

Male: All right, Chair Mandiberg, you're live.

Susan Mandiberg: I think we have a fair amount of work to do today. Has everyone had a chance to look at the amended document from our previous meeting? We'll go through it. I think Eric's going to share the screen. Does anyone have anything to raise before we get started? Okay, well, what I propose to do is go through it section by section. It's fine if you're down there, Eric.

Eric Deitrick: I figured it out.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. I can maybe not see everyone when the screen is being shared, so if you want to talk, if you would go ahead and use your raise hand button, I think that will move you onto the part of the screen that I can see. Starting from the beginning, the changes, at least the additions are in red. The things that were crossed out are crossed out. In Section 1, we've just changed the heading to add that it includes these basic definitions that people asked for at the last meeting. When (b) is the first time that there's a change. It's just a language tweak. There's nothing substantive that got changed there. On (1) (c) at the last meeting, people said that they would like the expanded mission to include that the mission should reflect diversity aims and that the mission should also include listening to unrepresented groups and stakeholders other than lawyers and providers.

We added this Section (c) to encompass both of those goals. Anybody have any reactions to the language here in (c)? Okay. People also at the last meeting wanted to add basic definitions sections. So, we added Section (4) for basic definitions. There were a couple of other definitions that are needed in the bylaws. In particular, the definition of action item and the definition of emergency. Rather than put those up here in the basic definition section, we put them in the section closer to where those terms are being used so that people didn't have to go back and forth to the basic definitions in order to see what those meant. Any reactions to Section (4) here? Addie?

Addie Smith: I actually want to take us back to (c) if that's.

Susan Mandiberg: Oh, okay. Sorry.

[Crosstalk 00:03:54]

Addie Smith: Raise hand button. I'm a little... Coming off of a sinus infection so I'm slow on the uptake.

Susan Mandiberg: And probably my fault for not recognizing your hand, so.

Addie Smith: No problem. I'm just wondering on (c), this is pretty soft language. Is it worth it for us to consider adding a stronger statement about sort of either more directly sort of addressing or participating in a system that has historically been sort of steeped in systemic racism and other concerns as opposed to sort of just this wink and a nod to communities impacted. I don't know if others thoughts about that.

Susan Mandiberg: Give me some language. Here's what I propose to do because the next time we're going to meet is at our retreat. Rather than send it back to me and Eric to tweak.

Addie Smith: Of course.

Susan Mandiberg: I'd like to add the language now.

Addie Smith: That sounds great. If others are comfortable with that, I can type something into the chat that we can massage together or collectively reject.

Susan Mandiberg: Or if you just want to... Yeah, that would work.

[Crosstalk 00:05:08]

Addie Smith: Yeah, that sounds great.

Addie Smith: Okay.

Susan Mandiberg: We can add a chat to the screen here. Okay.

Addie Smith: I would say I can do that while we keep moving. I'm nervous to type on the spot but I'll come up with something...

[Crosstalk 00:05:30]

Susan Mandiberg: If you would like to speak on the spot, I am happy to type for you.

Addie Smith: Let's see. To further... I would say something like — the commission takes a stance to do work that is, I don't know, anti-racist and anti-colonial or something along those lines where we're more directly committing to an equity lens and perspective in all the work that we do. Others should feel free to jump in and either shoot it down or retweet my thoughts.

Susan Mandiberg: This is what we've got so far. It would be added as a final sentence at the end?

Addie Smith: I think so.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. How do people feel about adding that language?

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I think it's great. I think it's also like related it to kind of what I've been trying to push for in terms of, like, what is our ultimate goal here and having some consensus around our ultimate goal because I think once we figure that out, which I think it should be inclusive of what you said, to add it to the bylaws so that it reaffirms.

Susan Mandiberg: Do you want to tweak this language in any way or is this language acceptable to you, Jennifer?

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I think the language is acceptable to me but I also want to just state that I think we will come back to this once we figure out what our overall goal is to add some language so our goal is reflected in the bylaws. Because essentially, it's a value statement. I think we need to include some form of a value statement that is inclusive of what was just said.

Susan Mandiberg: So, put it this way — the commission strives to work toward a system that is anti-racist and anti-colonial in implementing our constitutional duty to...

[Crosstalk 00:07:56]

Addie Smith: As a participant in the larger criminal justice system.

[Crosstalk 00:07:59]

Susan Mandiberg: So, in participating...

Addie Smith: I appreciate you doing the word smithing this morning.

Susan Mandiberg: I think this is the most efficient way to do it.

Addie Smith: Absolutely.

Susan Mandiberg: In participating in the greater criminal justice system. Is that what you want to say?

Addie Smith: I think so. I mean, I think that's the larger goal, right, that we're driving towards not just fixing public defense which we care very much about but recognizing that public defense is a participant in a larger system that is maybe not the best system and we want to undo that. Sorry.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. The commission strives to work toward a system that is...toward a criminal justice system. How about that? Toward a criminal justice system that is anti-racist etc.

Jessica Kampfe: Chair Mandiberg.

Susan Mandiberg: Yeah.

Jessica Kampfe: Can I just offer that the commission's work also affects the juvenile justice system.

Eric Deitrick: Thanks. I appreciate that.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. Toward a criminal and juvenile justice system that is anti-racist etc. How does that work for everybody? Anybody have any objections to this? Wesley, there'll be a way that I can get this chat afterwards, right? Wesley, okay. I'm sure there is a way I can do it. Okay. Okay. Anything else in article one? Okay. Article 2 — Commission Membership. Section (2) we corrected a typo on the date. On Section (40) we added 82.010. It's not relevant now but it will be relevant next year when we become part of the executive branch. What 182.010 says is any member of a commission appointed by the governor who fails to attend two consecutive meetings, regular adjourned or special shall forfeit office unless prevented by serious illness of a member or the family of a member or an otherwise valid in the governor's judgment reason.

If the governor removes someone for failure to attend, the governor immediately appoints a successor. Director Kampfe asked that that be added to this provision. I think that's a good idea so that everybody is aware that that exists. That led me to wonder and wanted to ask all of you if you think that we should add attendance requirements for commission members for 2024 because this provision in the statute doesn't kick in until next January. That leaves us without any attendance requirements for the commission members for the current year. I thought we should discuss how people feel about that. Does anyone have any input on that issue?

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I have some heartburn about this provision because I think about folks especially myself who work for non-profits, folks with lived experience. This potentially could be a hardship in that depending on the time of the year if it's session, I'm going to miss the meetings. That's just the reality of it. How do we build that in that depending on the work that someone does, there are going to be legitimate reasons why they may not be able to show up.

