

Transcript

November 15, 2024, 6:06PM

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:03
OK.

HA **Hull Andrew** 0:03
Something something.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:03
We're good to go, Mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:05
Alright, I'll bring the annual meeting of the Public Records Advisory Council to order. Today is Friday, November 5th at approximately 10:07 AM. I'd like to thank everybody for joining us today. We have a pretty aggressive agenda and as I mentioned earlier, it because it is Friday, I always try to wrap these things up in advance. So that you can get on with your important work in life so. I'd like to just do an agenda check before we begin. I hope everybody's had an opportunity to take a look at that and if there are any suggested changes, additions. We'd love to hear them at this time. Alright, well with that. Oh yeah, and Todd, thank you. Todd did update the agenda yesterday. We had to make a a minor tweak here and there, so thank you for doing that, Todd. All right. I will gather then that the agenda is sufficient and we're ready to proceed. Agenda item number one overview of the Public Records Advisory Council's activities over the last year, including the 2024. I hope folks had an opportunity to take a brief look at the report. I composed that earlier in the month and I had Yu Fang as well as Shasta review that

review the report and I'll just make a note that Shasta, our vice chair, won't be able to join us today.

She did give Todd and myself.

Heads up in advance that she would not be able to join us, so just wanna let that be known.

For the record, so the draft.

Annual report.

Is largely in the form and style that our previous two biennial reports.

Have taken it provides an introduction as well as the duties of the public Records Advisory Council.

And then it lists the Council members and one thing that we haven't quite done yet. I don't believe. I don't know if it's on the updated one on the on the web page, Todd, but do you include the new members since 2022 on that I'm looking.

At my draft. OK, good. I I didn't pick the one.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 3:00

We've actually will has actually been the only one who's joined us since then. And so rather than making a separate section, I put next to his name in the list that he joined us after the last report.

ML **Mark Landauer** 3:10

Great. Thank you for doing that.

I just wanted to recognize who the new folks were. Well, and so I've included that information or we included that information.

Let me see where my documents are. There we go.

And then I went into a rather lengthy summary of the legislative subcommittees work.

The direction that.

I was given when we presented Senate Bill 417 to the Senate Rules Committee.

As you'll recall, we were directed at that time due to opposition from largely government entities.

The chair of the Rules Committee directed myself and the lobbyists from this Society of Professional Journalists to convene a work group to try to find common ground.

On a proposal to reduce fees in the public records, I will tell you that those discussions are continuing.

And we should have an idea, hopefully fairly soon, whether or not we can reach an agreement.

We're sort of getting at a critical stage in those discussions. I will tell you that the group has been meeting on a weekly basis.

Since Todd remind me, I mean we've been, we've been going out this since.

God, it seems like March, right?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 4:47

Yeah. So it's all kinda hazy, but I think so.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:47

Maybe.

Yeah, it's, it's it's been, it's been rough, but we may be making progress.

So I I I I will just keep my fingers crossed.

And then, of course, we discussed in the report the process by which we reappointed the public records advocate. As you may recall.

Folks, we had to essentially create some by laws that would guide us in the process of the reappointment or hiring of a public records advocate. Of course we would.

The leadership of Scott Stauffer.

Compose some bylaws on the process by which we would review.

Recruit and hire the public records advocate.

We adopted those those bylaws and then went through the process of actually rehiring Mr. Albert, and that took place, I believe, at the end of October when we actually signed signed the documents that approved an additional four year term.

For for Todd.

The the report also describes the broader bylaw.

Subcommittee that Scott is also leading and I think Scott will have a presentation for us a little later on that.

So I won't necessarily delve into the details of that, but we will have some.

Material to to share with you.

Finally, a couple of other things briefly discussed, a process by which Todd Yufang had been working on.

Some draft rules for facilitated dispute resolution.

They have largely composed those. I think that there's perhaps a little bit more work to do on that, but Todd and Yufang will be submitting those proposed rules to the

Secretary of State in 2025 and I expect that he'll get that wrapped up in the coming. Year and then I may mention of two other items that I thought were.

Worthy of mentioning we have had for some time a discussion about issuing state issued e-mail addresses to the members of the PRAC so that all communications can be stored in a central repository. As you all know, we are public officials as.

Point of because we serve on this Council and as a result, our communications are public records.

And do need to be maintained for a certain period of time.

The idea here and it this is largely been pushed by Steve Sue.

I want to give him credit for this, that that we all get these state issued e-mail addresses so that material can be maintained.

And accessible to to the public, and then finally, the report also mentions.

The need for us to do surveys of public bodies, I wanted to make mention of that because that is a statutory duty of ours and quite frankly, we haven't done one for years. And so I wanted to highlight that.

As something that.

It's at least my intention to try to push out a survey in 2025.

So with that, I don't know if anybody has any additions or if anybody's had an opportunity to.

Review that.

But what I would say Todd, this is due to be submitted to.

The legislature December 1st. Is that correct?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 9:08

That's right, which I believe is a Saturday.

So technically, we'll get it in by the 30th, hopefully sooner.

ML **Mark Landauer** 9:13

Well, at this point I don't know whether the Council is prepared to do we need to formally adopt it, Todd, I.

I I assume we probably don't, but what I would perhaps suggest is if you haven't had an opportunity to review it.

To reach out to myself and Todd to make any suggestions, we can get those incorporated prior to its submission to the legislature.

Does that seem like a appropriate approach? Todd and members?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 9:50

I'm fine with that.

I would hope that people could get their responses or any edits in by middle of next week and also.

ML **Mark Landauer** 9:57

Let's set that. Let's set that deadline.

I yes, Rep Anderson, please.

HA **Hull Andrew** 10:06

Thanks. I just wanted to say I thought it was an excellent report and and I hope we can turn it in without very many changes.

So thanks for your hard work, everybody who did this.

ML **Mark Landauer** 10:16

Thank you, representative Anderson, Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 10:19

I was just gonna say the same thing.

Well done, mark.

I I also wanna thank you for basically presenting the update on the Bylaws Committee.

I don't have anything really to add beyond what you wrote in that report.

I can say a little more later, but no.

Well done, mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 10:33

OK.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 10:33

Thank you so much.

ML **Mark Landauer** 10:35

Yeah, no worries.

And then Emily, thank you.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 10:39

Thanks. I I thought it was great too.

I had one small suggested edit that I had already identified on page two under legislative subcommittee work.

Just that the full first line of that instead of saying that the full Council approved it, that a majority of the Council approved it.

ML **Mark Landauer** 10:57

Oh, that's right, Emily.

'Cause you abstained? That's correct.

Todd, can you make a note of that?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 11:04

Sure will do.

ML **Mark Landauer** 11:06

Thank you for that reminder, Emily. I I, I do clearly remember that you did that and I I apologize for.

My mistake on that.

And then I see Todd's hand up, please.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 11:20

Yeah. I just want to say if anyone has any subsequent edits, please send them to just Mark and myself.

Don't hit reply all so we could avoid any concerns about serial meetings.

ML **Mark Landauer** 11:29

Yeah, that's that's a good point.

Thank you, Todd.

And and I'll I'll lay down the gauntlet that that those edits need to be turned into Todd and myself by the close of business of Tuesday next week.

Let's just set a deadline so we don't have to dawdle.

All right. Is everybody comfortable with that?

I just see a bunch of head nods, so we'll check off item or agenda item number one.

And now we'll go to the determination of official record of the public Record Advisory Council and any subcommittee.

Todd, help me interpret this is this is this our discussion about whether we need actual?

Notes taken from the from our meetings, yeah. OK.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 12:26
Yes.

ML **Mark Landauer** 12:28
All right.

Well, folks.

As you know.

And Todd, you're gonna probably need to be my lifeline here.

As you know, we record these meetings as part of the official record. We also.

And and Todd, this is where I'm gonna need your help.

We also have automatic note taker.

I guess what's what's the proper?

Way to describe this.

This is where where Rep.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 12:56
Teams.

ML **Mark Landauer** 12:56

Anderson and I are the troglodytes who who don't know this this modern.

What do you call it, Todd?

Automatic note taking.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 13:09
Also known as a transcript.

ML **Mark Landauer** 13:11

There you go.
That's what I'm looking for.

HA **Hull Andrew** 13:14
I know that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 13:15
Yeah. So we do have.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 13:16
Yeah, Mark, I will say.

ML **Mark Landauer** 13:19
A go ahead.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 13:19
Sorry, I will say just in the years that we've been meeting on teams since the start of the pandemic, the quality and accuracy of the transcript has increased phenomenally.
Perhaps that's like due to the advent of AI and it I still when I post it, I say it's unedited, but it's a pretty close verbatim transcript of everything we say.
And it identifies the speakers as well as we go.

