-of-custody cases. So, the reasons why we would take cases that were not in-custody unrepresented is we may have taken a client with us when somebody came to the office from their previous employment. There might've been a client who had an in-custody case and an out-of-custody case, or we might've gotten a call from the court to say, "Would you take this person? Otherwise they're going to be on the unrepresented list," and we took them before they got reflected on OJD's list as opposed to after. So, we are continuing to target that in-custody unrepresented population as the primary targeted population by these offices.

You can see the counties in which we've taken the most unrepresented persons, and this should not be too much of a surprise that the biggest counties are Jackson, Multnomah, Washington, and Marion because those are the, I guess...and Douglas because those are the counties that are targeted by these offices and that have the most significant number of unrepresented. We are taking the majority of the Southwest cases in Jackson County, which has impacted that office's ability to serve the other two counties that it's supposed

to be serving, Klamath and Douglas counties. And that's part of the reason why in the ask for the fourth office, we have asked for an office that would serve both Douglas and Coos County because we're using so much of those four lawyers' resources in Jackson County. We really aren't able to adequately support Douglas County with that Southwest office right now.

In looking at the types of cases that we're providing representation on, you can see that the majority of them have been in custody. And then starting in June, when the Betschart ruling came into effect, we started tracking how many of the cases have been in-custody Betschart, potentially subject to release under Betschart. And we are really, with those potentially subject-to-release-under-Betschart cases, we're using our Trial Division very strategically to take cases that have high public safety risk if the person were to be conditionally released because we don't have an attorney available. And I say that with the caveat of we're making charge-based decisions. We don't have a lot of the other public safety risk information available to us. And so we've taken cases... When you see that our trial offices have taken cases in Coos County, Deschutes County, that's because of those Betschart concerns. Maddie?

We are doing time tracking for our state employees, and we have both lawyers and investigators doing time tracking. So, in here, you can see the types of activities that we're spending most of our time doing. So, 18% of lawyer time tracked has been associated with client communication, 18% has been associated with court time. And we can also see the time that's being tracked by the investigators and the amount of time that is being tracked to do discovery and case preparation. I think that this information's going to be really helpful when we talk with partners about ways to be more efficient with public defender resources, both things like court efficiencies and how that could impact public defender resources, but also what type of work can be done by professional staff within public defender offices that are not lawyers, and how building out those resources impacts the attorney's resource level. I see Commissioner Harris.

[Crosstalk 00:09:15]

Jessica Kampfe: I can't hear you.

Rob Harris: Thanks, Jessica. Sorry, I'm sort of a data nerd about this stuff. So, a couple of questions. Have you thought... Number one, the closed cases, I think it would be helpful to track the hours for cases that are originally appointed to these trial offices, not cases they brought along, because then we would have time from start to finish rather than halfway through. So, maybe you're doing that already, but that's just a suggestion. Number two, tracking them by county. It'll be interesting to see if, for instance, one county, it takes twice as long to process a

DUI or something, or the time from open to close is twice as long because that's going to affect what a reasonable open caseload would be – open caseload, yeah – would be for a county. So, I love the fact that we're getting this data. I want to make sure it's clean data and clear data as to what we are measuring. I think it's going to help measure, like you say, how much work could be reasonably assigned to non-lawyer positions and also outcomes. So, I'm assuming you're working on outcome measurements as well. This is great data. Thank you very much for getting this. I'm just making some suggestions as to data I would like to see to be able to make this system as fair and efficient as possible. Thanks.

Jessica Kampfe: Yeah, that's great. Thanks, Rob. And I would welcome a follow-up conversation to talk about how we could display things in ways that are most helpful to the commission that you would really want to see. We are measuring dispositions on cases, so we do have outcome data as well. That's not one of the things we chose to display today, but if it's interesting to the commission, that's something that we could display in the future. All right, Maddie. Oh, that's the end of our presentation on the state trial level data. Happy to take follow-up questions, or if folks would like to meet with us separately to talk about how you'd like to see this report improved for future presentations, we'd be happy to incorporate that feedback.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Any questions? Okay. Thank you very much. It was very helpful. I want to skip ahead in the agenda. We have about 20 minutes before we need to go into executive session, and one of the things that we absolutely must cover today is the executive director performance review plan. So, with Susan's permission, I'd like to jump to that item so that we can make sure we cover that.