Susan Mandiberg: I agree. I agree. When I saw this statute which had slipped past me, so thank you, Director Kampfe, for bringing it to our attention, when I saw this statute, I

thought, wow, it does have this escape clause about a valid reason for missing but that's in the governor's judgment. Obviously that's in the eye of the beholder. Whether we like it or not, unless the legislature changes that provision, that's going to be the rules starting next January. If people are comfortable not having an attendance requirement during this year while we are getting our feet under us, I think that's rational. But if people want to discuss having an attendance requirement, I thought it needed to be on the agenda for discussion. Does anyone else have any input on that? Director Kampfe.

Jessica Kampfe: The statute applies to governor appointees and my understanding is that the commission members that are currently serving are serving on a stagnated basis and all were appointed by the chief justice. It starts to phase in in January with new appointments but I think that... A commissioner who was appointed by the chief justice for four years, it won't apply to that position until it's up for reappointment. It's not just the six-month window that we wouldn't have an attendance requirement. Once we move to the governor's office, we will have different attendance requirements for different commissioners as the statute phases in.

Susan Mandiberg: Thank you for the clarification. That's something I didn't think through. Now that it's clear that starting in January and moving forward there would be different attendance requirements, anybody want to discuss that issue? Okay. I take it people are comfortable just leaving this the way it is for now.

Addie Smith: Is there a way to talk about, and I was sort of live editing so I apologize if we rehash this, sort of excused absences versus absences as a way to create some cushion especially around some of the issues with regard to folks with lived experience or folks who have jobs outside of this that are pretty demanding or is that a too generous an interpretation of what we're dealing with?

Susan Mandiberg: Who do you think would excuse the absences?

Addie Smith: Perhaps the chair and the executive director.

Susan Mandiberg: You're thinking that if a commission member is going to miss a meeting, the member would communicate with the chair and the director and ask for an excuse and the chair and the director would then look at it and maybe discuss it and then communicate back that there is or is not an excuse and somehow that would be recorded someplace?

Addie Smith: Yeah. That's what I'm sort of thinking is at the beginning of the meeting when attendance is being taken, it could sort of be announced that so and so has been excused from the meeting and then that might provide space for example if it's

session and someone just can't make two meetings, to not lose their seat because of those circumstances.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: We're already asked if we're going to come to a meeting so that we have quorum. I would assume within that process, there going to be a conversation like, "Oh, I'm not going to be able to make it for these reasons. Can I please be excused?" That's already recorded at least through email and I think to Addie's point, it'll just be announced at the meeting that this person has been excused etc.

Addie Smith: I love that because then it could be sort of like the big deciding factor is, "Actually, you would be the person that would lose quorum so unfortunately, we can't excuse you. You're going to have to figure out how to show up or you're going to risk your seat," but it gives some wiggle room.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. Let me suggest that the place to put this is in Article 3 that talks about roles and responsibilities. When we get down to Article 3, we can add something about that. Does that work for you all?

Addie Smith: Sure.

[Crosstalk 00:17:41]

Susan Mandiberg: ...termination issue at this point. Yeah. All right. Moving along in Article 2, subsection 9 is the next place we have a change. People were concerned at the last meeting that if we prohibited commission members from talking with staff, that would be a problem for commission members who have contracts or similar business. So, we added two things. One is at the very beginning when action in an oversight capacity, commission members should not communicate, etc. And then to emphasize it, we also added the last full sentence to (9) (c). When Eric and I were working on it, we wondered whether that last full sentence was needed or whether the meaning was clear enough by just adding the phrase "when acting in an oversight capacity." I think adding the last sentence emphasizes it and makes it perfectly clear but if it's clear enough without the last sentence, then it's more efficient to take that last sentence out. Do people have a reaction to that? Yeah, Jasmine.

Jasmine Wright: I think I think that last sentence is probably needed, at least I would prefer that we're pretty clear in there because certainly I as a contractor have times that I need to interact with OPDC staff in a non-oversight capacity, you know, my analyst on occasion and that sort of thing. I would want that clear that in a non-oversight capacity that I can communicate with OPD staff and that my that my staff can contact communicate with them without it being an untoward thing. So, I would prefer that that last sentence be in there for clarity purposes.

- Susan Mandiberg: I have no problem with that. I personally like the last sentence. Does anybody have an objection to the last sentence? Okay. Now we're down in Article 3 — roles and responsibilities. In subsection (1) (a), this is again relevant to what we're talking about a minute ago. We added the duty to inform the executive director and the chair as soon as practicable of an inability to attend a schedule special or emergency meeting. We could add language here if we want to provide cover that indicates that the director and the chair or the director or the chair shall indicate agreement with the reasons for the absence or whatever language people might want there to provide that kind of cover. I think it was Addie and Jennifer who were most vocal about this so do you want to weigh in on this now?
- Addie Smith: Yeah. I like the idea of sort of differentiating excuse versus unexcused absences as a way to provide some flexibility for folks on the board who are important members but who may have less time to be present at all of the meetings.
- Susan Mandiberg: Let's get some language. I'll type it into the chat. Rob will get the language from Addie first and then get input from you. Language... No, Rob, go ahead and talk while Addie's thinking.
- Rob Harris: Yeah. I just want to make it clear that this whatever we use here indicates that whatever happened or the timing on the excusal, I mean, sometimes you may not be able to know ahead of time that you're not going to be able to make it so either before or after, it could be approved ahead of time or approved after the fact. I want to make sure that's clear because life happens for people.
- Susan Mandiberg: It sure does. Yeah.
- Rob Harris: Then the second thing is I know that there's a transition of the governor's office but maybe make it so that at least during the interim, and I would just say the chair rather than the director because we are responsible to the chair not the director, and that during the interim, certainly the chair can make I think an excused absence. Afterwards, I don't know how you wordsmith that to indicate that the governor is clearly not bound by the chair's decision to excuse an absence but somehow that that carries some weight with the governor's office that the chair can still recommend this being an excused absence to the governor or something like that.
- Susan Mandiberg: I'm going to type in some possible language here into the chat.
- Rob Harris: Okay.

Addie Smith: I shouldn't have been typing and listening at the same time I was trying to get it started and I use the same words twice. Sorry.

Susan Mandiberg: Ah, okay. You want to say may be excused or the chair shall indicate?

Addie Smith: I want to make sure it's permissive so the chair has the opportunity to not excuse an absence if for example this is sort of the sixth meeting in a row and the individual's reason is I forgot this on my calendar.