ML **Mark Landauer** 13:42
Yes. And I will say that I did as I was the author of the biennial report.
I can tell you that I did go back and look at that transcript occasionally to pick up the nuances.
Of course I missed the nuance that Emily had abstained from that vote. But having said that.
You know, I did find it a little clunky.
I I will.
I will say that.
And Tony, I'll recognize you here, just in a quick second.
I did find it a little clunky, but I also found that it was a fairly accurate representation.
Of what?

What took place?

And so, Tony, why don't you go ahead and ask your question or make your statement and I'm going to ask a larger question of the group here.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 14:36

Yeah. Thank you.

So yeah, I think we're also kinda talking about the lack of minutes over the last few meetings.

So first of all, I apologize the secretary.

So that's been the my responsibility and at the very last possible minute this morning I sent Todd.

Draft minutes for all of this year's meetings and then December 6th, which I think catches me up. And obviously of course, don't.

I have no expectation of that those getting approved or reviewed today.

Clearly, I just.

Because of personal circumstances, I I just got EM done today and so.

ML **Mark Landauer** 15:14

Yep.

HA **Hull Andrew** 15:15

Fine.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 15:18

That's just filling in the background.

I'm happy to discuss moving forward, but I my term does run out at the end of this year, so I'll I'll get meetings for this for today's meetings and then the Council will definitely have to talk about moving forward.

ML **Mark Landauer** 15:26

Yeah.

Well.

Yeah. Well, Tony, first of all, life happens and we appreciate your your participation.

Your participation is always valued. And like I said, life happens.

So we appreciate the work you've done.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 15:49

Thanks. And I will say though what's comforted me and not turning it in as timely as possible is because of the the transcript and the fact that the, the, the, the video is online and my memory from past discussions about this topic is that both posting the video.

ML **Mark Landauer** 15:55

Yep.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 16:07

And now with the transcripts that satisfies the the the Statute for Public Meetings record taking.

So I think that.

The the Minutes as a document as a pdf of nicely polished thing is just kind of a public bonus in terms of how we're doing it right now.

Or I guess maybe it'll be a just a easy reference but.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:22

Yeah.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 16:27

People who really want to dive into what?

Is discussed have either a visual or literal literal.

Document to read in the transcript, which which are read documents. So that's.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:40

Thank you, Tony.

I you know, I I agree that with Tony that we are satisfying the the need for documentation of our meetings and discussions through the video as well as the transcript. I guess the the real question becomes do we feel that we need.

A.

More condensed summary of those meetings.

In meeting notes that that Tony has been doing over the years.

Summarizing those meetings, I don't know if we really do, but I wanted to throw that

out because.

If we determine that we do want to continue to have a Secretary, will we will want to add that to our bylaws.

At one of the things that I think we are going to need, and this is where I was going to raise an issue with with Scott is we need to list the officers probably in our bylaws as well as the terms of office.

In our bylaws, which I don't think we had in the initial draft, if my memory serves me correctly.

So that is something that occurred to me and and Todd.

Subsequent to our last meeting, Scott on of the Bylaws Committee.

So that's going to be an addition. We'll need to make, but I want to open up this discussion as to whether or not we need a further summary and if we determine that we don't, there's probably not a need for a secretary, right?

Whereas if if we do decide that we need a a summary, we will likely want to include a secretary in the bylaws. I see representative Anderson.

HA

Hull Andrew 18:28

Yeah. Thank you very much.

I I think there's potentially a problem between.

Here's the transcript. And then here's the summary of things, because it may or may not in some person's view, accurately reflect what was said and how it was said.

So on one level were were potentially asking for trouble. If that happens, that's. But if the if it's decided that we needed, it seems to me, and now I'm sorry, I'm talking like a lawyer, so maybe only Todd will understand me, but.

It may.

It may just be some head notes, Todd.

You know, I mean, it comes to you as a transcript and you, you say here's what was discussed here.

What was decided in a in a paragraph or two?

Because that does make it easier for the the the the public to see it rather than slog through a whole bunch of inane comments like I just made.

ML

Mark Landauer 19:23

Well, first of all, representative Anderson, I'm gonna add will to your group of attorneys, I believe #111.

HA **Hull Andrew** 19:29

OK, OK.

Sorry, will.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:34

No, I just just wanna make sure we all we have another attorney with us.

Todd, I see your hand up.

Please go ahead.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 19:42

Disagree with Rep Anderson's suggestion.

I've always made a point of not volunteering to be secretary, just given the nature of my other duties. If we open, decide some short summarization is the best way to go.

I'm happy to do it, but honestly I'd rather not add that duty if possible, and I'm of the opinion that yes, minutes are always good. But I do think the record we make with the video and the quality of the transcript, in my opinion is sufficient and I.

Will just say our subcommittees have never used minutes.

We've only ever used one.

Just a video, when those were available, and then once the transcript has become available, we started using those too.

We've been successful some willing to give it a try without a secretary position or minutes, but if ultimately we think summarizing in a short way is best. I can live with that too.

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:31

Any strong feelings, folks?

Yes, go ahead Rep.

Anderson and then Scott, please.

HA **Hull Andrew** 20:38

OK.

Yeah, I listen.

I wanna make our.

Staff person's job as easy as possible and and I think we could more than comply if

we have transcripts and video of everybody wants to see it.
So I don't have any strong feelings about head notes.
I just like to throw out legal terms every once in awhile.

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:57

Well, we appreciate that because for us unlearned individuals, we always become brighter as a result, Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:06

Yeah. Thank you.

I, as a practitioner of public body meeting writers, what I do for my job here, my knee jerk reaction from clerks across the world is you will always need written minutes.

That is what the statute says. You should always do written minutes.

So that's where my mind usually goes first.

But having acknowledged that, there's AI and that the transcripts are getting better to what Todd said.

And we do record the video.

And in the industry hearing more and more.

Bodies from cities to fed, you know, all levels of government embracing AI.

And reviewing the the last few unedited transcripts that Todd posted, I I am more comfortable and I will not be a stick in the mud and and draw a line and say that we must as a Council have someone do summary minutes.

I I think it comes down to me in the spirit of the public meeting lots.

It's about accessibility.

To what?

A public body is doing right, and so for many people in 2024, watching a video is a very accessible way of doing that.

But there is still accessibility.

And inclusivity issues in terms of written, having something written as well and I and I feel comfortable and I'm sensing there might be a leaning in the Council at the moment just on limb there but we might be OK with the transcript as it's evolving so. My my knee jerk reaction. I'll just say for the record is is we will always need written minutes.

But I I would be willing to go along with the transcript and the video and I'll just

observe I think.

I don't know if we want to be on the cutting edge of this, but it and there was a day when it was pretty rare for a body like a City Council to say.

We're only gonna use the video as our official record and to my knowledge, there's only one city in our state who has declared that and they've been on the record for that for five or six years at that at that point. But by by making a stand and.

And setting this.

Relatively minor logistical thing today.

We are kind of to my knowledge, one of the first bodies to publicly acknowledge that. So we would be sort of cutting edge on that.

So I'll have to say I I I would be fine going along with with the transcript and video.

ML **Mark Landauer** 23:16

Thank you, Scott. Tony.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 23:21

Yeah, Scott, thank you. Amen.

I like I was.

I was thinking about it and then raised my hand up, but I wanted to also endorse just the the idea that with artificial intelligence like it helps me a little bit with the last few ones that I did in terms of at least starting it and then having.

That.

Even even that takes a little bit of time to put together the Minutes, and I agree. Also with just like relying on YouTube, I wanted just to add one more thing.

Is that you when you post something on YouTube, you can also.

In the body of the the of the text, when you describe the video, you can hyperlink sections of the agenda. After you post the video. So so people that visit the video can Click to if they're only interested in this particular vote or particular agenda item, you can.

That in the section where they can just click on the time stamp and then.

That you know that would be a very convenient way where someone is doesn't have to watch a 2 1/2 hour meeting if they're only interested on a on a particular discussion. So and that could that could be like sketched out cutting edge kind of way of.

Of making it easy and accessible and not as time consuming to view the the

information that you see on Monday, the public work from one interested. So anyways.

ML **Mark Landauer** 24:38

Thank you.

Thank you.

Yeah. Thank you, Tony.

Well, I'm. I'm beginning to get a sense that that we're we're leaning in One Direction.

Perhaps I'll make a a a motion so that we can move this along.

Go ahead, Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 24:54

I I agree with where you're going.

I don't wanna disrupt the flow there, mark.

One quick question for Todd, one of the other things that has been a consideration in terms of setting video as the official record is this long term storage permanent storage of that video?

Is there any concern administratively from retaining those videos?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 25:13

No, only because I post them on YouTube under the PRAX official page and then I link to that on the Prax website.

And so, even though what is, what's stored in the system initially after these meetings eventually gets deleted, the permanent version of that, or at least the version that's required to last for the length of our retention period, is on YouTube.

ML **Mark Landauer** 25:36

My sense is we're leaning in a direction, so I'm just gonna make a motion that we consider the video and AI transcript of our meetings as sufficient.

For.

Meeting minutes.

