

Transcript

November 4, 2024, 8:01PM

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

SS

Scott Stauffer 0:04

Just reminding myself of our.

Subcommittee members will you include myself and Mark and Emily Gothard, and will and then both Representative Anderson and Senator Thatcher invited too, but with Todd also great well.

Morning, everybody.

Or good afternoon. Now, officially welcome to election Eve.

I'm sure that means all kinds of fun feelings for everybody today.

So.

I see.

We do have a quorum.

So does anybody want me to wait before we jump into our meeting?

I don't think our meeting will go terribly long today, but.

And here we got some other folks too, OK.

So we'll go ahead and get started.

I'll share my screen.

Which is the usual slides.

I wanna see my PowerPoint OK.

I got a rings. My other parts of that, so I can see.

Besides, OK.

Alright, for the valet here, making sure I can see you guys and the slides.

Hey, so welcome to our Bylaws Subcommittee meeting of the Public Record Advisory Council.

1st Order of business is I'd like a motion to approve the agenda and the agenda is laid out there.

It's basically approved agenda.

Discuss the section for the bylaws, take public comment and then talk about next meetings.

Does anybody have any member of the committee want to add or change anything to the agenda?

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:49
So moved.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:51
It's a moved by Mark and it's been seconded by Andrew to approve the motion as approved. The agenda as presented. Any further discussion seeing none all in favor say aye or raise your hand.

SA **Smith Andrew** 1:51
2nd.

WG **Will Glasson** 2:04
Hi.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 2:06
Any objections?
Say no. Very good.
The agenda is approved.
Thank you.
Moving on to our reminder where we are in this process, we're drafting bylaws for the public Records Advisory Council.
We had a first meeting to start the research part of it in September, and now we're meeting today in November to start writing it and start talking about we. We started the conversation about what sections we want.
And then start writing it so and then hopefully by sometime in the winter or by April, we'll be ready to refer.
A draft set of bylaws to the full Council to consider and to adopt.
So really quickly right to our discussion, we we kinda threw out a bunch of ideas last time.
What you see on your screen, there are some of the big subject areas, topic areas that we wanted to include last time and I went ahead and put together a draft set of

bylaws that were posted online.

Did everybody get had a chance to see that that draft bylaws?

WG **Will Glasson** 3:07

And they look great.

Thank you so much for putting those together.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 3:11

Thank you.

Well, appreciate that.

I see, Mark said.

He didn't get a chance to look at and that's totally fine.

I kinda.

I did it.

And then I was like, I was worried. I may have jumped the gun a little bit because we said the writing part was after this meeting.

But I started putting together my thoughts and I was like, well, just dump it into a document.

So what I put together was totally just the pieces I heard and the pieces I put together.

So I'm gonna switch.

To that Word document and we don't have to go into too much detail on this today, but.

Bring it to you now.

I'll ask the faces.

I wanna see the faces.

Everyone see my Word document then.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 3:52

We can see it.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 3:54

Maybe zoom in a little bit.

So maybe before I I dominate this conversation too much.

Did anybody have anything they wanted to say or any topics?

Bylaw subsections that we haven't mentioned. They may want to say anything before we get to deep in this conversation. Yes, Andrew.

SA **Smith Andrew** 4:14

Thanks Scott.

So just a reminder.

So I'm here on today on behalf of Representative Anderson, who's a non voting member.

So maybe my second wasn't in order.

Sorry, I shouldn't done that technically, but my question has to do with Scott. If you could Scroll down just to flag a pretty big issue for from our office, just quickly is there a mission section?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 4:36

Is then that's actually one of my questions too.

Right here I I I in reviewing other bylaws and reviewing.

Some do and some don't.

And the template that I start off with didn't have a section that specifically said mission.

It has this purpose section, but that's one of my questions as proposed right here.

It doesn't, but it could.

It could have a mission section so.

SA **Smith Andrew** 5:00

So just to just to flag it in context.

So I appreciate that I put in everybody's radar 'cause when I reread the statute again for the PRAC, and I may have missed it. It didn't.

A mission statement didn't jump out at me.

There was a statement about they can weigh in on legislation, but short of that, it seemed like an address.

So I just think it's something that these bylaws in one way or other should be cognizant of.

Doesn't mean we go out on a limb and define, you know, go too far, but at the same time, the statute didn't give a whole lot of guidance. So that would be my.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 5:32

I have the same conclusion.