Susan Mandiberg: Thank you, Jennifer. I like using first names, as you all know. So, this is something the Governance Subcommittee has been working on for a while. And I'll start by saying that, as my memo indicates, we had a couple of meetings early on in June and July, where we put together an approach that was much more global than what I'm presenting to you today. We thought that we needed to use the Executive Department's review mandate or review template in order that what we did would make sense to them going forward. But we thought about adding a whole bunch of questions that are not asked in that template, but that we thought would be important for the commission to know in terms of evaluating the executive director's performance. And that more global approach included a lot more respondents from a variety of places who maybe had not had as much contact with Jessie.

And after we put that sort of approach together, I had the ability to speak to our human resources director who made a number of extremely valuable suggestions. And we've had a lot of trouble finding times when everybody on

this subcommittee could meet, and so we haven't had another meeting since getting that input from human resources. And so what I have in this memo to you is my own and Eric Deitrick's approach to cutting down that more global approach to a very much more focused approach that uses only the executive branch's template. And what I am suggesting, and I'm going to say "I" because, again, we haven't had a chance to run this by the whole committee. What I'm suggesting is that we follow HR's direction to use this much more focused executive branch review template. And then later next year, if we want to, next year because we don't have time this time, but we can put together a different kind of review that meets the informational needs of the commission itself, but not necessarily of interest to the executive branch. And that could focus either just on the executive director or it could focus on broader issues.

So, what we are proposing here is that we do this review, that we accomplish it before the end of this calendar year. In other words, before we move to the executive branch because this would, first of all, give us a baseline in order to evaluate what's going on before we're in the executive branch versus afterwards in terms of the performance of the executive director. But second of all, it would produce a review that would be understandable to the executive branch. I'm sure they'll be interested in it. The reason to do it at all is it's one of our responsibilities as a commission to do a performance review of the executive director. Certainly, this commission hasn't done it since we've only been in existence since January, and I'm not aware of a competent one that was done by a previous commission. So, we need to get it done.

What the executive branch template says is that we, first of all, include commission members in the evaluation. All of us will need to respond to the questionnaire. Second of all, it requires us to include as respondents direct reports and executive team members. On page two of the memo, I've listed the six people who I was told fit into those categories. And looking at the organizational chart that we were given, I'm not sure that I have everybody who should be there. I listed these based on the information I was given, but before we review this and give it back for an action item in September, we'll make sure that who we have listed here matches up with that organizational chart.

Next is parties of interest and peers. We at first had thought about having 12 to 15 parties of interest and 12 to 15 peers. The executive guidance template suggests 12 to 15 overall of those two groups combined, and our HR department has suggested that we go along with that limit. So, parties of interest are defined as parties that benefit in some way from the relationship with the agency, and we need to limit these to people who have had significant direct interaction with Jessie because this is a review of the executive director. It is not a review of the agency. It's not a review of the commission. So, limiting to the people who've had direct significant interaction with Jessie, I asked for a list

of people who Jessie has had that kind of interaction with, and the people who are reflected in the memo are the result. They include lawyers who are members of consortia, lawyers who have law firm contracts, lawyers who are in nonprofits, and one investigator.

Finally, let's see where we are here, the template says that we should get input from peers. These would be people who are in other branches of government. And so we've included, again, only people who've had significant personal interaction with Jessie, a list of people here who include people in other agencies who have mentored Jessie, people from the state bar, people from the Legislature, people from the judicial department, people from the executive branch.