And that we probably do not need a summarization of that, thereby eliminating the need for a future secretary.

So Tony, you will have been the 1st and the last.

Secretary of the Public Records Council. And so anyway, there is a motion on the table.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 26:19
I'll second that motion.

ML **Mark Landauer** 26:19
Hoping for a thank you, Tony. There's a second. I don't think there's gonna be much agree disagreement, but everybody in favor please indicate by saying aye.

HA **Hull Andrew** 26:30
OK.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 26:30
Aye.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 26:30
Bye.

ML **Mark Landauer** 26:31
Any opposed?

WG **Will Glasson** 26:31
Hi.

ML **Mark Landauer** 26:33
All right.
Well, that took care of agenda item number 2 and #3.
Thank you for that discussion. All right.
Report by the Bylaws Committee.
Scott, I know that the the report covered it, but we did get a new.
Direction, at least on including officers being the chair and vice chair.
Of the Public Records Advisory Council.
That so we'll need a description of their duties or I think actually you have the duties

in there, but you don't have the terms of office and Todd, correct me if I'm incorrect, but I think that statutorily it says that officers serve for two years.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 27:16

Sure.

I think Todd may have just oh, there he is.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 27:28

Yeah, I I do have step away for just a second. But you are correct, Mark.

I had forgotten that our statute actually specifies 2 year terms for officers.

ML **Mark Landauer** 27:36

So we'll wanna just include that in the bylaw as well there, Scott.

All right.

So that's I guess, Scott, did you have anything to add?

This was we did have your name on there and I did all the talking.

So I'll shut up and let you make a few remarks so I can check this one off.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 27:55

I will just say thank you, Mark again the summary and and the annual report was was spot on.

I didn't have anything to add.

I I just wanted to say so before I forget. Yes, I will update the the latest version we're working on.

No secretary. The terms are in there, but it's not super clear that it's terms for Members, not terms of the officers.

So I'll just add a little note.

We can wordsmith that for the officers and then I'll update the Minutes section based on the decision the Council just made to reflect what we just decided.

Other than that.

I entertain the idea of sharing a version of the draft minutes bylaws with the Council at this point, but I didn't want to put too many different versions floating out there since it's not final.

I'm very happy to report that the bylaw subcommittee has met twice in the last in the fall and we've made great progress.

It's been a really good working group.

I've appreciated the help that everyone's and the participation of everyone who's done that.

We've got a a a draft going.

We're making some edits and that and we're really on track.

Probably months before the next Council meeting.

Uh, next summer, probably in the winter or early spring, to have a a final version.

Final draft of the bylaws. So thank you to everyone for the work on that.

It's it's gonna be very helpful I think to have some, some outline, some of the the operational functions that of our of our Council. And so that was really the extent of it.

I really appreciate your report, Mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 29:14

Yeah, thank you, representative Anderson.

HA **Hull Andrew** 29:16

Yeah. Thanks.

I just wanna I believe in order to be exact. I'm an ex official member. Am I not, Todd? So therefore I can't vote on anything, so I withdraw my vote. Then I'll try very hard not to vote again.

But I I'm here to just to monitor and appreciate the fantastic work you all are doing.

ML **Mark Landauer** 29:36

Thank you, representative Anderson.

Alright, we're on agenda item number 5, Todd.

The Advocate training and Assistance report, please.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 29:48

Thanks mark.

I've prepared this short presentation.

I placed it under our meeting on the website too, so you're welcome to follow along or review it later.

I'll share my screen now though.

K.

Hopefully you are all seeing my screen.

Great. I got a thumbs up from Mark.

All right. Well, everyone, as you know, we've agreed that during our meetings, although it given circumstances, it doesn't happen in every meeting, but whenever it's called for, I will provide an update on both the request for assistance the office has undertaken in the last period as well as.

Our trainings when we get to the trainings, you'll see I've expanded the category a bit because I don't think that we're training quite fits everything we do that is.

Training like, but we'll get there in a moment. So let's get started and I can't see anyone except Mark. So if anyone has questions, please feel free to speak up or raise your hand and let Mark. Hopefully you can tell me.

All right, so here's the history of our request for assistance through yesterday. As you'll see, there's definitely been a general uptick in requests that come in since the office opened its doors in April of 2018. Of course, we had a little bit of levelling off during the.

Onset.

Of the pandemic.

But our numbers have continued to increase ever since we ended last year at a grand total of 275 individual requests for assistance in a single year.

I will break down 2024's numbers a little more in a moment, and as of yesterday with still what?

At least six weeks to go in the year, we are already pretty close to last year's final tally for 2023, although you know it's quite similar, but so.

The work has been holding steady and of course a request for assistance is.

A discrete ask by either a member of the public, including the media or a public body state or local for assistance on a disputed public records request.

It could also be other questions related to the public records law, including anticipated issues or even through appeal and litigation.

So these are the categories of information we track for each request for assistance.

It's 10 categories in total and it's been very helpful to sort of help.

You Fang and I understand who's coming to to us for assistance. And what are those issues consist of as well as, of course, tracking the length of time it takes to resolve those issues.

So this is just a quick overview if anyone wants to keep reading let me know.

Otherwise I can move on to the next screen.

Hearing nothing, let's skip ahead to some breakdown.

So here are requests for assistance just for this year 2024, again up through yesterday, we've had a grand total of 258 requests for assistance so far. As I mentioned, 64 of them have come from public bodies and you'll see for each. Number there's a number next to it.

Those are the numbers I reported out on December 4th of last year.

So since we're close in time to that date, I just wanted to give a little side by side. Comparison so with still a few weeks to go to December 4th, we're down slightly on request for assistance from public bodies.

But the numbers are fairly similar, so you'll see. Actually local governments have reached out to us the most out of governments in Oregon, followed closely by state governments.

And actually, we had one outreach from an attorney for a tribal government as well. And then, of course, we've received three times as many requests for assistance from members of the public.

Very similar to our numbers from last year, the media is makes up 41 of those similar to last year and the general public has actually gone up a bit in that 153 of the request for assistance were from members of the general public.

Of course, some of these requesters from the government and the public are repeat requesters, but with new and different issues. So we count those as as separate requests for assistance. Out of those 258, as of last night, we had closed 240. Seven of them.

We managed to resolve 60 of them.

So what's that one?

No, I'm not gonna do math right now.

We managed to close sixty of them on the same day that they came in, and here's the range for the rest.

We have 1234. I'd say we have 6 outliers that have taken significantly longer to complete than our average number of requests and those could be for various reasons including waiting for information from a requester or public body or a lot of negotiation back and forth.

Between the parties about records, but on average our resolution ranges from 1:00 to 35 days. Again quite similar to last year, although last year I only noted 1 outlier at 82 days.

I don't know if that represents a trend or is statistically insignificant.

ML **Mark Landauer** 34:43

Hey, Todd, can I ask A can I ask a question?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 34:44

Yes.

Please.

ML **Mark Landauer** 34:47

This is really interesting information and I I'm kind of curious about diving into it more, but one of the questions I would have is, do we know after the assistance by the Advocate?

Whether any of these conflicts end up in litigation, is there any way that you are able to follow that?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 35:15

At this time, no, I mean often a request or a public body will update us and say, hey, I went ahead and appealed or it's even gone into litigation.

But you know, once we've rendered our assistance, it's it's up to whomever working with.

ML **Mark Landauer** 35:27

It's out of your hands, yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 35:28

Yeah. And so that's in some ways it's kind of nice.

It's like being the uncle rather than the dad. Like I could be, you know, have fun, fun with the issue.

And then they go back to whomever has to really worry about it.

But it's also can be frustrating because yeah, I often do wonder. You know what's happened here, or did we do enough to help? Or will we hear from them again?

But it's really kind of out of our control, unfortunately.

ML **Mark Landauer** 35:50

I just was curious about whether or not we have that ability and I I imagine we don't,

but.

I I just thought that that would be sort of an interesting angle on litigation avoidance, if you will, right?

And and whether whether or not this is actually, in some ways helping reduce court activity, you know? And so I it's just an interesting thought on cost avoidance. If you will will.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:24

Sure.

ML **Mark Landauer** 36:26

Hand up will.

WG **Will Glasson** 36:30

So obviously there are two levels to litigation and public records realm, right? You have the administrative level and then you have the the Circuit Court level. It's easy enough to move from the request from assistance based on the name of the individual to an E court search to at the end of the year to to determine if. That individual then filed suit against the public body, now collecting information from.

District attorney's offices on whether appeals were filed could be more difficult. That can always be something that we also, you know, add in as a as a part of the end of the year report.

District attorney's offices.

I think I would have to take a look at the Statute, but.

Our supposed to provide information if requested, but I I've got to look to confirm that I thought they were part of the public body.

Mandate.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 37:27

If you're talking about the work of the prac, then yeah, I would say the district attorney's cuz it's basically all public bodies in Oregon are supposed to provide info to the prak.