ML **Mark Landauer** 5:34

If, if I might chime in myself here.

I I tend to not think that a mission statement needs to be in our bylaws, you know.

I don't even think we have attempted to pull together a mission statement for the PRAC.

It might be something that we want to do at some future point.

And I certainly don't have any.

Antagonism.

Or or.

I'm not timid from taking that on, but I don't think that that is necessarily.

Needed in the bylaws. I I do think that we need bylaws to operate as a Council and as a public body, and I forgive me. My dog is chiming in here a little bit as well.

I think he's agreeing with me.

I just, you know, I I can think of some items that I'd like to include in a mission statement like ensuring that the public has the opportunity.

To.

Address the Council during meetings that we want to be as transparent as possible things of that nature. But I don't know if it that's a long way for me to say I I don't statement necessarily needs to be in the bylaws.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 7:11

I.

I I hear what you're saying, Mark, I I am.

I thinking I'm back and forth too. Will your hands raised?

WG **Will Glasson** 7:17

Thanks and I'm basically piggybacking on Mark and on Andrew in the sense that one of the things I like about the bylaws is that it it definitely captures some of the statutory duties, most of the statutory duties for the PRAC. I think there is guidance that we can.

Provide beyond that and I think it would be helpful as a committee for us to talk

about kind of what our philosophy is for providing guidance.

That's not otherwise set forth in the statute.

The mission statement.

In my mind.

It's one of those areas.

Another area I wanted to at least have a conversation around was the relationship between the the PRAC and the Oregon Sunshine Committee because there are.

There are some different functions there and I think it would be useful for us to have a conversation about maybe not necessarily talk about it in terms of staying in our lane, but but understanding what our focus is, where we're beginning to approach.

The the purpose of the Sunshine Committee.

And you know more generally, I do like bylaws that provide guidance in areas where we don't necessarily have clear statutory.

Direction if those areas are places where we're reflecting kind of the spirit of the Council, some of the values of the Council, such as transparency, such as providing a certain level of access to some of records.

And so, you know, to the extent that we identify some of these areas that don't map to the statute.

I think it'd be great for us to to list them and then make sure that they're available there for further discussion.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 9:02

Thank you, will. That's a really good.

Sunshine committee. I hadn't even thought about that, and I think that's a really good thing to to consider putting in here at some place.

Yeah, I I took a note of that Sunshine Committee.

It's almost like an A section on external relations, maybe? I'm not sure.

WG **Will Glasson** 9:21

Exactly, yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 9:23

Well, it's it's funny because I also serve on the Sunshine Committee as well, although albeit I'm I'm somewhat of a new member.

It is a great question.

Will as to how we interact with the Sunshine Committee. I think we've had one discussion with them and that was several years ago. If my recollection is correct. So yeah, that that might be something.

We want to explore.

I agree with will on that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 10:02

I don't know if we asked and forgive me for not being clear on did are they both about the is the PRAC and the Sunshine Committee about the same age?

ML **Mark Landauer** 10:12

Yeah, they, they, they were both I think created in the 2017 session.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 10:12

Did they both? Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 10:18

John Huffman was the legislator who I think pushed both of those bills through the process.

And of course, the Sunshine Committee was designed primarily to review all the existing exemptions and to make a determination as to whether or not.

The reasons for those exemptions still hold today.

And.

My further impression, having only served again for about a year, is that the Sunshine Committee makes recommendations to. I think it's the.

Todd and and I saw that Cameron was on here, makes a recommendation to the Legislative Oversight Committee or the Legislative Council. Committee.

Which if you look at it, I don't think has met for for several years.

So and the Legislative Council committee is primarily designed for hiring the Chief Legislative Council, and so they haven't met for many years.

And so the Sunshine Committee and I know I'm way off base here, but Sunshine Committee's essentially submits a report.

And it goes to dark.

Well, let's just say a black hole never to be seen again.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 11:53
Does the Sunshine Committee have bylaws?

ML **Mark Landauer** 11:57
Great question.
I don't know the answer to that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 12:02
Maybe we can.
That's a good follow up question.

WG **Will Glasson** 12:04
Yeah, that I just pulled up the website.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 12:04
Do they have bylaws?

