

Transcript

January 6, 2025, 8:01PM

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

SS **Scott Stauffer** 0:03

Go ahead and do quick introductions to get us going. I think the main gist of today's meeting is to more or less review the final the near final version of our bylaws that we can then present to the full Council later this year.

I will just say at the beginning that I'm recovering from a little bit of a cold, so forgive me if my voice goes out.

I am.

Trying to medicate with a cough drop in my mouth, so apologize if I come out sounding a little rougher than than usual.

So just to establish and go on the record that we do have a quorum, can we have all the members of the subcommittee turn their camera on if if feasible, and then say your name and I'll start, I'll say Scott Stauffer, Subcommittee by law, a bylaw subcommittee chair.

That I'll call names just to keep it consistent against Mark or the next name race I see.

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:57

Good afternoon everybody, Mark Landauer.

I'm happy to be the chair of the Public Records Advisory Council and member of the Subcommittee.

Thank you, mark. Emily.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 1:10

Emily gothard. I'm on the practicing member of the subcommittee.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:14

Thank Emily, will.

WG **Will Glasson** 1:19

Hey there, will glass in.

I'm on the prak and a member of the Subcommittee as well.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:24

Thank you. And I'm seeing a bunch of names.

Andrew Smith, are you here on behalf of Representative Anderson?

Is that right?

SA **Smith Andrew** 1:33

Amen, behalf of Rep.

Anderson. But I do remain.

I'm not sure if we are. He's a voting member and whether he could delegate on top of that. So I'm just here to help track and keep up.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:43

Thank you ex officio.

I think Anderson and Senator Thatcher and I do see Senator Thatcher. Are you with us today?

ST **Sen Thatcher** 1:51

I am with you today.

I don't know how good my connection will be though.

I'm on the road.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:55

Fair enough.

So noted.

We appreciate you taking the time.

Anybody else, Todd, that we should acknowledge? Todd. Todd, do you wanna say hello?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 2:05

Matt Albert, Public records advocate.

And I think that's everybody.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 2:09

I miss. Is everybody OK? Great. Well, let me see if I can't share my screen and we'll do the slides.

And go from there.

Right. So that's the meeting. So the 1st order of business is approving the agenda.

The agenda is as laid out there, really just finishing up reviewing the draft bylaws, talk about next steps.

Take public comments and call a day.

Are there any questions or requested changes to the agenda?

ML **Mark Landauer** 2:42

Move the agenda.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 2:44

I believe Mark has moved to approve the agenda.

Is there a second?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 2:47

2nd.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 2:49

It's moved by Mark, seconded by Todd to approve our agenda for today.

Any further discussion?

Sing, then all in favor, say aye, or raise your hand. I.

Any objections?

Say may or raise your hand now.

Seeing none, the agenda is approved.

Thank you very much everybody.

On to the big show.

Just a reminder where we are, we started off last summer fall doing research.

We started putting together pieces of different bylaws we found.

And we had a last meeting in November that was really a really good content conversation about the pieces we put together. And today there hasn't been really a lot more activity, not much more activity since our last meeting, but we wanted to

take an opportunity to review the.

The draft as it stands today, before we move on, pending the tenure of the conversation today, will determine whether or not we need another meeting after this to finalize what we want to present to the Council.

And then I believe the next full Council meeting is in June or July or whenever that is, that that'll be our goal in terms of presenting this to the Council.

Any questions about our timeline?

ML **Mark Landauer** 3:58

Got if I may. Todd, do we have a full PRAC meeting scheduled at this point?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 4:09

I don't believe that we do, Mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:11

OK.

I just wanted to check on that.

To ensure that that we don't have any conflicts in the flight deck is clear. So Scott, thank you.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 4:24

Great. Thank you for checking, Mark.

So any other questions?

Same thing, OK.

So before I shift what I share on the screen here, just wanted to highlight there have been the version I'll share with you.

I'm gonna share the word version here in just a second, but.

There's quite a bit of redline, but I think the majority of the redline that we'll be looking at here in officially what's called, I called 2.1 of our draft bylaws we talked about last time.