WG Will Glasson 37:32

Yeah, that's what my memory was. Yeah.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 37:34

Yeah, not in my office, but to the Council.

WG Will Glasson 37:37

OK, so I think I think if we want to move forward with that evaluation that you described.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 37:38

Yeah.

WG Will Glasson 37:45

That mark then then we can we just, you know, we could probably do it as a two step process.

Send those notes out to the district attorney's offices to follow up on reports regarding appeals that were requested on the administrative level.

And then have somebody log into E courts and just do some name searches.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 38:04

Hey. Well, I'd say hold on to that idea, 'cause when we get to planning for the next year at the end of the meeting, that could be a very good project for us to work on.

ML Mark Landauer 38:11

Well, that that was sort of the why I was leaving down that question of whether or not we can actually quantify the public benefit to the work that this office does.

I mean, these numbers provide a really good idea of the benefit that the office provides.

But, but there's a data point I think that's missing, and that's what we're we're discussing right now, so.

I.

I I would agree with you, Todd, that I don't want to make more work for you and you, Fang.

But but it the same time.

I think we need to adequately capture.

The impact that this office has, whether it's through.

The facilitated.

Negotiations that you conduct on a regular basis and the avoidance of court time that may result from the work that this office does.

So maybe we flag that for our future.

Discussion in the agenda.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 39:20

That's great.

Well then just to wrap up this section, so we have an office policy that if we, you know, if we're communicating with the request or whether it's a public body or a member of the public. And we haven't heard from them back from them in within 30 days.

We consider that request for assistance closed.

That's just really for administrative purposes. If someone comes to us on the 31st or the 60th day, we're not going to refuse them assistance. But in terms of like a line item in our tracking sheet that matters considered closed and so.

We've had 25 so far this year that became unresponsive and were considered closed after 30 days last year. A few weeks later than we were talking now, it was at 30 and we currently have 11 open requests for assistance, including two I got last like late Yester.

That I'm working on and and those also include those that are older and we're hoping to hear back from the requester so we could continue to offer assistance.

ML **Mark Landauer** 40:16

Thank you, Todd. Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 40:17

Sure. So it's go.

ML **Mark Landauer** 40:20

Could I just ask one more question because I am curious about local government and the the requests initiated by local government.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 40:22

Of course.

ML **Mark Landauer** 40:33

Do you?

Do you have a breakdown of that?

Do you?

Do you?

Is there a sort of a trend like are you seeing more school districts or is it cities or or is it evenly distributed?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 40:46

I'd have to go back through the sheet and consider those one at a time, cuz in terms of record keeping we we know what type of garbage is. You know obviously contacting us. But in terms of like the numbers, we just have a column that says local govern.

That, you know, we check and then in different column put in which government that is. So for purposes of this sheet I did the math but I did not do the breakdown.

ML **Mark Landauer** 41:07

Understood. And I don't expect you to go back, although I do think that that would be something that would be helpful in the in the future.

Just seeing where if we have any pinch points right, I think that that would be an interesting data set to to observe as well any any other. Any other comments on on this data folks?

Please go ahead, Todd. Sorry for interrupting.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 41:35

No, no problem.

I was taking note of what you said.

In the meantime, OK.

So here are the trainings we've conducted since after the last the last meeting of December of last year. We presented this level of detail for these. I actually do break them down.

And so instead of just saying trainings, you know the office does so much that I consider training like behaviour because we're still disseminating information about the nuts and bolts and best practices of the public records law to interested audiences beyond the individual.

Requester under our RF as and so I've started doing something called Q and as sometimes we'll have two to two to seven public employees who are interested in learning about public records issues. It's often it's often very specific to their work. So instead of sort of the 90 minute dog and pony, you know PowerPoint Public records training that we do for larger audiences, I like to do what are called Q. And as I give them a little preamble about what I consider the most.

Important aspects of the public records law and then they basically just fire questions at me for however long we're meeting about their particular issues, or they sent me their questions ahead of time and I've prepared my responses. But usually a pretty helpful, robust discussion that digs down to.

Specifically, the work that they're doing rather than general public records information overall, those have been very effective. And so I've added those to this category as well as interviews every year during Sunshine Week, we are interviewed by Jefferson Public Radio.

And it's a great opportunity for you, Fang and I, to get out a lot of information to their listeners. Again about the nuts and bolts and best practices of the public records law and then presentations as well.

So sometimes I'm asked to talk about our office, the Prac upcoming legislation, really specific issues within the public records law.

So I've put those all together.

Into what was formerly the training slide. And so I did do a breakdown here.

Of the types of entities that we've provided training to, as you can see.

The largest one at a grand total of four were state agencies.

Our numbers are down a bit from last year when it comes to trainings. I don't know if that's, you know what that's due to specifically. We have never said no to a training.

We're always available to help, we just haven't heard back from as many organizations or entities as we did last year.

And so I believe that.

Is it?

Any questions here, though, before we come out of this slide?

Think so, OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 44:09

I don't.

I don't see any Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 44:12

Alright, well great.

Thank you everybody.

Of course, you know I'm always happy to answer questions offline as well for your review. This material later and anything comes up.

ML **Mark Landauer** 44:22

Great. Alright, well.

I, for one will probably be recommending to my association that we get.

Public records training.

At our next annual conference, we haven't done it for a couple years, so I'll try to pad your numbers there, Todd, in the future.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 44:45

Thanks mark.

I will say this is the first year we weren't contacted to present at the conference, but that's OK. I didn't take it personally.

ML **Mark Landauer** 44:51

Yeah, I. Yeah, we'll get you back on the rotation here.

Any any questions folks?

All right.

With that, we'll go to our next agenda item and that's on the 2024 EBOARD and 2527 biennial budget build report.

Todd and Yu Fang.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 45:15

Thank you, mark.

Yu Fang has graciously agreed to take the lead, since she's also been our lead person

in the office, working on these issues.

I will be here to assist, but I'm going to throw it over to her now.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 45:28

OK.

So can everybody hear me OK?

Excellent. Let me share and start my slides. So I have brief slides.

These have also been posted in PDF format on the Pratt website.

From beginning.

Go.

OK, so for our for the budget, the way that I've set the Todd, I've set this up is kind of comparative with the operate operating budget that we've had for 2023 through 2025. And then kind of a comparison with what we've asked for the.

Upcoming budget cycle.

So where we currently stand is we are funded through.

Other funds through an assessment.

On other state agencies and the breakdown of our budget is personal services, and S&S, which is services and supplies. We have two full time employees and we're fully staffed at this point in time, an executive director and which is Todd and myself as operations and policy.

Analyst for.

As you can see, that kind of that's the largest portion of the of the pie goes to funding staffing.

And the remainder goes to DAS. IT services HR Services, telecom.

Our supplies and kind of other assessments by other agencies and travel expenses for our trainings and the both that we give and that we receive.

So comparatively, from the the total budget number of 1,000,100 and 72941.

For the upcoming biennium, 25 to 27 you see that there is at least for what we've asked for, an increase, right?

And that largely comes from kind of what we're asking for from personal services, which at this point I think I'll kick it over to Todd to discuss both the E board issue and kind of our ASK.

From the legislature thanks you, Fang.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 47:50

Yeah. I'll start with our ask from the legislature.

This is our third attempt to get.

Two additional positions.

One would be an office manager that handles a lot of the administrative stuff and initial contact with requesters, getting basic information about their dispute.

I spent a lot of time on administrative tasks.

You know which is fine.

We're small state agency, but it takes away from my other bread and butter duties and has made it difficult for us to sort of expand our services and to say like white paper, systemic analysis.

Going out to affinity groups and letting them know what we do and offer training. So we were hoping.

Sort of normalize our operations like any other state agency with administrative staff and then also an operations policy Analyst 3, which would be someone who could do some of those more deep dives into issues and help us build out the capacity of the office it's been made.

Clear to me that for state agencies like ours that aren't in the governor's primary areas of priority, we're being asked to keep things status quo.

Because we are meeting our statutory duties at.

Current funding levels, adjusted for inflation, of course, and so therefore it is highly unlikely we will be getting those two additional positions that we're asking for before I move on to the E board issue, I see Rep.

Anderson has his hand up, yes.

ML **Mark Landauer** 49:07

But yeah. Thank you, Todd.

I was just gonna recognize Rep Anderson. Thank you.

Go ahead, Representative Anderson.

HA **Hull Andrew** 49:15

Yeah. Thank you very much and I appreciate the work that you and yufang do, Todd.

I'm just a little curious. I think the amount was \$981,000 for personal service.

Are you guys splitting that sour that that amount between the two of you or what?

Where does it all go?

Says the man who makes.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:34

I get about 95 percent, 5% goes to you, Fang.
You know? But she's happy to be here.

HA **Hull Andrew** 49:38

OK.
Yeah, that's how it should be. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:38

No, it's you know where you know it's it's just the nature that you know.
It's just the nature of the beast.
We're both at the top scale for our positions and then of course you know about
holistic, you know services like healthcare, etcetera.