And then finally, the template sets out the questions that are required to be asked of all these evaluators, and it tells us what kind of evaluation scale we are to use. So, most of the questions get evaluated by a scale of unacceptable, acceptable, effective, very effective, no opportunity to observe. There's also a space required for textual comments, and then there are a couple of questions that just ask for textual responses, and they're all listed out in this memo. What I was hoping to get from the commission was, in addition to questions, suggestions for what you might want us to do differently.

We have set a subcommittee meeting for early September, September 9th, to discuss the input from the commission, and then we will bring the final proposal as an action item in the September meeting. And HR department is poised to get this survey out to the respondents immediately after the September commission meeting. We hope to have the responses back. I'm happy to talk about how that will all work, I mentioned it briefly in the memo. And then be able to discuss the analysis of the answers in a November executive committee meeting because it is a personnel matter. So, that's where we are. I'm happy to answer questions or hear suggestions. If you don't feel like you want to make a suggestion today, I haven't had time to look through this, which I can imagine is true. We're happy to receive any kind of suggestions that you might want to make or critiques in writing. You could submit them to Eric and that will get them to me. So, I'm open to anything people want to say or ask now.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Thank you for your hard work on this. This is wonderful. And thank you for providing the timeline so that we have an idea of what to expect. Does anyone have any questions first or any matters that they'd like to discuss? Addie.

Addie Smith: Mine's just really brief. I was wondering, to the extent that it's shareable, sort of why scaling it back was a suggested recommendation. I think it makes sense, but I'm just curious.

Susan Mandiberg: I think that the main reason for scaling it back was to not make it different from what these kinds of responders have seen in the past, to make it more accessible, and to make it, first of all, shorter. Easier, also easier for us to evaluate. The original approach that we had put together as a subcommittee involved having one list of questions for one group of respondents and a separate list of questions for a separate group of respondents, and it was very complicated. While this wasn't actually stated, my sense when I thought about it was that there were a number of things that we might want to look into as a commission that either the executive branch wouldn't be interested in or that maybe quite frankly, it wouldn't be any of their business. And so that if we could separate the different kinds of evaluations, that might work to everyone's benefit. You're muted.

Chair Jennifer Nash: I said thank you. That was very helpful. Are there any other questions or comments? All right. Well, thank you. That's very, very helpful, and look forward to voting on a plan in September.

Susan Mandiberg: I look forward to getting some suggestions. [Laughter]

Chair Jennifer Nash: You did a really great job, so we'll see. All right. We have about eight minutes before we need to go into executive session. Eric, do you think that you can update us on the federal public service loan forgiveness in that period of time?

Eric Deitrick: Certainly. Chair Nash, members of the commission, quick update here. I kind of tipped it off in Bend, at the June meeting over in Bend. High level, there is a public service student loan program that the federal government's administered since 2007. Again, high level. The requirements of the program are that you do public service work for a qualified employer for a 10-year period. And during that 10-year period, you make monthly payments on your loans. And there's a bunch of rules about the loan types that have been temporarily waived, but that's generally the program. And the qualified employers have always been defined as nonprofit offices for governmental employees, which leaves a state like Oregon, which public defense is public service work, kind of in the lurch, and that a large part of our workforce doesn't fit into either of those categories. And legally really couldn't [Inaudible 00:25:41] have Trial Division until this past year.

So, I was contacted in April by a public defender who had heard about this administrative rule change in the federal program. It actually happened last summer and kind of flew under the radar because we didn't really hear anyone talking about it. And around the same time I was contacted, you started seeing webinars by NAPD and the ADA show up highlighting this change in rule. And what the rule basically says is that if you do public service work full-time, which is defined as an average of 30 hours per week, per year, and you are a contractor, then you are eligible for student loan forgiveness. This is good news.

And it's a little tricky for us because we know this is going to be beneficial to a bunch of our providers who because of the structure of our contract system have been doing full-time public defense for a long period of time.

But the way the program works is we have to certify it, and we don't have data to know who's working 30 hours per week or not. So, we reached out to get legal advice on how we could sign off on this program in a way that minimized risk to the agency. The advice we got was that we could and that if there was a person who came forward with an application that they have been engaged in full-time public defense work, they meet that definition, then we would need two things in order to sign off on the certification. One is someone else to corroborate that, likely the contract administrator that they were a part of in doing their contract work. And the second piece was that the certifications may be under the penalty of perjury.