So I don't think we need to go over every single red line if the committee would like to, we certainly can. But I think there are really 5 sections that I wanted to make sure that we especially touched on today.

And you can see him here.

There's just a follow up question on the purpose mission statement that I think we

came to consensus last time. There was a proposal that we enhanced the text about the legislative work of the the Council. We added some language about record requests, how that is going to have.

That would be handled.

We deleted the Secretary out of the officers and terms section and then we kind of cut and pasted whole whole thing for I think the city of Portland.

In terms of meeting expectations in terms of bylaws, so.

Wanna make sure we cut and pasted that part correctly?

At this stage, does anybody know of other parts of the bylaws we wanted to talk about today that you wanna make sure we talk about today that's not listed on here?

Seeing none, I'm going to stop sharing this and I'm gonna pivot.

To the Word document and we'll go through that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 6:00

Hey Scott, I did have a maybe one other area that we might wanna look at.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 6:02

Yes.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 6:05

Well, it's on page three of the document.

It's maybe regarding public comment and this time allotted to speakers.

You just have like a default 3 minutes for allowed for speakers and up to 10 minutes to speak for representatives of groups.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 6:25

This section here.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 6:26

Yeah, I just don't remember that discussion and I and I'm fine with it if everybody else is. But I thought it usually worked like the amount allotted was at the speaker's discretion, sort of based on the requirements of each meeting.

But I'm open to a minimum as well.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 6:41

The yeah, I don't.

I'll top my head to remember that conversation, either Todd, but I'll just say I believe the three and 10.

That's sort of a kind of a standard for city meetings, but it's it's I totally agree too that the the discretion of the chair, I think is is the general how we've operated and how how most public bodies I think operate so.

Open that conversation when we're there.

So maybe we'll just go ahead and start there.

What do people think?

Do we want to call out in the bylaws this 3 and 10 notion or use more language?

It says.

Discretion of the chair.

Mark your head shaking, OK?

ML **Mark Landauer** 7:19

Yeah, I I I completely support.

The notion that we take public comment during the course of our.

Regularly scheduled meetings. I have no quibble with that I do.

I don't recall having this this conversation about 3 minutes and 10 minutes, and I'm sort of reluctant at this point to want to adopt that, Scott.

Again.

You know my my goal has always been to ensure that the public has an opportunity to address the Council.

I do think that it should be at the discretion of the either the Chair or the Council itself.

Obviously, the Council can override the chair at any time they choose to, but my my suspicion is that the Chair, whether it's me or anybody else.

Will welcome public comment to the extent that it is germane to the topics at hand and that we have, over the course of the time I've been chair, willing to extend the meeting to accommodate the public's comet, so I don't know if we really need time limit.

You know my general.

Theory has been giving people 2 minutes, and if they're being on topic and and adding to.

The conversation then we extend that time period so that they can complete their.

Comments to the Council.

I I just don't think we need to lock us in.

So that's sort of my my feeling, but if if there are others on the Council or the subcommittee that feel differently, you know, I'm I'm more than willing to change my views on that to accommodate them.

But again, my theory and the way I've.

Approach this as chair is ensuring that the public gets all the time they need to address the Council and I I don't think we necessarily need to have.

This as as detailed as it is Scott, that's a a long winded way to say I I don't.

I don't think we need the time limit. Thank you.

SS

Scott Stauffer 9:52

What I what? I think I hear Mark and kind of proposing is deleting this second sentence in the in that paragraph that just refers to the three and 10.

Emily, will Todd, any other thoughts?

Senator Thatcher, Andy Andrew.

WG

Will Glasson 10:06

I.

I guess I prefer detail.

AP

ALBERT Todd * PRA 10:06

I'm in favor of leaving it at the chair's discretion.

Oh, sorry.

I think I talked over somebody.

SS

Scott Stauffer 10:10

I think it had.

WG

Will Glasson 10:10

Yeah, I'm. I'm also in favor of leaving it at the chair's discretion and generally for points of order.

I like detail and bylaws.

It does provide better guidance, but I'm not.