WG **Will Glasson** 12:06
Let me let me see.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 12:13
Oh, I'm. I'm hearing so far in our conversation.
Mission statement, whether one or not.
And then also.
Looking at how our bylaws, the PRAC bylaws addresses Sunshine Committee.
And there's question every time.

ML **Mark Landauer** 12:31
I.
I guess the question becomes whether we we need to, but I did see that that
Cameron turned his camera on and I know he's not a member, but I certainly
welcome any input that he may want to share.

M **MILES Cameron D * GOV** 12:51

So I can answer a couple of your questions.

The Public Records Subcommittee of the Legislative Council Committee has not met in probably three or four years.

It's only purpose is to receive the reports from the PRAC.

It doesn't normally meet the Legislative Council committee meets occasionally 'cause if any, or any litigation involving legislature they're involved in that. So they do meet occasionally.

But this public Records Subcommittee of that committee never meets other than to receive the report.

This.

Oregon Sunshine Committee does not have bylaws. We haven't done any of that in that committee.

There's not really the same need because we're doing recommendations to the legislature and we are not in charge of a an agency.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 13:37
New camera.

ML **Mark Landauer** 13:38
Cameron.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 13:41
All right.

So that notwithstanding one question on a mission, we might want to circle back to before we end today.

But was there anything else?

Let's see.

I have another question.

Qualifications. I guess that when I was putting together this template, I noticed that some of the other committees that we got bylaws from, they talked about qualifications, but our Ors doesn't mention qualifications. So is there a need for qualifications section in our bylaws? Probably not.

ML **Mark Landauer** 14:12

I don't think so, because the qualifications are essentially laid out in the statute and

the qualification is basically, you know, you're a designate either. You're the Secretary of State or you're their designee. Or you're a member from the city or. A member of a media organization, so I I I I imagine, Scott that those. Entities will identify who they believe is the most qualified individual to represent their. Their their interests. So I I don't think we need qualifications for membership.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 14:54

That was kind of what I was.

ML **Mark Landauer** 14:54

Except that you're you're a living, breathing human being, perhaps.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 14:59

That was sort of my my general assumption too, but I wanna raise it to Todd.

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

Yeah. So I've never drafted bylaws before.

I don't know how exacting we need to be, you know, but The Who serves on the prac is a process that's wholly controlled by the governor's office.

And so they do need to suss qualifications because you have to be like a member of the media for those positions, so on and so forth.

So if anything we could say you know qualification for each position as determined by the governor's office or pursuant to statute or something. If we wanted to be that detailed.

Or you could just leave it as is because it's.

So it's outside the practice control.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 15:38

Yeah, I I I've drafted a few bylaws and it there's always that balance of how prescriptive do you get versus how open you leave something. So you don't have to constantly revise it and you're also not locking people into a certain outcome every single time. So I'm kind.

Of feeling like and this is just me. I kind of feel like the I don't know if we need qualifications less than here because.

But as Mark was saying by virtue of who the Members are, that's sort of how you get qualified.

So I lean on, maybe not, but we do have other hands, right, Andrew?

SA **Smith Andrew** 16:10

So there is this this situation of my boss is a ex officio member correct under the Statute. So the thing that might help us or future members of the PRAC, which is elected officials oftentimes can't be at the meeting at these meetings. For example, my boss isn't here.

Today hasn't been always in the past. It might make a good it might be a good idea in the bylaws to say for those people those two elected.

The senator, right, and the representative or their alternates may attend or something.

Because it's a non official, it's a non official anyway.

WG **Will Glasson** 16:44

Or designee I mean.

SA **Smith Andrew** 16:44

So I don't.

I don't think that goes Askew with the statute, but.

WG **Will Glasson** 16:47

Yeah. I mean, in the language, in a lot of bylaws around this is their designee.

SA **Smith Andrew** 16:52

Yeah, but I the statute.

WG **Will Glasson** 16:52

It's kind of, yeah.

SA **Smith Andrew** 16:54

I don't remember the way it was written or if it allows that leeway.
It seems like it could, but I don't know.

ML **Mark Landauer** 17:00

I don't think it addresses it Andy, but I do think and I I certainly as the chair, welcome a member of that ex officio's staff to attend in order to be able to report back to the Member.

So I I I think that that's a sort of a friendly suggestion if if I might and and perhaps for the.

Ex officio members that that we allow for.