Susan Mandiberg: Let's try this. Something like that.

Addie Smith: That's great. And then should we include something like — that information will be relayed to the appointing individual or body? I don't know if we need to. That might be excessive.

Susan Mandiberg: It'll be in the minutes.

Addie Smith: Yeah, I agree. I take it back. I began that argument.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. So, Director Kampfe and then Rob.

Jessica Kampfe: Thank you. I do. I liked Rob's language around relaying it to the governor. I just want to be careful that with our bylaws can't cede the governor's authority to the chair.

Susan Mandiberg: Right, right, right.

Jessica Kampfe: So, as long as we're being clear that it's permissive and not mandatory in nature. And then just that for scheduling purposes and counting of quorum purposes that we make sure that the executive director and agency staff are informed so that we can facilitate that administrative responsibility.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. So inform the direct... Well, on subsection (5) now (1)(a)(v) says that the member shall inform the executive director and the chair as soon as practicable. The executive director already will be informed and then it would be your job, I guess, to inform your staff. Let's see. Rob, you also had your hand up a minute ago.

Rob Harris: Yeah, just on accident.

Susan Mandiberg: Oh, okay. All right. Everybody good so far with this? All right. Moving along to (1)(b). There are no changes in (1)(b) here. I have two issues that were raised to me over the last couple weeks that I need to raise with this committee. The first issue is whether voting members of the commission should have to approve

litigation that the commission is involved with in general or legal pleadings, specific legal pleadings in particular or whether at least the director should have to run legal pleadings past the chair of the commission. In general, what the commission's duty or responsibility or role should be in dealing with litigation that OPDC gets involved in. Any thoughts about that? Jasmine.

Jasmine Wright: Yeah. I mean, I guess I see our role as or how been presented to me is that our role is to set policy and not to be involved in the day-to-day operations of the committee. I guess I don't see, I mean, the committee has legal counsel in Eric and I guess I don't see as our role as approving litigation. I mean, I don't know if everyone else has a different position on that. Not everyone obviously on this commission are even attorneys. So, I'm not sure that we should be approving litigation. I don't think we should be getting in that level of micro complexity. I mean, we can but I don't think we should. I guess that's just my two cents for what it's worth.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay, Jennifer.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: As someone that had to go through this process was it last year, I think there are times where it's like the agency is being sued and or least what we went through is that the agency was being sued but then the commission was being sued. There going to be time times where we can't necessarily coordinate and that the commission is represented by someone separate from the agency and so we're going to have to deal with it. I guess that would be my... Again, I'm not a lawyer and that's kind of my rough understanding of how the process went. We have to be able to speak to what are we going to do when the commission is the focus of the litigation and the agency is also a party to that same litigation.

Susan Mandiberg: It's a really good point. One difference is I understand it and perhaps Director Kampfe could correct me if I'm wrong but previously, the legislation made a distinction between the commission and the agency but under the current legislation we're all sort of mashed together, which is something we've all talked about before. I'm not sure how that distinction would come out anymore if OPDC was a defendant in a lawsuit because we're all called OPDC now. Unless the commissioners got sued by individual names, right, that would make it clear that they were...

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Which we were.

Susan Mandiberg: Yeah, which we were.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Yeah. We were individually named in that.

- Susan Mandiberg: Maybe to put together your comment and Jasmine's comment, it might make sense for the commission sometimes to review the fact of litigation as opposed to the specific documents involved in the litigation like pleadings. But from what you're saying, it's certainly rational to anticipate times where the commission might need to talk about litigation positions and that would reflect policy. Jasmine, go ahead.
- Jasmine Wright: Well, and I could see a situation in which maybe we maybe retain outside counsel when we get a summary of what's going on certainly when we get...if we get sued. But I guess I just don't want to have the situation in which we're essentially have to sign off every answer and counter claim that happens within the litigation.
- Susan Mandiberg: Yeah.
- Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Well, how we handled it though is that the whole commission wasn't involved. Myself and another commissioner kind of took the lead on it and we would report back and if there were any decision points that had to be made we would put those forward but generally, that was kind of outsourced to a smaller subsection of the commission.
- Susan Mandiberg: One way to deal with this might be to put in a provision that the director... This would be in a later section, that the director would inform the chair of litigation and that it would be up to the chair to decide whether it was something that needed to be added to a commission agenda. Would that be a rational way to deal with it, Jasmine?
- Jasmine Wright: Yeah, yeah. I think so. I think the chair needs to be informed about certainly the chair needs to be informed of any litigation and they need to communicate with that. I think the entire commission needs to be needs to be informed of all litigation so from my perspective, yeah, I think that'd be helpful.
- Susan Mandiberg: Okay. We'll add that in a minute down below when we get to responsibilities for the director if that works for everybody. The second issue that was raised that would maybe come under (b) here. Go back to (b). Thank you. Is we have nothing in the bylaws currently about an annual performance review for the director. So (b)(iii) talks about hiring the director and the commission's ability to terminate the director for cause but every board that I've ever been on has an annual review of the executive director and also at the beginning of the year sets out performance expectations for the coming year that become the basis for the annual review. In my experience, that's a very healthy thing for a board to do. Well, for I think maybe obvious reasons. It occurred to me that we should put something in this section about setting annual performance expectations

and doing an annual review of the executive director. I'd like to hear people's input about that. Addie and then Jasmine.

Addie Smith: Yeah, I would just second that. I appreciate you recognizing that oversight. I think that's a really strong and important addition for the health of the agency and makes a lot of sense.

Susan Mandiberg: Jasmine?

Jasmine Wright: Yeah, 1,000%. I think Jessica is doing a great job but I think a annual performance review is healthy for the organization and healthy for her. I think it's good. I think that's a win-win for everyone.

Susan Mandiberg: So, maybe add a new subdivision. I would make it a (iv) because it'll come right after this. I'm going to put this in the chat in a minute. Set annual performance expectations for the executive director and perform an annual and carry out. Okay, starting there. Somebody help with the wording.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I really like it. I think what we have seen in the past that has been a sticking issue is the setting of expectations and having that be clear across the board. I think explicitly saying expectations is super helpful so that we try to mitigate that as much as possible if not completely.

Susan Mandiberg: If Director Kampfe you have any input on this, this would maybe be a good time to weigh in.