HA **Hull Andrew** 49:51

That, yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:52

I mean, I don't even know what the true breakdown of that is, except I know it's
exactly what it costs to employ both of us.
There's nothing else in there beyond that.

HA **Hull Andrew** 49:59

Well, I don't.
I don't have any objection to that at all.
That's what I figured it was.
There's the standard salary, and then when you add benefits and everything else on
top of it, that's where we come, so that's fine.
Thank you very much.

ML **Mark Landauer** 50:11

And Tony, Tony.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 50:11

Thank you.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 50:16

Yeah, just a quick question, I guess. If there's ever, I understand that the you said talk about status quo and chances of of the additions not being approved.

But I'm wondering, whenever you whenever there is a good time for.

The like increase in in staffing and stuff.

I hope you also consider some sort of line items for communications as well in terms of doesn't that for like an actual person, but.

I I just you know with with, if I did the math right, like almost 60% of the requests from for services come from the general public according to the report, there's clearly an interest there for information.

And it I don't know if like you know having.

More.

Visually appealing website with informations are like sampled presentations or trainings that you do like to stock dog and pony show you were talking about that could be easily accessible.

That might reduce some of the workload that you do, or it might increase it, but just you know.

You could probably figure out like maybe some sort of like.

Marketing agency or something to?

Create that that stuff as a like a one time project like a website and fancy video or something. Or like just to put to whatever materials you have making it to something shiny and nice for the general public.

I think that would go a long way.

So anyways, I just wanted to mention that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 51:55

Thank you, Tony. I wholeheartedly agree.

And you're right about that being a line item because we got creative for a couple summers and used remaining discretionary funds to hire an intern to get a little extra work done.

And then we were told that's a no. No, we can't do that anymore.

So unless it's specified in the budget, we're not supposed to be doing it. And so you're right, that's a good idea to think about for a future budget build. And thank you, Stephanie, for pointing out that of course, these numbers represent two years, not just one.

So we're not exactly living high on the hog here.

We're just getting paid, of course.

And then as far as the E board goes, so this is interesting apparently for positions in state government when they're vacant and they're being hired for, they're all budgeted at Step 2, regardless of how likely are to hire somebody at that step.

And you know, we're fortunate to hire you.

Fang is the deputy public records advocate, and she came in at a much higher step due to her, you know, experience in education.

But the position for this biennium was still only budgeted at Step 2.

Which means as we approach the end of this biennium, we're actually facing a shortfall of \$40,000 to fund the remainder of Yu Fang salary.

And so we will be going.

The day keeps getting pushed back, but I've been assured we still have enough money in the budget to meet Yu Fang's salary until we get to this point.

But we will be going.

In early during an early part of the upcoming legislative session to request the remainder of that salary for 2325, and then of course, in the 2527 budget.

Her salary is fully funded, so it isn't an issue, so we just have to get over this last hump administratively, but apparently that's quite standard and so we are we are not concerned.

So if if anyone let me know if you have any questions. Otherwise I'll hand it back to you, Fang to finish up.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 53:47

Pausing to see if there are any questions.

But that actually concludes our budget report. The remainder of the slide goes right into kind of the next agenda item. So I will temporarily stop sharing to see if there's any discussion or questions.

ML **Mark Landauer** 54:05

Any questions, comments.

Alright, well yufang, let's go to agenda item number 7. The facilitated dispute resolution process administrative rule.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 54:21

OK.

So this is kind of where we are.

Well, let me just give some some background.

So our the the office of the Public Records advocate.

The Statute empowers the Advocate to create kind of a rules process that guides the formal, facilitated dispute resolution process. That's also kind of outlined with fairly good detail.

In the statute now the the rules that we've already.

Drafted and are in the process of formalizing the subpoenas.

Here are kind of what those those rules are designed to clarify.

So we will live in our chapter 180 and the set of rules we're proposing kind of just gives kind of basic procedural guide rails rules governing future adoption of rules and amendment or appeal of permanent rules.

It'll also formally adopt kind of the model rules of procedures that DOJ puts out.

So that we're kind of in line officially with what other agencies.

What their their administrative processes are?

Key part of the our is kind of defining parties who can receive formal, facilitated dispute resolution services.

Which is just by by kind of contrast and clarification kind of what we receive and the work that we do in response to requests for assistance.

That is a form of dispute resolution, right?

We are performing tasks that sometimes require mediation between any state or municipal body and a member of the media or member of the general public, so we can do that work, but kind of separate from that is this what's formerly coined as facilitated dispute resolution that's enshrined in.

The statute.

That is supposed to have more of a.

Formal flavor to it, and which up until now hasn't really been formally requested by the eligible parties who can request it.

So part of the rules are about defining with good clarity, kind of which parties can can formally request that form of dispute resolution and also outlining the procedure

governing that facilitated dispute resolution. And that would include.

Kind of what the request submission process would look like.

As well as with the timelines for the Advocate's response and for party's response, and for the availability of remedy is what that would be like.

This will also include the set of rules.

Will also include standards of conduct as well as kind of a clarification of the remedies available and appeal options, as well as confidentiality rules governing this form of dispute resolution.

Yes. Oh question.

ML **Mark Landauer** 57:30

Yeah, actually I do.

So Yup, the confidentiality issues.

So obviously we're a public Records Advisory Council and we're talking about confidentiality here.

Could you perhaps explain a little bit further on that?

At least so that the public can understand why that exists.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 57:50

So in general.

For mediation that occurs in Oregon, there are certain other oars, other rules, and statutes that may govern some confidentiality around those discussions, right.

And there's this form of mediation.

There is also and we can kind of break that down and discuss that in greater detail.

Future meeting where we can talk about those those contours, but that confidentiality is just to clarify well what are the eligible parties rights with respect to those discussions under statute?

What confidentiality do we have to maintain in the course of providing these services?

That said, there's of course this.

I guess conflict between, well, this is public records we're dealing with, right?

This is a discussion of these.

These are public records. This process should be as transparent as it can be by design and in spirit with the public records laws.

So we've kind of thought through that as well and tried to maintain a balance there.

Between what were required to do any confidentiality that were required by law to maintain.

Versus what?

You know where we're endeavoring to do to increase.

Transparency of process.

ML **Mark Landauer** 59:25

Yeah. Thank you for that, yupeng.

I just wanted to, I think, highlight the point that you know, there are statutory guidelines for these types of discussions, right. And and that that's not that you're not trying to hide the ball here, right?

That's that's the point here.

So thank you, Todd.

I see your hand up.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 59:47

Oh yeah, just just to add to what's being said.

So when our statute was drafted, whomever drafted this section.

Made our ADR subject to ORS Chapter 36, the chapter on mediation that comes with confidentiality baked into it.

There's some wiggle room and some discretion, so of course we'll always air towards a side and disclosure, to the extent possible, but we will also honor the wishes of the parties engaged in in the resolution process with us.

And so actually, now that gets me thinking that we should probably put in that we should probably figure out.

Well, this is probably more about the forms we use, but we'll have a section where they could check their interests and confidentiality to the extent that we could guarantee it.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:00:29

Thank you for that clarification.

Sorry for the interruption you Fang.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 1:00:34

Appreciate the questions.

K.

So OK.

So in terms of next steps and a timeline to where we're going, so the proposed rule in its current kind of draft format is basically complete, right and.

A version of the draft was kind of sent off to the prac August 2020, third for courtesy kind of review.

And we got some feedback from, I think one of the members of the public and kind of some some questions from from the body.

So we've done some, you know, minor adjustments and now the form of this draft is going to be taken to the next step, which will be to prepare notice of proposed rulemaking.

Complete the necessary fiscal impact documents and to submit that draft form.

To the Secretary of State, which probably happened in March.

Of next year, and once that happens, it kicks off kind of a notice process as well, specified legislature legislators.

The agency mailing list.

The Secretary of State's Bulletin, as well as I think in our own rules, we are going to send off.

Notice to kind of media entities as well, right?

And and abroad and a body of stakeholders, because the idea is we want to set time and we're required to set time for a rulemaking hearing.

And for adequate time for members of the public to provide their commentary and to perhaps oral and written comments, I will note that the rule making hearing right, while it may be kind of one one day set aside, there is further time beyond that to receive written and.

Oral commentary from from you know members of the public and from interested stakeholders.

So once we receive that.

We will consider and address those concerns.

And prepare.

Kind of a final form of the rule based on those considerations, and once that happens, that final permanent rule filing gets prepared and submitted to the Secretary of State.

Kind of the model process for this, that that I've taken a look at is it can take like at its quickest timeline kind of six to six months to go from preparing that notice of

proposed rule making down to.

The final permanent rule filing, of course, there can be no any number of.

I don't want to say obstacles, but but things, things that may make increase that time period, but where we're currently sitting at, we're looking at finalizing the set of rules and having it permanently on file by next by the before the end of next year.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:03:44

Great. Are there any questions?