This is not a hill I'd die on.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 10:27

You will, Emily.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 10:28

I agree as well with leaving it at the cherish discretion.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 10:33

Delete it like that.

That look OK everybody.

And I see your comment, Andrew.

Thank you so much.

OK, that looks good.

You did say one other thing, and I, and I concur with with the the consensus here.

Mark, you said at the discretion of the chair or the Council, you want to add language to that effect. Do you do we think at the chairs sufficient?

You're muted, mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 11:00

Well, these are.

We're obviously getting into the weeds at this point now, you know, I I I guess I would look to the other members of the Council to see whether they think that delegation to just the Chair.

Is sufficient.

I don't want to be an iron fisted person who who's given all the power here, so I I I would look to the other members of the Council for their feedback.

I.

I.

I don't.

I suspect we're not gonna run into this problem, but I see Will's hand is up, so I'm I'm I'm looking to will this to bail me out here, I guess.

WG **Will Glasson** 11:44

I guess my experience with public meetings and with having.

More than one individual or groups of individuals have come the ability to control

those meetings.

Is that it simpler is better so I I think having the chair.

Able to make this call is, is, is. It would be my preference. I think Council can always raise the issue that they would like.

A different decision and there could be a discussion around that, but the the idea of having sort of an.

Vying contingents between the chair and other committee members around this particular point doesn't strike me as necessarily super productive in public meetings.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 12:28

You will, Senator Thatcher.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 12:33

There we go.

There's the mute. I I I agree with what's been said and legislative committee meetings. There isn't necessarily a minimum time unless it's a very popular topic. And then you look at the the testimony on hand and your time on hand because we have to get out of those.

Rooms at certain times and then you limit the testimony accordingly.

You know to to get everybody in, but also.

Allow allow for testimony. But I I don't know.

I I it does need to be left at the discretion of the Chair, but maybe.

Can be a guidance as to planning on three, three minutes. I think that's kind of the guidance in the legislature.

I don't know if it's official or not, but to to plan on a 2 minute to three minute testimony and it can be adjusted from there.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 13:28

Thank you, senator.

I saw a thumbs up from Andrew at one point.

Any other comments on that?

I I do take the the suggestion from the senator that it is helpful in terms of setting expectation for the public, what they might expect, but leaving room.

For the discretion of the chairs also seems to be carrying the day so.

So I'm hearing that we don't need to add council at this point and I see your hand

raised, Joe and as a non member of the committee, I think we'll take comment once the committee is done.

Thank you.

I'm hearing that we're OK not adding counsel at this point and this and we're good to move on from this section or is any further thing about public comment from the committee.

OK, then let's go back up to the top.

Thanks for flagging that, Todd.

We had a couple of things in in Article 2.

I just wanted to confirm reading my notes here. We talked about this last time.

And there was consensus that we didn't want to do much more in terms of adding a purpose or mission statement, but there was the idea that in the future, the Council may want to circle back to that. Just wanted to check in with that.

That's we're we're all still feeling good about leaving the mission purpose statement alone for right now.

Maybe having an impulse to write something right now?

Nope. OK, this one that then the next one.

In it was suggested at our full Council meeting on November 15th that we consider adding, adding or enhancing the existing language regarding the the Council's legislative work. And so I I believe I highlighted section four of the the BB4 there in terms of what it calls.

Out there and I'm feeling like I pulled that.

We pulled that language from.

From the Ors so so this point of discussion for the committee as it stands now, the bylaws basically I think quote the Ors.

But what do people want to do when I see under your hand raised?

SA **Smith Andrew** 15:30

So yeah, just one quick thought.

It's more of a that is framed in a kind of a negative way in the sense of identifying something as a shortcoming as opposed to be. I mean, this is a very minor, of course, as opposed to say, improving.

It kind of comes at it from a we're going to say what's bad as opposed to this is how we can make things better.

Not not a huge thing, but we'll probably never look at this again for 20 years.
So I just throw that out there.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 15:52

Fine. We'll take it. Thank you, Andrew.

Thoughts on the the call to legislative action for the Council?