Jessica Kampfe: Oh, I think having annual performance reviews for the executive director is a very healthy thing for the organization. I would note that the way that the transition from the judicial to executive branch is structured that starting on January 1st the executive director is appointed by the governor. The governor has the power to hire and fire the director I believe for 18 months before that reverts to the commission. I don't know if that impacts the commission wanting to do a performance of review of the director during that period. I think that the governor's expectation for performance reviews is every two years that performance review would be conducted.

Susan Mandiberg: Rob, then Addie then then Jennifer. You're muted.

Rob Harris: Yeah, sorry about that.

Susan Mandiberg: Yeah.

Rob Harris: Just mentioned a couple of things. Number one sometimes I found that it's helpful to say rather than annual review, say an annual review in September or

something because otherwise people are unsure when that's going to occur. I think maybe every two... Maybe a semi-annual review since our budget is every two years and maybe that's where the legislation sounds like it's every two years. That's something to consider also. It is work to do these reviews and to set performance goals so maybe two years is appropriate as well. As far as timing, I don't know, Jess probably has a better idea... The executive director probably has a better idea than I do but maybe once the budget passes, when is that like June, July, right, normally?

[Crosstalk 00:38:47]

Rob Harris: Yeah. I mean, you'd maybe you'd want to do the review in like September because or August because then what your goals are going to be based upon the budget as well and what your priorities might be. Those are just some suggestions. I don't think need to make this paragraph 12 paragraphs long or anything but those are my thoughts on this.

Susan Mandiberg: Addie.

Addie Smith: I love the idea of setting sort of a time period that it's supposed to happen to ensure that it's triggered. I would just say in to address the executive director's question about the sort of transition to the governor's office and the ability to hire and fire, I think for the health of the board as we move into the new our new form etc., we might as well do it anyway because I assume that the governor's office would be really interested in our findings and it could be something that we could share but maybe that's presumptuous.

Susan Mandiberg: Jennifer.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I was actually just going to make that recommendation that is part of that review we do a recommendation in terms of, like, keep this person on or like these are our concerns and we really think you should look at a different solution in terms of this person. So, either at the end of our review make a recommendation for how you should proceed or a finding.

Susan Mandiberg: All right. That could be just something that we do. I don't know that that has to be in the actual bylaws but obviously that's just my opinion. Director Kampfe.

Jessica Kampfe: I would just also note in terms of timing that the director serves a four-year term. So, I think that every two years makes sense and you may want to align it with that decision about whether or not the director would serve a new term.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. Should we do new wording here? Let's see. It would be for — set annual performance expectations for the executive director and carry out semi-annual

performance review in September. Based on those expectations, the performance review may include recommendations. How about that? Any comments about that? It captures everybody's input, I hope. Okay.

Rob Harris: I think the one the one thing I would say based on what the executive director just mentioned about the four-year terms and again, this may be getting too much into the weeds but if you haven't done a performance review for 18 months on the executive director and their term is coming up, perhaps you want to do one prior to, maybe like three months prior to the end of their term or something. But maybe that's just something you would do anyway as part of the renewal process of their term. Maybe that's just superfluous language that we don't need.

Susan Mandiberg: I seem to... Okay. Well, we could say...

Rob Harris: So, I withdraw that because I rather have less than more and just give us the flexibility to do that if necessary like a special review or something.

Susan Mandiberg: We could say at least every two years.

Rob Harris: Sure.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. I'll add "at least." okay. Thank you.

Jessica Kampfe: Chair Mandiberg, would you consider instead of "carry out" "require." That way if the governor's office directs the annual review the commission could make a decision about whether or not, it would use the governor's review for the director so that you don't have two reviews in the same period.

Susan Mandiberg: Where do you want to put that?

Jessica Kampfe: You've got "and carry out semi-annual performance." If it just said "require" then I think it could be directed by the governor's office and the commission could use it or directed by the commission.

Susan Mandiberg: So, substitute the word "required" for the phrase "carry out?".

Jessica Kampfe: Yes.

Susan Mandiberg: Got it. All right. I seem to have messed up the way my chat is working but I think I can figure it out. Okay, going on to (1)(d). Again, this was the concern about personal capacities versus oversight capacities. This makes it clear that commission members can advocate in their personal capacities as long as they make it clear, at the legislature as long as they make it clear that they don't

Speak for the commission. Hopefully that addresses that concern that people had. Any comments on that? Okay. We were going to add something to (2) here for the executive director to indicate whether absences were excused or not excused. How shall we do that? We would add maybe a (d).

Addie Smith: Is it? I'm not sure we need to add anything based on how we wrote the other section where both the executive director and the chair notified and then the chair made a determination. Or are you thinking the executive director needs to let the governor or others know?

Susan Mandiberg: Let's see. Hold on.

Jessica Kampfe: By statute, agency staff has to inform the governor's office. So, it's — the commission administrator shall inform the... I don't think it needs to be in the executive director section. If you've got the commission chair as the one that makes the decision, then I don't think it needs to be in the executive director section.

Susan Mandiberg: Great. Okay, Addie your hand's still up. Do you want to add something else? Okay.

Addie Smith: Nope.

Susan Mandiberg: I'm perfectly happy not to change anymore. Okay, going down to Section (4) Article (4) meetings. People in the last meeting wanted to indicate specifically that the commission is permitted to have listening sessions to gather input from people with lived experience. We added this language. Any reactions to this language and after that, I have something I wanted to add as a discussion item here. Addie?

Addie Smith: I think just getting in the habit of talking criminal juvenile justice and dependency, right, because I think that's the other piece of the work here.

Susan Mandiberg: And juvenile justice and dependency, okay. I'll add that.

Addie Smith: Delinquency side. But otherwise I think it's great.

Susan Mandiberg: The issue I wanted to raise, as I'm sure you've all noticed, I've been using first names instead of saying Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Harris, whatever. As I said at the last meeting, I'm just not a very formal person. When I was thinking about this in the last two weeks, I also had some conversations with some people who've been on other commissions that have had listening sessions with people with lived experience. They advise me that if you want people with lived experience to feel comfortable sharing their experience, the

best way to do that is to break down the barriers between the people who are talking and the people who are listening. In my experience and in my opinion, using formal titles like Commissioner Smith creates barriers. It doesn't break down barriers.