I guess I guess my only question would be this.

You've been doing facilitated dispute resolution up to this point.

Without without this.

So this is more of a sort of a confirmation of your your practice, just setting it into its proper, shall we say, bureaucratic shelf. I I this just formalizes what you've been largely doing up to this.

Point I would gather correct.

Correct.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:04:24

I would say yes and no.

Definitely yes.

Because you know, yes, we mediate all the time and but this is part of the rightsizing as you know, we continue to evolve as a standard state agency.

But also no, because interestingly enough, I would say that all the mediation we've done to date is more an exercise of our soft power or shuttle diplomacy.

No one has been compelled to participate, nor have we made the limited type of findings that were able to, of course.

Facilitate a dispute. Resolution is still just mediation by a different name.

It's a conversation between parties where you try to come to an A common understanding.

You can commit to writing, but this process in statutes it's a little more formal and a little more adversarial than what we do now.

But interestingly enough, in talking to colleagues in other states, the few other states that have similar authority, they're much more likely and more often using the soft power like we do. Then this formal authority.

Because once you move into this more formal area, parties break down into their

individual camps.

There it's more antagonistic.

They're less willing to come to some sort of compromise.

But nevertheless, we have these authority and at some point it will be appropriate to use it rather than our soft power.

So yes, Mark, we want we want to take everything we've learned from our, you know, informal mediation and use it to inform a rule for when we actually exercise this, the stronger authority.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:05:47

So so it if I can perhaps summarize, then you use the soft shoe approach at the beginning and if necessary you will deploy this approach when and if necessary is is that the fair a fairway to describe it. Both parties though would have to agree to.

Enter into this is that is that a fair?

Summation.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:06:19

Yes, with state agencies, we have a little bit more of a hook than a carrot.

We can more or less tell them they have to, although they can still choose not to participate. And based on the why they're doing that, I can make a finding of, you know, bad faith against them.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:06:23

Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:06:33

Cities may opt into this, although bad faith findings can't be made against them and no other government in Oregon is subject to this provision.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:06:36

Right.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:06:42

So it only applies to state agencies and the executive branch.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:06:46

And cities.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:06:46

Cities, if they want to, and that's it.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:06:49

Thank you for that clarification.

Are there any questions?

And and let me let me perhaps describe the history, because in 2017, when the PRAC was created.

This.

Was applied this facilitated dispute resolution was applied to just the state and city.

He's also volunteered. OK.

I can tell you that.

The special districts, the counties, the school districts weren't necessarily opposed to participating, but wanted to see whether the Canary survived the coal mine, so to speak.

Now that this is sort of becoming more.

Shall we say formalized?

I still think the jury's out for whether or not those other entities want to join.

Maybe that's a discussion for us at a future time.

I don't know.

I don't know whether my clients would be excited to do that, but maybe that's a discussion that we have in the future because again, this does not capture all levels of government at this in, in our state.

So I just want to point that out Yufang and Todd, thank you for that.

Are there any questions?

OK.

I don't see any.

We're making some good progress.

Why don't we go to agenda item number 8?

Just doing a QuickTime check.

We've got 45 minutes. I still want to be able to get to the public.

If we if we have any any folks from the public today, so why don't we go ahead and go to key performance measures?

Todd, thank you and thank you you, Fang for that for that report.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:08:45

Thanks mark.

Just just to your last point, yeah, we've been very lucky in that. I've never had a public body refused to talk to us, even if it's just a quick response to why they think they did what they should have.

They're always willing to provide some sort of answer to us, even though they don't. They're not required to, and I certainly don't show up with a big stick.

I usually let any public body that's not within our jurisdiction know that they're they don't have to talk to us if they don't want to, but that ioffer our services and it's gone really well so far as you can see by our numbers.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:09:17

Yeah, yeah. And I just again wanted to provide a little bit of historic background on why that why that occurred.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:09:26

Yeah, I think that's great.

Thank you. OK.

So let's move on to KP, Ms. or key performance measures.

I'm sharing my screen again.

You should be seeing a large spreadsheet.

So what are key performance measures and why are we talking about them?

Well, in 2325, that is the first biennium in which our office actually advocated for.

And now controls its own budget, rather than being held and administered by death.

As part of that budget build, we learned that every state agency has to create.

Part of its budget, what are known as key performance measures, which are usually tied to its core duties as a way of taking action. To demonstrate that you are in fact meeting your statutory duties during a given biennium.

So this past biennium, the presentation to the legislature about our KP Ms. was that we now know that they exist and we're required to have them and we will work with stakeholders in the legislative Fiscal Office and.

Da CF OS office to create them.

With this next biennium, when we present our budget, we will be able to say that we've now worked with those partners as required and created.

4K PMS that are tied to our statutory duties and also incorporate 1 KPM.

That's a requirement of all boards and commissions in Oregon, so we could start with that one since it relates directly to the PRAC. And then I could talk about the other three that are specific to my office.

And again, please ask me any questions throughout.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:10:56

Todd, would you mind, can you?

Can you perhaps?

Magnify these 'cause. I'll. I'll be. I'll need a electron microscope to read it as it is.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:11:03

Oh, sure.

Sorry. You know on my side.

Yeah, no.

Thank you, Marcus.

For me it looks normal sized, so I didn't know how it was coming across for you guys, so I'll just scroll.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:11:12

Yeah, that that's probably sufficient right there.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:11:16

What about one down? Is that OK?

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:11:19

No, you if you could.

There you go.

That's what I'm looking for.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:11:23

OK, OK. So.

All small, all boards and commissions.

So I'm sorry. Let's talk about KPM #2.

This is the one specific to the PRAC.

It's it's the public Records Advisory Council's best practices. All boards and commissions are required to do an annual self-assessment.

So we've been out of compliance for how many years is it, 7-6 years now.

But we're supposed to do an annual assessment survey of all Council members using 15 required questions.

So I'm gonna stop there and jump to the questions.

And I'll make that larger, though. Then I'll have to scroll so you can see them.

And a lot of them actually relate to a board's oversight of the agency it connects to.

So you'll see there's things like.

The executive director's performance expectations are current.

The executive director receives annual feedback etcetera, and so this is going to become a guiding document that I think will help the Council.

And my office continue to build and enhance our relationship around these points that are required to be answered like for instance because you know, I just had a Director 360 review in order to be reappointed to my four year term. But I've never had an annual review.

Like I've had in, you know, every other pretty much every other position I've ever held.

But if we're going to meet compliance with this.

With a survey that we have to do, we'll have to start instituting stuff like that. And I suppose the Council will have to decide.

Is that something that's just between the advocate and the chair, the advocate and the chair and vice chair, or the Advocate and the entire Council?

So things like that.

So I'm just going to Scroll down so you can see the other questions. And of course this is available under our meeting for today. So you could read through the questions as well.

You know, board members act in accordance with their roles as public representatives.

The board coordinates with others where responsibilities and interest overlap.

You know, maybe some of this isn't appropriate and we just answer not applicable.

Or yes or no.

But these are the types of questions that were required to start asking ourselves as members of the Council and then answering.

So just going back to this KP.

So obviously if the target is all current members of the Public Records Advisory Council in this case are ex officio Members will get to vote and participate in this. We'll do it once a year over e-mail, and we're going to report out is what is the percentage of.

Best practices that are being met by the Council.

Let's talk a minute for a minute about these dates.

So these KP, Ms. are meant to be, you know, answered annually.

They don't have to start at the beginning of a calendar or fiscal year and.

They have goals in terms of how successful we hope to be. So the goal here is 100%.

Now that is not 100% that we are meeting best practices, but rather that we have 100% participation from Council members. So I'm putting this in your ear. Now, when it comes time to answer the survey, please work hard to do so by the date.

Will be required to be reported out and I've set this date that will begin April of next year. If you see the dates, the start dates. Oh, sorry.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:14:38

So it's tied, Todd, I apologize.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:14:41

Go ahead, mark. No, it's alright.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:14:43

So no, this is really this is really good.

I.

I presume that I'm going to be relying upon you and Yu Fang to ensure that when that start date kicks, you'll be pushing that information out to the members of the Council.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:15:04

Absolutely.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:15:06

OK.

I.

I I just.

I wanna make sure that we've got somebody's eye constantly on these so that we can fulfill our reporting duties, right.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:15:18

Absolutely. And that's in part why I have.

You'll see that each of these starts on a different month because you know it's. It's my responsibility to get these going.

And you think will be on leave for some time. So I'll be back to being on my own for quite a while.

And so I just wanted to make sure my dates were realistic and that will I'll be able to make them happen in a timely fashion.

So yes, so by you know, prior to April, you'll be hearing from me about the start of the survey and we might even need a meeting to talk through what the questions are and what they mean, Mark.

But then we'll we'll get it out and get started in April on that one.

And that is the only one that's specific to the PRAC and is required.