So, we have put that together with the draft policy in your packet. We're going to do some office hours at the beginning of September to kind of walk folks through what the template form looks like and what they need to submit to us before we can sign off. And the plan is to come back at the end of September and ask the commission to approve the policy. So, the only tricky thing, which I tried to highlight in there, is that the reason there's been so many webinars is this rule change was announced, not much explanation. And there's a little bit of ambiguity as to what they mean by do you...is there some state law prohibition that requires you to be a contractor? I tried to articulate the material why I think it was, and why I think as an agency we could sign off on these. Just want to make clear that we can't guarantee what the federal government's going to do, but that's the update on the student loan issue.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Does anyone have any questions or comments? Susan.

Susan Mandiberg: Yeah, if we turn this into the federal government and they don't approve it, will they tell us what we might need to change in order to get their approval? We'll be able to have a chance to amend it?

Eric Deitrick: I would hope so, I would believe so, but I don't know that either. It's been interesting to look at the information that other states are considering, and there is a lack of certainty right now. And I think as a part of, again, we just started hearing, at least in Oregon about it in April, it's about four months in the process. Usually the administrative process to go through this takes significantly longer than that, but I would hope so, Commissioner Mandiberg, and I will keep everyone posted on how this goes.

Susan Mandiberg: And my second... I think this would be wonderful to be able to offer this to people. I think it would be a game changer for a lot of people who might



otherwise not go into public defense work. But do we have the capacity as an agency to be able to administer all this?

Eric Deitrick: That is an excellent question, and we are already fairly short-staffed. We've been trying to assign this workload to folks internally. Right now, I've only heard from about 10 people around the state, so I'm not sure how big of a push there's going to be from our providers to make these certifications. I suspect there will be significantly more than that, but I'm not positive. I see Chair Nash nodding.

Chair Jennifer Nash: I'm only nodding because I was trying to send Mona a direct message for a question she asked, and I sent it to Susan instead, so it has nothing to do with anything that you're saying, so sorry about that.

Susan Mandiberg: Well, you can nod because as a former law professor who's talked to people about career plans, I know this is important.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Well, I will tell you my personal experience. I recently, or recently a year ago, unexpectedly had my still substantial amount of student loans forgiven because, believe it or not, I had been making payments since 1996 and still owed half the amount I had borrowed.

Susan Mandiberg: Amazing.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Oh, gosh. I never missed a payment. And it was life changing. I was one of those people that... I had three kids when I went to law school, so I borrowed a lot of money, and I was one of those contractors that wasn't eligible. And it was really frustrating because I didn't make any money. I was working full-time as a public defender, but by contract, so I didn't qualify for public service student loan forgiveness. So, this is a really big deal, and if we can make this happen in any way that we can, we absolutely should do this because it really does change people's lives, so this is a really good thing.

Eric Deitrick: Well, I will be back next month asking the commission to approve the policy that'll be informed by the feedback we get during office hours [Phonetic 00:31:45]. Thank you.

Chair Jennifer Nash: And I will say, Mona, to your question specifically since we're on the meeting, I am going to make a change to the agenda. We're going to go into executive session, but I'm going to say that we don't need to have an FCMS report specifically from Mr. Martin because we have the legislative report, and we also have his written report in the materials, so he does not need to come in after the executive session, which only leaves us a brief two things to deal with after

the executive session. But it is now one o'clock, so we will move to executive session, and I will read the information about that.

The Oregon Public Defense Commission will now meet in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(i) to discuss the job performance of an employee. The executive session will last for approximately 60 minutes. Representatives of the news media and designated staff shall be allowed to attend the executive session. All other participants may not attend. Representatives of the news media are specifically directed not to report on or otherwise disclose any of the deliberations or anything said about these subjects during the executive session, except to state the general subject of the session as previously announced. No decision may be made in executive session. At the end of executive session, we will return to the open session and welcome the audience back into the meeting. So, for commissioners, you'll want to disconnect from this, use the link provided for executive session, and rejoin in the executive session. Thank you.