Hearing none, I feel like we have raised the committee and I'm not hearing any impetus to revise this at the moment, so if you feel otherwise, I think we might have a few more days to to look at it or probably a couple months to look at it.

But.

Hearing nothing else going to roll on to the next topic then.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:31

Hey. Hey, Scott, can you scroll up? I'm sorry, OK?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 16:34

OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:35

No, no, no. Just go down.

I saw membership and I I saw red and it just says draft.

So I I just, I thought we may have missed something there.

We did not, so thank you.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 16:47

OK.

Yeah. And I can noted, we talked about a lot of this red stuff, that stuff you see underlined that highlighted last time and it wasn't necessarily the comment was flagged as resolved. Doesn't mean we can't recircle back to now, but.

For wasn't flagged as something we had talked about today, talking about public comment.

We had a the discussion last time about minutes and the full Council waited on that.

So that's been resolved.

OK, records request was came up last time and on the 15th the full council talked about it.

And and basically the gist of what was requested was added to the bylaws. Was that just calling out that any record request for the Council's records will be handled by the PRA as office?

So that's that's what's put in there.

Any questions or concerns with that?

ML **Mark Landauer** 17:39

Yes, if I may, Todd, Todd.

As you can see this, this mentions the Pra's public records request policy.

Just wanted to check in with you.

Remind me, did you bring that policy to the Council yet, or is that something that still needs to be completed?

I apologize.

My my memory is is is failing me at this point.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 18:11

It's all good, mark.

Yeah. So we I gave an outline of what the policy would be, which is all the basics.

Essentially I'm the custodian.

We won't charge unless we have to. If we have to charge, it'll be a new fangs rate because she's the lowest paid employee capable of completing the relevant tasks in our office.

And I have to actually draft that, which I've not done as of yet, but will happen this month.

ML **Mark Landauer** 18:32

K and if I may follow up, Scott just briefly Todd, is it your intention to put that policy into place prior to our next?

Meeting of the full PRAC? Or is that something that you intend to bring forward?

My my recollection again.

Sorry, going from memory was that you?

Sort of provided the PRAC.

An oral outline of the policy.

We and we were given the opportunity to provide you feedback at that time. I guess my question, my question is at this point, are you comfortable in putting in place that

policy without the approval of the full PRAC or do you feel that you already have that appro?

I apologize.

I didn't look at the meeting minutes from our last.

Our last meeting, I apologize.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 19:30

I I left the meeting believing I had the authorization to do it.

But I would probably send a draft to everyone.

Take a look at anyway and they could respond to me individually to avoid any public meetings, law concerns, and then once everyone's on board 'cause, I don't expect a lot of pushback. But of course, if anyone on the Council has concerns, I'll address them. So I'll wait.

For feedback, once I send out the draft and then I will post it in advance of our meeting, because technically depending on what goes on, we don't have to meet statutorily until June.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:59

Yeah, I I I guess my point here is Todd.

I'm anxious for for your office, for the office, to have that policy in place.

I guess that's that's what I'm driving at and.

I'll I'll. I'll zip it now.

I see Senator Thatcher's hand is up.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 20:22

Yeah, I get the opportunity to look at contracts and rules and statutes and all kinds of things. And when they're referring to something outside of that document, it's nice to know where to find it.

This just says it's outlined in the PRA as public records request policy.

And it might be good to close the loop on where particularly direct people to where they could find that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:45

That's great.

That's a great addition, Scott.

So I I suspect we'll wanna do some kind of a a hot link from our bylaws to wherever that policy ultimately resides.

That's it.

Great, great comment, senator.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:01

Nicole.

ML **Mark Landauer** 21:03

Thank you for that input.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 21:09

Yeah, I was gonna suggest a hyperlink as well.

And maybe we could also say like as well, you know, this is still a draft. So we could say and as posted on like and we could put the website.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:21

Yeah, I like that.

Because over time pages will change, but if you if the landing page of the PRA.

As available and that way I can do it right now too.

We don't have to wait until you've posted.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 21:33

Yeah, and it's oregon.gov/pr.