Now in terms of the other three key performance measures for our office, again, they're built around our core duties of in mediating disputes and offering trainings.

For the KPM #1, this is also another requirement.

This one is a requirement for state agencies, which is a customer service survey.

This one contains 6 questions that we're going to ask.

Those who receive our services and I'm going to jump to those questions now, make it bigger.

So it's about timeliness.

Ability, helpfulness, knowledge and expertise.

Availability of information and overall quality of service. So of course, you know, we're hoping for, you know, favorable answers. But of course this will continue to point a way to where we can improve our services as we start to collect these answers.

Jumping back to the KPM again, of course.

So we're gonna send this survey to both public bodies that receive our services and members of the public.

We're gonna do it via e-mail through a random sampling of our services, making sure that we still have a nice spread amongst governments and public bodies and the what we'll be reporting on is the percent of customers rating their satisfaction with us as good or excellent.

I hope to start that in March and you know, trying to be a realistic but also being aspirational.

2026 we're hoping we get basically an 80% favorable rating and by 2027 we get that up to 90% and if not, again, that'll continue to point the way to where we can improve services.

Next is mediation efficiency.

This is an internal diagnostic that we will be working on which is tracking the number of days from when we receive a request to when we offer resolution and of course, resolution doesn't necessarily mean of the disputed public records.

It's rather that we've completed our interaction with the requester, giving them all that we can in that in that instance. And of course this will be tracking mine and new things, numbers utilizing our current tracking sheet. Since we already have that tracking sheet, this will formally begin in.

January.

And I've set a pretty high bar of completing the majority of requests for assistance within seven days, and by 2027, hopefully 5 days.

Time will tell if that's realistic, or if we have to adjust these based on just the realities of the work that we do, including often waiting for people to get back to us with information.

But our goal is to get these as completed in a timely manner as possible and then?

 **Mark Landauer** 1:18:44

Do you think that?

Do you think that that is a realistic goal given that we do see the number of requests for this offices services?

Trending higher.

Also noting that you know, I recognize that that you're hopeful to at some point in the future get two more live bodies in your office.

I just wonder if that is perhaps too aggressive.

Of a goal considering the limitations and the amount of work that is being requested

of your office, I I I'm not asking you to change it. I'm just asking whether or not you think that's a realistic.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:19:28
Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:19:36
Goal.

And look, I'm all for shooting for the stars and hitting the woodpile.

But if we can shoot for the stars and and maybe hit the moon, which is a bit more of a.

Realistic goal.

You know, I'm all for it.

I don't.

I just my point here is that you've got limited resources, limited staff.

Yet the amount of work that is being asked for this office to do seems to be on the uptick that that's all I'm saying.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:20:10
No, that's I.

I think that's reasonable, Mark. And you know, prior to preparing the report for the Council today, what I said, I think we're trending in this direction and then actually looking at the numbers, I started to get a little worried. And I I did have it in the back. Of my head to reach out to the legislative fiscal Office to discuss this particular KPM to see you know what we should be doing here if we should be a little more closer to reality now that I have these numbers for this year in hand.

So yeah, it's worth thinking about for sure.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:20:38

That's all I'm saying is is just, you know, strive for improvement but but be realistic. That's all I'm that's all I'm saying.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:20:47
Yeah. Thanks.

I appreciate that, mark.

I really do. OK. And then the 4th, KPM is training effectiveness because of course that's a big part of what we do as well and the goal here or the target is the percentage are what we'll be looking for is the percentage of training participants who said.

Yes, to did the training provide you with relevant and useful best practices for processing and responding to public records requests?

And of course, that's going to go out to whomever receives our trainings. And my goal is to, you know.

For the trainings in person.

Course hand out maybe a hard copy version, but also create an online version and we could even provide AQR code at those trainings as well as the online ones in addition to a link to make it easiest for participants to fill out and what we'll be reporting on.

Is the percentage who in fact said yes, it was relevant and useful, and I hope to get that started in February and the goal is.

85% satisfaction for 2026 going up to 90%.

In 2027, I do think those are realistic numbers just given the feedback we've received to date. And of course, again, if we don't hit those goals well, then that'll be very important feedback to see what are we missing in our trainings that recipients need. To make them better.

That that is the KP, Ms. before I get out of the screen. Please let me know if there are any more questions.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:22:14

Todd, so this office is LFO is only requiring 4 KP mississ that correct?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:22:15

Yes.

Yes, for two reasons.

One you know, it's centered around core duties and of course these are our core duties and also kind of like what you were saying about the mediation.

Timeline. They want us to be realistic and not overextend ourselves with too many KP, Ms.

You know, we're not like DHS.

It has so many different divisions etc.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:22:39

Right, right.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:22:40

So yeah, smaller public bodies apparently tend to trend towards around 4:00.
And so we're in line with them.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:22:48

Well my I've shared my sort of reaction Todd, about setting realistic expectations.
Are there any other comments that folks would like to provide?

All right.

Well, I I think that's good work, Todd and Yu Fang.

I'm I know that this is important for the budget process and the Ways and Means
folks always look at these KP, Ms. and drill down into them so.

You know I'm. I'm glad to see that we're finally setting some.

Some expectations through the budgetary process, and I think that these are good
ones to have.

So that's my reaction anyway. Anything else?

Alright, thank you for that.

We're gonna go to.

The PRA and Prac Public records policy this is this is one of my.

Folks, I'll I'll share with you that that.

Todd and Yufang have had.

A, shall we say, a policy in mind, and have been following that policy in their own
minds, but.

One of the things that we have talked about quite a bit during the.

Ideas surrounding reducing fees for public records was this concept that a public
body could not charge fees for a public record unless they had a public records
policy that was either posted or accessible to anybody who wishes to look at it well,
knowing that the.

The public record Advocate's office is also a public body.

Thought that it might be wise for us and the PRA to have a public records policy.

And so, Todd, take it away.

AP

ALBERT Todd * PRA 1:24:52

Thanks mark.

Yes, as you so rightly pointed out, we ourselves are in violation of the current statutory requirement to have a publicly posted public records policy.

And so I will be getting that up in the near future.

So today I was just going to describe what that would be in very, very short, fast, very quick fashion because the policy is required to state who the record custodian is or who the custodians are.

The means for submitting public records requests and the manner of assessing and charging fees.

So I will be the custodian of both the my office and the Prax records.

In fact, by statute, the advocate is the custodian of the PRAX records.

The channels will be that a requester can submit a public records request through our online portal through our general e-mail address and through a physical address.

And of course those will all be noted in the policy and on our website and we've received grand total as far as.

I know of.

Perhaps 5.

Since the inception of this office and the Council, four of which have been from the same two requesters, my goal is to not charge any fees except for particularly larger owners request that dominates one or both of our times.

But so we will still indicate that fees are possible and following the current case law, essentially of saying that the.

Lowest compensated employee capable of performing each part of a public records request should be the rate at which you charge.

I've given this some thought and we will charge at you. Fangs rate 'cause. There's only two of us, and she has compensated at a lower rate than me, although, honestly, she probably shouldn't be.

And so again, I intend to never charge if possible, but if we do, it'll be at her hourly rate.

Or that I should say the hourly rate of the class and comp that she currently occupies.

So any questions or advice about that?

ML

Mark Landauer 1:26:52

So the the intention here folks, I I'm not gonna ask for a formal approval of the policy because I think we're probably all satisfied with what Todd described.

Is there are, are there any concerns?

Let let me start with that.

Are there any concerns with what Todd described?

I don't see any.

So Todd, my recommendation is rather than having to bring this policy back for approval that we just give Todd and Yufang the permission to go ahead and implement that policy at the time that well as soon as possible and without unreasonable delay. How's that?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:27:44
Will do.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:27:45
OK, great.

Well, thank you for that, Todd.

I I when I thought about that, I kinda got.

All I I turned very white.

Shall we say all the all the color in my face had had flushed out, so I'm glad we're gonna get this little detail fixed.

Alright, so with that, we are now at goal setting time and I think that this is an important.

Item I listed two things in our biennial report.

One of them was a goal to perhaps shift to a state.

E-mail address so that.

Our interactions can be.

Withheld or categorized or put in the record so that that can be accessed at future times and dates.

I also want to ensure that we do one of our statutory requirements and that will be of course surveying.

Public bodies.

I think that that's an agenda item, Todd, that I'd like to put on our next meeting agenda is to begin thinking about what our next survey should be.

Should it be on timeliness and response times? Usually that.

Well, that's the survey we did.

I think it was in gosh, 2018.

I mean that this is how long it's been since we've had a survey.

So Todd, one of the things what we might want to do is get a copy of the previous survey that we did.

And maybe make that an agenda item for discussion at our next meeting.

If if that seems reasonable to everybody, I I do wanna get a survey out this year because that is one of our statutory requirements we haven't done so in at least five years at least that's my recollection.

So I do think that that's something we need to have a discussion about and and get something put out.

So I at this point what I'd like to do is sort of open the floor.