Certainly when I'm talking to people who are not lawyers for example clients, I want to break down the barriers. I want to have a person-to-person communication and so I use my first name. As I said before, I do that with students as well. It's always interesting to me to see which students are comfortable calling me Susan as opposed to professor. But the ones who are end up having a better relationship with me because we can talk as human beings. So, I wonder if other people are also comfortable doing away with commissioner this and commissioner that, I do believe that the executive director who does have a formal official position should be called Director, which is what I've been doing in this meeting. But I've been using first names on purpose to see how people feel about it. So, how do people feel about it?
Jennifer.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I think it's weird to use titles. As someone that comes from movement building, I think everything you just said in terms of it creates a barrier, it creates a distance but it also creates a power dynamic especially when you're dealing with folks with lived experience or folks who are not lawyers. It creates a dynamic of — I'm the professional, you're not. I know what I'm talking about, you don't. It makes folks less inclined to engage because they don't feel like they are subject matter experts when in fact they actually are probably more so than the lawyers or folks working at non-profits. I think not using titles especially when we engage community right-sizes that power dynamic and creates more of a welcoming space for folks to show up authentically. Addie.

Addie Smith: I don't have anything to add and I can't say anything better than what's already been said. I'm just really glad we're having this conversation and I agree.

Susan Mandiberg: Is there anyone who objects to using first names for commissioners? And then the other question is this something that we should just start doing? Of course this is just our little committee so I don't know how people in the broader commission feel about it but we can certainly explain our position. Is this something we should just start doing or is this something that should be reflected in the bylaws? Anybody have any opinions about that?

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Again, I think this ties back to like whatever value statement we develop. I think it would be nice to kind of start the next official meeting with a reset of, you know, this is the values that we're bringing into this space. As such, we will be conducting meetings in this way where we're going to relate to each other as

individuals not our titles and we encourage those folks who are not on the commission to act accordingly.

Susan Mandiberg: I gather that depending on how our action item vote goes, we may be at least discussing these bylaws at the retreat. If I'm the one who's leading that discussion, I'm certainly happy to do what you suggest, Jennifer. I think that's correct. The question is whether in addition it should be reflected in the bylaws. Eric?

Eric Deitrick: Thank you. I really also appreciate this conversation. I'm curious amongst you all commissioners communicating with each other and using your first names but from the perspective of staff addressing you in meetings as commissioners, would you suggest the same? Because I think we're very used to, at least from the staff perspective, referring to you in your roles. I'm curious what you think about that.

Susan Mandiberg: Great question. Anybody have any input on that? Jasmine?

Jasmine Wright: Yeah. I've always been a little uncomfortable with people referring to me as Commissioner Wright. So, I would be very comfortable with staff calling me Jasmine, with everyone calling me Jasmine. That's just me. Other commissioners may be, specifically maybe our legislatures, they may have issues with this though it would surprise me if they did but I'm real comfortable with everyone calling me by my first name and everything that everyone has said about approachability with the public and everyone else. I'm real comfortable with where we are and what our discussion's been today.

Susan Mandiberg: Well, from what I'm hearing, maybe it shouldn't go in the bylaws but should be discussed at the retreat. If people at the retreat want to add it to the bylaws, they can always do that. As we think about... I have to say that I am also completely comfortable with staff calling me Susan. In fact, I am more comfortable with that than the other way. Okay. Anything else that anybody wants to say on this topic? All right. Going on to (3) or subsection (3). We switched things around a little bit. We started out with defining emergency meeting.

This is the same language that was there before. It's just in a different place. In subsection (b) we just tweaked some language to make it a little more readable. Any issues with any of that? Moving along to subsection (7). What we have here is first in subsection (7)(a), people wanted the agenda to reflect diversity aims. The most efficient way to do that is to refer back to article one to the mission. Subsection (3) got moved up because it's an agenda issue so it's there. Here, we're talking about timing. We're ending up here when we're talking about agendas, if you look at everything here in (7). What it now says is that the

member can request an agenda item 10 business days prior to a meeting. We put that as business days as opposed to 10 days so that it doesn't mean people have to work over the weekend. Although I'm sure almost everybody does work over the weekend, it's not a requirement here. So, 10 business days prior to the meeting, you can request an agenda item.

Then one week prior to the meeting the agenda is published to members and the public. It's also the last chance to add an agenda item. But at the start of a meeting, the agenda can be amended with non-action items. That's the timetable that this sets out now as regards agendas. We'll talk about materials in a minute because what we did in subsection (7) here is separate agendas generally, action items and then materials for everything else into separate subsections. Just talking about agendas that's the timetable this now sets out for agendas. Everybody okay with that? All right, moving on to subsection (b). We have a special section there for action items. And then in subsection (c), and that's for agendas and materials. For subsection (c), there's a section for non-action items.

Right now with regards to materials, let's see if I have that here, with regards to materials, the publication of materials for action items is a week and the publication for non-action items is also a week. We could change the structure of this to just have a section for materials because it's a week for both. We sort of thought it was important to have a separate section for action items as a way to emphasize that those are different things but in any case, it could be mashed together relatively easily. Any comments on any of this? Everybody okay? All right. Moving on to conduct of meetings, subsection (8). The question of whether cameras should be on or off. Where we left this at the last meeting was Eric was going to look at other bylaws and consult the justice department.

Eric can obviously weigh in if I've got this wrong but my understanding is that the justice department folks indicated that there's no formal guidelines on this. That it's the best practice to have cameras on during a meeting but it's not required. So, the language that we have here in subsection (b) is a compromise that to the extent practicable, commission members shall have their cameras on and that all voting members shall have their cameras on during a vote. Again, it's important that there be a quorum throughout the whole meeting but it's super important that there be a quorum during a vote. That's why we put it together that way.

Any comments about that? Okay. Subsection (e), this is about accommodations. ORS 192.63 or sub (b) requires that a person who needs an interpreter should give 48 hours notice. If less than 48 hours notice is given, reasonable efforts to obtain an interpreter would be made. Also the subsection (d) says that the agency shall try to use only certified interpreters. That language applies only to

interpreters for hearing impairment. Eric, did you want to talk about what the OPDC staff does now as a matter of course with regards to interpreters?

Eric Deitrick: Sure. Thank you, Susan. I will get used to Susan. This is good. Yeah, so in our public notice and agenda that we send out prior to commission meetings, we have information included in there which is required by Oregon revised statutes Chapter 192, who to contact if they need an accommodation for one of our meetings whether in terms of hearing impairment or language. That notice goes out with our meeting when it's publicly noticed.

Susan Mandiberg: I had another issue that I wanted to raise here and that is the issue of language interpreters. I have certainly represented people who don't speak English at all or don't speak English fluently. If we are going to be inviting people with lived experience or people from communities that are impacted to weigh into our deliberations, we can anticipate that there will be people who struggle to speak English. I'm wondering whether we need something in our bylaws about interpreters of other languages. I have no idea, and perhaps Director Kampfe can weigh in on what kind of abilities the agency has to deal with finding or providing language interpreters. Are we in a situation where people who don't speak English easily have to bring their own interpreters or what are we going to do about that?