[No dialogue]

Chair Jennifer Nash: All right. I think we have everyone that we're going to have join us. We certainly have a quorum. So, we're back in the Oregon Public Defense Commission meeting on August 21st after having an executive session, and we have one more item on the agenda to address, and that is a briefing on the service delivery transition planning by Eric Deitrick.

Eric Deitrick: Thank you, Chair Nash, members of the commission. Wanted to give a briefing. I know this past year, there's been a lot of work before the commission. The agency, just the formation and onboarding of the new commission, addressing the unrepresented persons crisis, preparing for the transition to the executive branch, remediation and modernization work and documenting all of this in reports to the Legislature, as well as the recent budget and top planning that has happened. But there is a lot of work to do for the future. We have an obligation under both the '21 public defense bill, House Bill 2002, and then SB337 to do a number of things. And I included in your materials a brief summary of those, as well as the initial project plan and a document from the Sixth Amendment Center.

And the work that really needs to be done is all kind of interconnected, and that's what I tried to demonstrate in the materials that went out to y'all. First and foremost, we need to change to a contracting workload model. The foundation has been done to do that by this commission in its consideration of the caseload standards and the workload standards, but that actually needs to get built out into something that is a process. We need to work on that. Effective next summer, we need to transition our hourly folks to a more formalized panel. We're still, effective next summer, we're going to be

employing people here at the agency to do public defense work. We will be contracting with entities just as we're contracting now, subject to some language and statute about what's prohibited in terms of financial incentives or disincentives for those contracts. And we need to build out that panel.

And for each of those, there's kind of data requirements the agency has. There's supervision, training, and oversight requirements the agency has. And those are going to look different depending upon the service delivery model. So, internally, we had our kickoff meeting to begin this work. We wanted to let the commission know that. The goal is, of course, we need to get a lot of this work done for our contracts next summer, which is July 1st, 2025. I know Lisa Taylor earlier talked about the briefing we're going to give to the Judiciary Committee in December. We want to be at a position where we can provide a good update to that committee then and continue working throughout the year.

For the plan right now, given Moss Adams project management work on other pieces of our transition, they're going to assist us on this. And then I'm really happy in that, particularly since the Sixth Amendment Center has really been involved here in kind of documenting our system, working with the Legislature on ways to improve the system. I believe they're going to be contributing to this service delivery work as well. We've been working with Nancy Bennett over the past month, who's been at Sixth Amendment Center for about five years. But previously, she worked for the Massachusetts system as the person who built out their private assigned counsel model, which is what we're going to be trying to do. So, I expect that we're going to work with them in finalizing up a contractor plan for her to continue that work throughout the year.

There's some deliverables mentioned in the initial project plan. What we started doing yesterday with both Nancy Bennett and Moss Adams is kind of breaking those out into subcategories. And I think over the next couple of weeks, we're going to continue doing that and mapping out all of the really specific tasks that need to be done to achieve this goal. So, we plan on coming back at the September commission meeting with a deeper dive into the project management plan. Happy to answer any questions.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Does anyone have any questions about the project, the massive project to change the service delivery transition? All right, I don't think we... Oh, I'm sorry, Brook.

Brook Reinhard: I'll be real quick. What is your goal for this actually happening? I mean, realistically to flip it. Is it two years to fully flip?

Eric Deitrick: Commissioner Reinhard, the content of today's meeting has, like, I mean, echoed what's really important. It just came up during the...

Chair Jennifer Nash: I'm having some trouble hearing you.

Eric Deitrick: Are you? Let me get closer. Can you hear me now?

Chair Jennifer Nash: Yeah, that's better.