Dot Gov forward slash PRA.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:52

Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 21:54

Yes.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:54

I'll confirm it.

I'll confirm it that that's where we're going there. OK, cool.

AP

ALBERT Todd * PRA 21:56

That's correct.

SS

Scott Stauffer 21:58

All right.

Thank you all for that.

Anything further on the records?

Request reference in these bylaws.

OK.

We got two more items and the next one is just. We've eliminated a position everybody.

There is no longer a secretary called out.

Anybody have any thoughts on that?

No, no. OK.

Then the last one that was of well, let's not call that earlier, but just to say we will add an exhibit A, the PRA hiring process that we put together last year will be exhibited to these bylaws. And I have a reminder for the clean version to ins.

That so we're good on that.

This section got quite a bit of we talked about the interaction with other agencies and subcommittees and.

Expectations of meeting attendees.

So this is quite a bit of redline I believe this.

F.

One was I.

I think I pulled this straight from maybe the web the Ors, but interactions. Other agencies and boards, and then expectations of meeting attendees. I think that G section I think like I said, came from the City of Portland, so perhaps we could take 30 seconds to a minute.

To let folks read this in real quick, and then we'll have a discussion.

Does that sound like a plan?

30 more seconds.

We're gonna have a a second to take a look at this text.

It reads.

It's a lot, but I think it reads fairly straightforward.

Does anybody have any thoughts, comments, observations otherwise?

SA **Smith Andrew** 24:33

So #1, I'm just curious, is this common language? Actually? Let's see number GI guess is that common? The kind of that that you have cease and desist language or I mean what are what are cities and counties and other public bodies doing?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 24:49

I think this is this is pretty well in practice, if not always written down.

Like I said, this we did get several examples and this I remember there were a couple of public meeting expectations texts like this and this. Like I said, I believe was from the city of Portland.

So I think it's not uncommon, but probably the standard, Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 25:11

I was gonna say we have a specific reference to assistance from other public bodies in our statute noted here one 92481, subsection 10. It says all public bodies, as defined, shall assist the Council in the performance of its duties to the to the ext. Permitted by confidentiality concerns and so actually all public bodies have this duty to work with us to the extent they're able to.

And so I think it is good that we put it here and referenced it specifically.

And that that's something like along the lines of like when we did our survey telling public bodies, hey, we'd love your participation and actually to the extent confidentiality laws don't get in the way, you actually have to answer our survey.

So I think it's good to reference that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 25:55

And will I saw your comment about adding a space before members, so I think I just did that. OK, no excuse me.

Anything else?

Alright, well then folks.

Barring any other any other topics related to these bylaws?

Anyone else talk about?

I think I will switch sharing then.

And I'll go back to.

PowerPoint here.

And I will say.

Found that how we're at the reviewing step.

The next step? Then we gotta talk about is getting this ready for presentation to the full Council. As it's been noted a couple times in this meeting, the next full council is probably given that this is a long legislative session, you're probably not 'til June.

Of this year, so no great rush, but my thought is I will adopt A all the edits, all the red line will make it go away.

Make an ice cream version. Insert exhibit a.

I'll ask Todd to distribute that to the committee and we can take a look at it.

I feel like if nothing else, just because of the passage of time, it may be beneficial for this committee to next meet, maybe really quickly in May.

Just to give us some time to refresh ourselves about what it is we did.

We go to the full Council and that kind of also gives us the next the next step date.

Does that sound reasonable to everybody?

ML **Mark Landauer** 27:31

Yeah, I'd like to do a check though. Scott, on the the timeline here because I'm pulling up the legislative account calendar.

Legislative Assembly, much to my chagrin, is due to conclude on June 29th. That is the constitutional signee dial, though the target date is mid June.

Having said that, I I would probably.

You want as a course of. There are gonna be others on the prac who are having to also deal with the Legislative Assembly.

I'm probably gonna look to a meeting shortly after the July 4th.

Date just to ensure that we get a full slate of participants.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 28:26

Works for me.

ML **Mark Landauer** 28:27

And so and so I think what we'll want to do is probably put out the.