I I.

Of course, I think we're on the our goal is to another goal is to finish.

Bylaws, I think that that's gonna be easily achievable, but I think we should document the fact that we are.

That is one of our goals to complete.

With that, I'm gonna zip it and see if other folks have.

Suggestions, recommendations, ideas about further goal setting for this body now before you do so, I want to remind everybody that this body does not have, only has to meet once every six months, Todd or once a year.

Right. Is it six months?

Six months.

So, Mindy, we don't have to meet very often, but at the same time, I'm not.

I'm not averse to meeting.

So long as we have business to conduct right?

I don't want us to meet for meeting sakes, so at some point.

I do think that we're going to want to have a discussion about our goals that we have listed to see what is realistic.

To do within the times that we have available, right?

Noting that some of us are going to be involved in what is called a legislative session that's going to last for 160 days.

Thank you, representative Anderson.

I'll be spending quite a bit of time with Rep.

Anderson and his 89 other colleagues.

So my availability is going to be somewhat limited. I imagine that there going to be a few others that are also impacted. Todd, please.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:31:40

Well, along those lines, Mark, I just wanted to say if our legislative concept that we've been so slowly cooking actually becomes a bill, we'll probably want to meet to discuss that and decide as a council, if we're going to endorse it and set up testimony and all that.
Good stuff too.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:31:56

Yeah. And I think that that's I, I personally I don't know if that's a goal, but I think it would be a role that we play regardless of whether or not it's it's a goal. But I I'm I'm certainly open to including that as one, so long as.

The white smoke comes out of the chimney.

And by the way, if you haven't seen Conclave, I highly recommend it.

Alright, goals. Come on people.

You want something?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:32:33

I I certainly echo the importance of documenting that we're gonna adopt bylaws next year and then I'm nowhere near the legislative expert. But I I I suppose we'd wanna get back to.

Having that legislation discussion that we had pretty actively a year ago, but I don't have a general concept or or proposal to make on that front, but we took a year off from that. It kind of feels like this year and we were working on other things.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:33:01

Yeah.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:33:02

But.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:33:04

Well, I'll, I'll tell you. There are 10 people who have, as I described earlier, have been

meeting on a weekly basis for two hours and it's.

It's been an interesting discussion.

Let's just leave it at that.

Tony.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 1:33:25

Yeah, I don't really have much of a dog in the hunt for this this discussion.

My term ends, but I I wanted to just yeah, just bring up that there's been a lot of work on that legislative.

Process and so I don't.

I'm not sure if we're like the purpose of this whole setting is to like have a full list or if anything, but my my suggestion or hope is to that that work continue just.

That in terms of the Council discussing it from my memory.

I believe it was Michael Crown who's out here, had some some discussions about it and with you guys. And so it seems like.

And plus with all the VP meetings that you guys are doing, it'll be a an important part of the work for next year.

So I don't.

Yeah. So I don't know if it belongs in a gold whatever, but I I think I think it would be awesome just to have like as a written something the goal of of.

Finishing that legislative work or.

Just just feed accounting to it somehow.

Like I don't know.

Yeah, just goodnight to that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:34:34

Thank you, Tony.

You know, on on review legislation typically.

The legislature doesn't come to us for their feed for feedback on their bills. Quite honestly, we have had and and you know, as we all know and as I have been reminded a couple of times, you know, they're the policymaking body and we're just advisory.

And I think when the legislation was originally enacted.

Idea was to run various bills by the PRAC for their input.

Well, that hasn't really panned out.

Shall we say?

We have had though in the past, members of various bodies.

I remember the Secretary of State's office in 2020, prior to the 23 session, brought a bill related, I think to.

Historical.

CS **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** 1:35:36
Tribal cultural value.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:35:38
Thank you, Stephanie. Appreciate it.

CS **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** 1:35:41
Thanks.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:35:42
That they sought our input and our support for we did give our support for that bill.
If I recall correctly, Stephanie.
And so I'm. I'm a little curious whether or not we might also consider some bylaws for consideration of of legislation.
I don't know if that's something we need to do, but I would.
That might be another bylaw topic that we want to consider.
I'll just throw that out because we really don't have a formalized process of reviewing bills.
And I don't think we've really talked about that.
That might be another agenda item that we want to discuss and perhaps set up more of a formalized process.
I'm open to suggestions on that.
Sounds like everybody's ready for lunch.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 1:36:45
Yeah. Well, and there's there's lot of us missing.
So I wonder if there's a way to like maybe survey folks that aren't here that way they can and I don't. You know, I'm well, I don't.
I don't know how it works with like public open meetings and and stuff like that but.

Since there are like half of us here, I do wonder what other folks have would have to say about it.

So.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:37:08

Emily.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 1:37:10

I think maybe we're just being quiet because nobody objects or disagrees with what you're saying.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:37:17

Well, I appreciate that affirmation.

I feel a little bit over my skis a bit.

You know what I think this is a topic that we ought to discuss at our next meeting.

By then, we'll probably be.

Thick into the session itself.

I have no objections to anybody approaching the PRAC and asking what we think about a bill.

In fact, I I certainly appreciate that opportunity.

But I don't think that there's anything that requires us to review legislation and provide input, so perhaps we need to have a little bit of further of a discussion as to how we're going to deal with this, representative Anderson.

HA **Hull Andrew** 1:38:03

Yeah. Thank you very much.

I would be.

You know, I am a member of the legislature and I will be a member of the legislature.

So I'm just asking both you as the chair and also Todd as the staffer of this committee, if there is in fact something that that you think you might be able to weigh in on any legislation that is coming before the House of Representatives or the Senate just.

Let me know and and I'll see what I can do. You know, I am on.

I presume I I will be reappointed as Vice chair of the Judiciary Committee, which I

think is where a lot of of these items will come through.
So I I'd be happy to involve you in the discussion as much as I can.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:38:44

Indeed.

Thank you, representative.

Appreciate that very much.

Alright. Well I I think we may be wanting to add this as an agenda item for our next meeting just to have a discussion.

Todd, if I recall correctly in past.

You folks have provided a list of public records proposals when we have met, I can certainly assist in that.

I've got to build tracking system that I can pull up.

Most of the public records related bills, but as as folks know, often times exemptions will be buried very deep into a bill that is 100 pages long.

I'm not necessarily gonna pick that off or pick that up, at least at first glance.

But yes, Todd, go ahead.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:39:42

Oh yeah, that is, that is every legislative session.

That is an aspirational goal of this office to search through every bill. Because you're right, a lot of these exemptions are buried.

And so it will be my goal again.

I probably will need more help than usual because like I said earlier, I will be on my own doing our daily duties, the admin stuff and rolling out the KP Ms.

Plus, it's Sunshine Week in March and I'm hoping to try to do something and have the hearing for administrative rule during that period too.

So yes, anyone that becomes aware of any public records bill or related bill please?

Send it my way so I can hopefully keep a list going.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:40:16

And and Todd, just know I've got a tracking system.

You can lean on me if if you need a backup on that.

All right with that.

Are there any other goals that we wanna set folks?

Not really hearing much.

We have a lot of work ahead of us still, so I think that that we're probably pretty well set for goals at this point.

Anything else to add for the good of the order?

Wrong goals. I'll give it 5 seconds.

Alright folks, we are now at the point of public comment.

Are there any members of the public present, and if so, are there any members of the public that would like to address the Council?

Alright, hearing none.

Anything else for the good of the order folks?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:41:19

Yes, I just wanted to say something.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:41:19

I will.

Oh yeah, go ahead please, Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:41:22

Which is I just wanted to extend my deep gratitude to Tony As for his service as a member of the public or as a member of this Council representing the public.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:41:25

Yes.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:41:31

Tony, you've been on this Council longer than I've been in the office.

Your contribution has been immense. I think you've always kept us grounded and realistic about our work, but also always urged us to strive to do more and to reach out to more people and to make our work more inclusive.

You know, I hope the person that comes behind you to fill this role is.

As interesting.

Interested in our work, but I won't forget what you've done here.

And you've made my transition to this role a lot easier.

I've always appreciated your guidance and support.

You'll be missed.
And I just wanted to say thank you.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:42:05

You're here.
Thank you, Tony.
Appreciate your work.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 1:42:08

Thank you.
Thank you.
I appreciate it.
It's been a great ride and amazing work by everyone and and honor, so I appreciate the magazine.
I wish you all the best.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:42:17

Let the wind be in your sails. I will. I will.

TH **Tony Hernandez** 1:42:20

Thank you.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:42:24

Entertain a motion to adjourn.


SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:42:28

I'll. I'll move to adjourn.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:42:30

Thank you.
Thank you, Scott.
Thank you for the second everybody.
I don't see any objections.
We'll consider ourselves adjourned.

Have a wonderful weekend, everybody and go ducks.
Sorry, had to say it.

 **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** 1:42:45
Thank you.

 **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:42:46
Thanks everyone.

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** stopped transcription