Eric Deitrick: So, thanks, Commissioner Reinhard. The key to all of this, and I think you've heard this in several of the topics today, is having an online billing system. And so from my perspective right now, it's challenging to see how we roll out a panel in the formalized form we need to. So, that's the piece where I think the focus really needs to be. I think we can get a lot of work done over the next year before the contracts go in effect. Like I said, the big thing with the workload model, the foundation upon that has been really investigated by this commission, some decisions that have been made. We need to update our standards. I mean, part of 337's mandate was really giving this agency and commission a robust standard-setting authority. We have a team that can get that done. I think the training piece is going to take a bit of time, but we need to get started working on that. So, I don't know, I'm optimistic that we can get a lot done by next summer, but it's really going to take a full push, and it's going to take a lot of work with this commission, and an advisory committee, frankly, that we need to put together so we're getting feedback and bounceback from the folks that are going to go through this transition with us.

Chair Jennifer Nash: Rob.

Rob Harris: Thanks. Actually, Brook and Eric just addressed one of my main concerns was getting the timekeeping system up and the billing system working, making sure that lawyers can bill online and get paid quickly because I can only imagine the delay and payment timeline if we're using the current system, given the delays currently in the system. Also looking at the list under section three, I mean, we've known what's been in SB 337 for a year plus now, and some of these things, I don't know, but you're probably working on it, like setting minimum standards by which appointing counsel are trained and supervised. But I know OCDLA's been talking about that for a year, trying to get some movement in that as well and participate and be able to contribute to that, and I don't know what's been done within the agency.

So you know what'd be interesting is to look at some of these things and see how far along you are on them or where you're doing or what your expectation delivery date is because it would be nice to see some progress on some of these issues. And I understand that a lot of the bandwidth that the agency's been taking up dealing with the unrepresented crisis and contract changes, I get that, but it would be nice to know where we're at on this because you've got some

hard deadlines set in 337 that people insisted on. And the people who insisted on this, I'm going to expect them to be able to deliver it or come back and say, "We need more time." Because there was conversations during the drafting of that, that these timelines were way too aggressive, and our recommendations were rejected by those who insisted this could be done. So, I guess I would like to see some progress on some of these things.

By the way, I'm not against a lot of what was in 337. My complaint, my concern and complaining as well because I complain a lot, was that we need to be able to make sure people have lawyers and there's no disruption in the service and let's not blow up a system that works. Can we fix the system, not blow it up? Or at least do a more measured transition. But this is what was adopted. So, I'd like to see some of this stuff done. And I'd like to see some of these things taken care of. And I'm sure some of them have been done, but I guess I'd like to see more on this transition plan.

Chair Jennifer Nash: I thought we had a 337 project manager and we had a 337 plan that because we've submitted reports and done presentations during Legislative Days about, "Here's the list of things that we're supposed to do under 337 and here's what's been done." So, maybe bringing that back to the commission just with an update would be helpful.

Rob Harris: Thank you. Yes, great.

Eric Deitrick: Yes, we will bring this topic back to the commission at the September commission meeting in more detail.

Chair Jennifer Nash: All right, any other comments, concerns, anything for the good of the order? All right, with that, thank you very much, Eric. We're going to not... Well, I'll just ask. Director Kampfe, is there anything that you would just like to brief us on that we haven't already talked about?

Jessica Kampfe: Just to let you know that we have an executive assistant joining us on Monday, who will be the liaison for our commission. So, I'll look forward to introducing you to her when she's on board, but I really am hopeful that having that resource dedicated to the commission is going to help with a lot of the scheduling and materials and is really going to elevate our ability to engage well between the agency and the commission.

Chair Jennifer Nash: I was in on her final interview and she's really great. She basically already did this job somewhere else and then is joining the agency doing the same job. She was a liaison between a board and executive, or between the commission and the executive director on the executive team, doing all the things that we need her to do. And she's very pleasant and very competent and you should have

heard the answer that she gave me when I asked her how she treated emails. Very detail oriented. So, yay for me and for the rest of us too. All right, with that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Anyone? All right, I'll just make the motion and I know no one opposes. So, at 2:16, we will adjourn the meeting and thank you everyone for your time. Take care.