Jessica Kampfe: Thank you, Susan. I don't have a quick answer for you. Off the top of my head I think we are working through this issue and our agency in a number of times when people are calling into the agency and don't speak English. Language Line can be an option that we use and is probably the easiest thing to do when we don't have a lot of notice. We can look at it and get you a more thorough answer but I don't have one today.

Susan Mandiberg: Is this something that should be handled in the bylaws, Addie?

Addie Smith: I was just going to say I'm not sure. I mean, I don't want to... I think that we can put it in the bylaws without having the exact answer today, right. I think we can have a line that says something similar either to what we have here in Section (e) or that efforts will be made to ensure that interpretation services for the purpose of English as a second language. I'm saying it all wrong because I have a cold but I would suggest we add a line that allows for a request for interpretation whether it be regard to reasonable accommodations or not. That's what I'm trying to say.

Susan Mandiberg: I would like to add something. I don't want to add something that makes it impossible for staff to function until they figure this out. The question would be...

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Can I just hop in?

Susan Mandiberg: Whether it have a separate section or whether it add something to (e) to make it clear that (e) applies to both physical accommodations and language accommodations.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I believe the state has some language around like their public hearings around accessibility and I would honestly just pull that language.

Susan Mandiberg: Do you know where it is?

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I do not but I can look for it.

Susan Mandiberg: I can look for it also. So, state and...

Eric Deitrick: Susan, I can help you look for that.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. Are people comfortable with us not adding anything now but bringing it up at the retreat? Yeah, okay. I'll make a note of that. Okay, moving along. What time is it? Oh, we're doing pretty well. Public Comment subsection (b). Language was added. The concern that came up at the last meeting was that we felt that sometimes we didn't have enough time to really give adequate consideration to written input from members of the public if it was given to us right before the meeting and that we considered that input to be important enough to treat it with some dignity. This is the language that we added to take care of that issue. Everybody okay with that that? All right. Moving on to Article 5 subcommittees. There's a couple of issues here. One is in subsection (d).

We added the word executive to agencies because people correctly noticed that it was kind of weird to talk about including judicial and legislative agencies but not executive agencies. We added the language about consideration being given to gathering input from people with lived experience. We will add juvenile. We will add the other, we will add the dependency language there as well and also in all the other sections where that language is. I had an email from a stakeholder after our last subcommittee meeting.

This stakeholder pointed out that of both of the legislative members of the commission are from one single political party. The stakeholder suggested that it was important for the commission in doing our work that we know the viewpoints of people from the other political party. One suggestion would be, assuming people agree with that assessment, to add something here to subsection (d) about legislators or I guess legislators from a political party not already represented on the commission. How do people feel about that? Addie.

Addie Smith: We may just want to say the ability to add legislatures in general because it might be we want a counter perspective or it might just be that there's a legislator who's taken a particular interest in a subcommittee or a subtopic or a project that we're working on that we would want to be able to include.

Susan Mandiberg: I like that. If I go ahead and add legislators in general, are people okay with that? That would cover the territory. Great. The other question that comes up here in subsection one is whether we should have standing committees. There are two at least kinds of standing committees that I could think of as being important to have. One is this committee, a governance committee might be useful as a standing committee. It doesn't mean it has to meet all the time but it would mean that it would be there when governance issues needed to be addressed. The people would have worked together as a subcommittee on other things and you wouldn't have to start from ground zero. But the other committee that could be seen as a standing committee, and this is actually based on a conversation with Director Kampfe, is a... Let me see my notes here. Where are my notes? Oh, boy. I'm sorry. I thought my notes were good. Let me think through. Eric, help me. What was the other standing committee we were thinking about?

Eric Deitrick: The legislative committee.

Susan Mandiberg: Legislative committee, right. Legislative committee, right. Thank you. I'm sorry. Oh, here, I do have it in my notes. Okay, so, here's what the situation is. If the commission has to get a copy of a report that has to go to the legislature, the timing is often not conducive to us having enough time to really study and discuss that report. Of course we saw that problem came up in January. What happened in January of course was that the report had to be turned into the legislature without us really being able to discuss it, understand it.

A possible solution to that that Director Kampfe suggested we discuss would be to have a legislative subcommittee that could review the reports and meet more often than the commission itself meets and then report with a recommendation to the full commission. That way, having a legislative subcommittee could ensure commission oversight and help deal with the short reporting timelines. Director Kampfe, I am absolutely positive you could explain that better than I just did.

Jessica Kampfe: Thank you, Susan. The commission has a number of quarterly reports that we have to do because we're under so much legislative oversight right now. For example for the spring emergency board this May, we have six different reports that are due. The reports have to be submitted to the legislature 6 weeks typically before they are heard. Because they're quarterly, when you back that up, it means that the commission would really only be able to hear the report

and vote on it at the same meeting because otherwise you'd have to be... We wouldn't have even heard the first quarters report before you were hearing the second quarter's report.

It would be real helpful in terms of being able to get commission oversight and input in those reports if we had a subcommittee that was meeting in the interim that could review the reports and then we can still plan to bring them to the commission for a vote prior to turning them in. But there's just not... To this point with regard to the May meeting, we just reached out today to commissioners to schedule an April commission meeting to review the reports that have to be submitted for May legislative days but the commission is going to have to hear those reports in April and vote on them in April in order to meet that submission deadline in May. If we had a subcommittee, there'd be an opportunity to get more constructive input from the commission prior to voting on it. I think it would be a very helpful oversight tool for the commission to have a subcommittee.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. So, subsection (1)(a) gives the commission chair in consultation with staff voting and non-voting members, gives the chair the power to create standing subcommittees. The question that we need to discuss is whether the bylaws should create standing committees that are always going to be there, that are not within the chair's power to create. Eric, do you have some input?

Eric Deitrick: Yeah. I just wanted to comment, Susan, a little bit on this governance subcommittee because I do view it as a standing committee. The commission created it at the meeting in January with no end date. But to that point, one of the charges to this governance subcommittee was to recommend to the full commission what additional subcommittees should exist. So, I do think it's within this group's charge to think about these long-term subcommittees. I talked to Rob who I see just raised his hand about one of the other governance pieces we need to figure out which is the audit committee, which isn't necessarily a commission subcommittee but is responsible for reporting to the commission in its responsibilities.