The document for feedback in early June.

That way it'll be fresh in people's minds.

And we can have a a lively discussion at the full PRAC meeting in in early July.
Just wanna just wanna make sure everybody, I I I'm trying to think of timelines here
and I'm just wanna make sure that everybody's expectations are in line with what I'm
thinking.

So my my thinking is we're gonna probably wait until July and I see Senator
Thatcher's hand is up.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 29:11

No, continue train of thought.
It was another topic.

ML **Mark Landauer** 29:14

Oh, no, no, I'm. I'm done.
Senator, please go ahead.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 29:17

K.
Well, I I just wanna mention that I have a placeholder bill in case there's anything that
comes up that.
The Council or the.
Our you know Todd wants to change or you know see something that needs to be
tweaked or whatever, let me know.

ML **Mark Landauer** 29:35

Senator Tom Holt and I will be.
Trying to we we tried to reach you during legislative days.
We do have an update on that. So we'll we'll get a meeting arranged with you
shortly.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 29:50

Sounds good.
Thank you.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 29:55

Right, so this by this subcommunity might not meet again until June and I think then

the full Council in July.

That sounds good and I will.

I'll still adopt the things and get a clean one out there before that. So before we pivot to public comment committee members, anything else you'd like to discuss related to our bylaws?

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:17

I'd just like to thank you.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:17

Alright.

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:18

I just wanna thank you, Scott for all your work on this.

Not only on the hiring.

Guidelines that you put together that will be exhibit A, but but all your work on on this product as well is is really appreciated.

As you know, we've been in existence since about 2018, and here we are in 2025, finally getting some bylaws put in place, so.

The the the snail may travel slowly, but it finally crossed at least one finish line.

That that's been long overdue. So thank you for your work on this.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 31:00

And you, you guys have been a great subcommittee.

So thank you for all your work as well.

Right. There was at one point, Joe, you had your hand raised. So we'll. The committee will then entertain public comments if anyone is interested in making said comments, please raise your hand and we'll recognize you.

JA **Jo A. Barker** 31:22

I'm trying to have a sorry. Hi.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 31:26

Joe.

JA **Jo A. Barker** 31:27

From.

I do agree with everybody dealing with the public records comment that it's at the discretion of the chair.

But by the same token, I wouldn't cut myself short by implying that groups are not allowed to request extended time.

For example.

To me, it would seem that they would have to make.

A request to the person creating the agenda to to to request for the additional time of 10 minutes. So you might want to put like a little sub bullet underneath there that you know general policy is 3 minutes for individual comments. But we do allow for reasonable accom.

Of 10 minute for group efforts.

Group comments or something like that, especially if it's on a real tenuous issue.

And that's in speaking to Mark's comment with respects to the legislative session.

M at page one of your.

White paper your your Word document, you have the adopted date of June 1st for the bylaws.

Am I to understand based upon Mark's comments that that would tentatively be pushed back?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 33:03

Yes, the the June, thank you for your comments though. The June 1st date was just a placeholder totally.

Expecting that the date would be revised to reflect when the Council actually adopts it.

So yeah, that was just a placeholder.

Those dates will get changed.

Thank you for your remarks, Joe.

Any other comments?

If not.

Then I think I will entertain a motion to adjourn and just a reminder to summarize.

You'll get a clean version from me probably soon.

And then we will look to set up a poll for June meeting pre prefetching a July Council

meeting.

That sounds good.

Then I'll I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

ML **Mark Landauer** 33:53

So moved.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 33:56

And to remove by Mark, to adjourn to a second, I think I saw will second it.

All those in favor of adjourning say aye, raise your hand.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 34:04

Hi.

WG **Will Glasson** 34:04

Bye.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 34:06

Any opposed?

Any opposed?

We are adjourned.

Thank you very much everybody.

Have a great rest of your start of your new year and good luck in the legislative session for all those celebrating that. Thank you.

SA **Smith Andrew** 34:16

Thanks Scott.

Thanks for all your work.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 34:16

Thank you.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 34:19

You see around.

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** stopped transcription