Susan Mandiberg: Of course we have a separate section here, subsection (2) that deals with the audit committee. It does not treat it as a subcommittee.

Eric Deitrick: Right.

Susan Mandiberg: I'd like to get back, before we get to talking about the audit committee if possible, to the question of whether the bylaws should direct certain standing committees to exist. Rob?

Rob Harris: yeah, thanks. On this legislative subcommittee, my thoughts on this are that it's not a substitute for this full commission approving a report. To the extent this commission forwards approved reports to the legislature, they should be well-reviewed by the entire commission. We should not be relying on a subcommittee to do that work. Certainly the prep work but not the... I don't think we forfeit our obligation to review this stuff. To the extent that the many reports legislative oversight has burdened this agency with doesn't really work very well with the timelines that we have as a commission, sounds like a legislative problem not our problem. They created. I am reluctant to cede full commission authority to a small number of people on this commission even though I'm not disparaging that.

I'm just saying I don't know that that's the proper way to get these reports approved. It bothers me that we have this timeline that is forcing this commission to make decisions that cede authority to subcommittees basically because we don't have time. I mean, in an essence, that's what we're saying, right. We're saying we don't have time as a full commission to review this stuff. Therefore, we're going to cede it to a subgroup of this commission. That bothers me a great deal. It's almost like the legislature should make a choice. When do they want these reports? Do they want these reports on a time or do they want this commission to be responsible for these reports? We're fixing that what appears to be a problem. Maybe I'm misperceiving that but that seems to me a problem. That's just my general thoughts on this on that particular issue.

Susan Mandiberg: Any other input on this? Yeah, Lisa, thank you for weighing in.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah. Again, Lisa Taylor, Government Relations Manager. Just to that point, I'm thinking of how this would actually play out like in the January meeting when you had just become a commission so you hadn't reviewed the reports thoroughly. We added a note in all the reports that said been approved but it's been approved to meet timelines and we didn't feel we had enough time to review. I think that should we have a legislative subcommittee and the timing arose where we really just couldn't get it in front of the commission for whatever reason, a note would be made of, like, this report's been approved by the legislative subcommittee but the full committee has not approved it or has not seen it yet.

I've also been looking at the timeline like for this, for the May legislative days. You'll be getting the reports and the materials posted a week before the commission meeting. We'll be getting Chair Nash a draft report two weeks before that when she looks over the agenda for the commission meeting but then looking at like the September legislative days, I was actually just looking this morning and it looks like the reports are due a Monday where our commission meeting is that Wednesday. That would be a space where a

legislative committee approving something would be very helpful and then that Friday, you can turn in replacement reports. Monday we could turn in a report saying the legislative committee has approved it. Friday, we would turn in a replacement report saying the entire committee had approved assuming that's what happened. Those are just kind of my thoughts and scenarios.

Susan Mandiberg: Thank you. One way to deal with this could be, and again the question would be whether this got put in the bylaws or not, but one way would deal with this would be to establish a legislative subcommittee and give it the power to recommend to the commission but not give it the power to approve of a report. That way, again depending on the language, but if the subcommittee had only the power to recommend action to the commission. Similar to what we're doing with the bylaws. We don't have the power to approve the bylaws. We just have the power to recommend that the commission approved them. That would give the staff a little bit of breathing room.

It would still require the commission as a whole to approve things. If there weren't time for the commission to do that, the notice that could be put on is that the legislative subcommittee has reviewed but has not been able to formally recommend to the commission or whatever language to that effect but it would still provide some interim feedback mechanism to the staff that otherwise would not exist. That might be a compromise position. If we were to take a position like that, I think putting it in the bylaws that the subcommittee did not have the power to approve but only the power to recommend might be a prudent thing to do. Rob?

Rob Harris: Yeah, thanks. Yeah, I understand mechanically how this would work. I just question whether we should do it this way. Because well, for one thing, I guess the bylaws that we've approved or are about to approve or hopefully will approve say that action items have to be placed on the, is it seven days prior or one week prior? I guess we'll have those reports one week prior. That's probably enough time for us all to review these reports and vote for an approval or not. Maybe that's the answer to it but as Lisa pointed out, there might be gaps here where we don't have the ability to do that.

I guess the question I have, and I don't know the answer to this, is whether or not the reports are such skinny timelines or small windows of opportunity for us review. Is the reason that we're just understaffed and are not getting these reports done quicker or is it because we just need the data and we're unable to compile them until we get the correct data? In the one case it's maybe a staffing issue, we need to boost up I guess but in the second case, it's a legislative expectations that we simply unable to meet. I guess I'm wondering in what circumstances is the commission not going to have these finalized reports to review for a week before we're able to vote on them?

Jessica Kampfe: Rob, it's not that you wouldn't have them a week before you were able to vote on them but you wouldn't have the opportunity to discuss them in one meeting and then come back in the next meeting and vote on them. We should be able to get them to you a week in advance of a commission meeting for you to have full opportunity to review them and vote on them but if the full commission had feedback and changes the agency was directed to make that it there wouldn't be an opportunity to bring it back in front of the full commission before voting on it.

Susan Mandiberg: Does anybody want to deal with the question of whether there should be standing subcommittees in the bylaws? If not, we'll just leave it and discuss it at the retreat and again, can always add it if we need to. Moving along to subsection (e).

Addie Smith: I think Jennifer maybe jumped in and said something.

Susan Mandiberg: Oh, I'm sorry.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Yeah. No, I was just saying I think there should be, I think there's work that we routinely has to get done. I guess I look at this document as a, like, this is what you should know for current and new commissioners. Knowing that consistently we're going to have to deal with reports, consistently we're going to have to deal with the legislature, consistently we're going to have to do X. We should let folks know that.

[Crosstalk 01:26:57]

Susan Mandiberg: Do you want to make a motion, Jennifer, or not?

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I guess I'll make a motion that they should be included in the bylaws but that we can discuss it at the retreat.

Susan Mandiberg: Well, I'll just take that as a friendly suggestion of what to put on the agenda for the retreat for this discussion if that works.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: Sure. Yeah.

Susan Mandiberg: All right. Getting to subsection (e). I'll just make a note for myself. We realized as we went through this that we didn't have procedural requirements for subcommittee meetings and that the requirements we had above really only worked for full commission meetings. We added these requirements for subcommittee meetings. The timing here is different. Four business day days for the agenda and three business days for the material because we figured that

subcommittees are more nimble, need to be more nimble. They meet more frequently. Certainly open to changing that time table. But for example, for this meeting, if we met every...it was two weeks between the two meetings. There wasn't enough time for Eric and I to do the work to amend the previous draft and get all that to you sooner than... I think we managed to do it five days before the meeting.

But if you're going to meet every two weeks, having a one-week requirement for things just doesn't work with everybody's busy schedule. You can't get the work done in a week in between meetings. The reason that we put the different timetable here was because there's just a different cadence of how things work. Any questions or comments about that? Okay. So, then the last thing here we dealt with (3)(b) already. And then the grievance procedure on Article (6) subsection (1). We just did a reference back to the procedural requirements to make it clear that those apply to where the public comments get put on an agenda. That's it. Any other comments? Rob.

Rob Harris: Yeah, I wanted to just touch briefly on the audit committee which is section (2).

Susan Mandiberg: Oh sorry.

Rob Harris: I know wasn't highlighted but Eric and I talked about this a little last night I think and then there was a meeting with John Hutzler, the chair of the audit committee and myself and Jennifer Nash the other day as well. I'm on the audit committee as the commission member. I think the audit committee, and Lisa can probably correct me if I wrong on this but it's either a creature of the legislature or a budget note, which I guess is legislative. It created this sort of independ... Well, I mean, audit committees are independent, right. They don't report directly to the executive director. They're going to report to the commission. It's an internal audit so it's going to audit the.. Which I'm learning a lot about audits that I never knew before. It audits the performance and procedures and best practices of the delivery system itself and that's the internal audit.

I think that the chair and the audit committee were formed by, I think Brian Deforest sort of got them together. They crafted their own charter and they crafted their own way of electing members to it, which is what a charter is. That's what an audit committee does. They create a charter. The charter that they used was based upon many template charters that other government agencies use so I don't have huge concerns about that. But I think that we might want to talk about adding maybe a paragraph or two to this section for audit committee so that it's clear about at least how the membership is formulated for instance. I think you can have available to you, I believe, the charter of the audit committee so you can see what they've done. But it's sort of a creature I

didn't know existed honestly till I got on there which it reports to the commission, not the director.

I think it's finding its way how it best fits into the commission which I think the conversation I had with Jennifer and John the other day was very helpful for all three of us, probably mostly helpful for me. But I do think that at the very least, we might want to consider have the commission consider maybe fleshing the section out a little bit to have a little more direction for at least how the people are appointed to the committee or who is appointed to the committee. It's pretty good. They have like two professional auditors. They have this couple of staff people from the agency. Director Kampfe can probably explain this a little more than I can.

They have two outside members and they have like two providers or something but it's pretty well-balanced and it has functioned pretty well. But I do feel like, yes, it has to be independent from the agency director and staff but it's not independent from the commission. I mean, it reports to the commission. So, we may want to add something else in here. I'm just not sure what it might be. Maybe Director Kampfe has some opinions or Eric has some opinions on that or Chair Nash will have some opinions on that. But I just wanted to sort of flag that for us as I think that's a section that probably needs to be added to as well.

Susan Mandiberg: Can I make a suggestion then since this is our last subcommittee meeting before the retreat? If you, Rob, since you are on the audit committee and perhaps Director Kampfe and perhaps Chair Nash could suggest some language in writing and send it to Eric in the next week, then he and I will put together something to add to the discussion at the retreat.

Rob Harris: All right.

Susan Mandiberg: Does that work? Because I know nothing about the details of it so I'm not competent to write this but you all are or you all do. If you could make your suggestions, then we will put it all together and come up with some language that we can discuss later. Does that work for you? Excellent, okay. I think we are done with discussion on this draft unless anyone has anything else to say. Then I believe we are on the last part of this which is an action item. Eric, I'm going to turn this over to you to talk about the options.

Eric Deitrick: Yeah, thank you, Susan. I think at this point, the decision for this subcommittee is whether it wants to formally recommend to the full commission that it adopt the bylaws as drafted with the amendments that we incorporated today and we'll put into the final draft that we send out to the commission after this meeting. If one of you would like to move forward, we would need a motion. The motion would be to have this group recommend that the full commission

adopt these bylaws. The motion would need to be seconded and then we'd take a vote. It would then go to the full commission at next week's public meeting.

At that point, the commission would have a discussion about what you've presented to them. They would have three options at the meeting next week which is to adopt them as presented, adopt them with amendments that they articulated during the meeting and directed staff to incorporate in the final draft or delay a vote until a subsequent meeting so it could deliberate further. But that's going down the road. For today, it's simply whether there's a motion to advance this with a recommendation to the full commission.

Susan Mandiberg: That would be to advance them including the changes that are reflected in the chat?

Eric Deitrick: Correct.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. So, we need a motion. No motions. Hmm, that's awkward. Nobody wants to present these to the commission? Let's hear a motion.

Rob Harris: I'll move to approve the redline draft as amended in the chat. I would also like to add to that and potential changes to the audit committee section which are not... I just noticed are not... Unless you want to add those to the chat, Susan.

Susan Mandiberg: No, no. I think you're correct.

Rob Harris: All right. Then that would be it. So, that' be my motion, to approve the redline version as amended by the chat and as potential amended in the audit committee section.

Susan Mandiberg: Is there a second.

Jennifer Parrish-Taylor: I'll second it.

Susan Mandiberg: Okay. All in favor, raise your hand. Either... Okay. Anyone opposed? Okay. I think that passes. Thank you all very much. I thought this was a very useful discussion. The last thing on the agenda is Eric with future business.

Eric Deitrick: Yeah, thanks, Susan. I already covered it a bit just talking about how these bylaws as recommended by this subcommittee will go to the full commission next week for their consideration. I do think there is further work for this subcommittee. There are, as Susan mentioned, possible additional subcommittees or standing committees that I think this group is best equipped to task. We can talk further, I think once we get through the retreat and public meeting next week about when this subcommittee would like to get together

again. I do think there will be ongoing revisions that we'll need to... We'll learn things as we go forward and we'll think of things that maybe we can put into our bylaws as time goes on. One last comment, Jasmine, I did see your hand up there at the end. One of the things for governance I know that you and Brooke are particularly concerned with is the fact that you're existing providers and how that impacts your ability to serve a commission. I just wanted to let that we're still waiting on that advice but I did hear back from OGEC yesterday that it should be coming to us shortly.

Jasmine Wright: Okay. Thank you.

Eric Deitrick: Yep.

Susan Mandiberg: Anyone else have anything they want to discuss today? Okay, well, I'm looking forward to seeing you in person next week. Thanks for your time. Enjoy this beautiful weather. Have a good weekend. Bye-bye.