A designee to attend the meetings.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 17:39

I can see adding some I agree with what I think you're saying, Mark. I I could see adding some language maybe under the the sections where the sender representative are mentioned and then having designees welcome.

Yeah. Will your hands raised?

WG **Will Glasson** 17:55

So and this is a separate topic I've written or worked on a number of bylaws lately around for committees for homelessness response, and we learned fairly quickly based on some of the public meetings we had for those committees, that it's very useful to have a provision in the.

Bylaws around meeting management.

The ability to.

Manage the meeting based on expectations around.

You know, sticking to the time limitations for comments or behaviour in the, you know, for public meetings.

In person meetings.

Most of these meetings, I suspect, are gonna be done by zoom, but I think there there are areas where we would should consider putting in guidance for the public on how meetings will be conducted from sort of the behavior and conduct standpoint and and what particular officers who.

Are conducting the meetings may do.

If someone is is not following those conduct requirements.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:00

Yeah. Good.

Good point.

And I believe the draft I put together here tried to address some of those things in there.

So maybe it's.

Maybe it's be helpful if we after this meeting.

WG **Will Glasson** 19:10

How did I miss it? I saw a meeting conduct.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:11

What's that?

WG **Will Glasson** 19:13

It didn't. It didn't really.

I mean Robert's rules of order.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:16

Maybe. Yeah, maybe it didn't get exactly what the things you're addressing, but I think there are.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:21

There it is code of conduct.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:26

It might not include all the sections.

This was I was.

I was working off of a code of conduct that the City of Milwaukee has developed, but it might not include all things like you mentioned.

Will time, time limits and timelines.

I don't think that's in here, but that is something that could potentially be added in there.

WG **Will Glasson** 19:42
And the code of Conduct addresses member conduct.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:45
Right. That's right.

WG **Will Glasson** 19:45
I'm I'm I'm. I mean that's certainly useful but.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:47
You're you're talking about pop members of the public or or those who who?

WG **Will Glasson** 19:51
It's cracked.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:54
Appear before the the the Council itself.

WG **Will Glasson** 19:58
That's correct.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 20:00
I'm not, I I I think that's a good topic to add or subsection that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:04
I agree.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 20:08
OK.
There's also sorry.

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:09
And Scott to that to that end perhaps?

The enforcer of that ought to be the chair or the vice chair, depending on who is chairing that meeting.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 20:25

Yeah.

Maybe adding?

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:28

So. So the chair or whoever's chairing the meeting will.

Is expected to enforce that code of conduct #1 as well as.

The amount of time individuals.

Are allowed to speak if it just gives the chair the ability to talk to, to close somebody's.

Public.

Testimony. If it's not Germaine or or what have you.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:05

Well.

I like that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 21:09

Well, was that sort of what you were talking about?

WG **Will Glasson** 21:13

Absolutely, yeah.

Again, it's.

It's it's not the most important section.

In the meeting until it, it's until you're in that situation where you really wish you had it, and then you know my my experience has been just from a legal response standpoint, it's incredibly useful to have that language in there to defend, for example, muting a microphone.

ML **Mark Landauer** 21:22

But it could be it could.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 21:24
It could be.

ML **Mark Landauer** 21:24
It's important though.
Yes.

Yeah, and and and Scott, we'll we'll wanna include sort of a provision that, that.
Enable some you know some person on the Council itself to direct.
A muting of that individuals microphone.

WG **Will Glasson** 22:01

And I can provide a couple examples.
There are some public meeting links that have the the code of conducts.
I'll, I'll drop those in the chat.

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:12
Bill.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 22:12

Thank you.
Thank you. Well.
OK.
So we've got, we've got a few sections identified.
To follow up on already and I wanna make sure we circle back because my Cameron
put in the chat.
This might go circle back to the qualifications discussion.
There are designees that are not appointed by the governor on the PRAC.
So they are just pointing out that there are non governor appointees that we have.
Who are appointed by.
The President of the Senate Speaker of the House, yeah.
Did you want to say anything further on that Cameron?
Yeah, OK. This has been great.
Let's roll through.
I think I had a couple other things.

I had flagged talked about qualifications.

Remove some some bylaws and this might not apply based on our Rs, but some bylaws have a a removal process, lack of attendance behavior. That's not I don't.

There's different ways to get around it.

Our Ors didn't talk about that, and so I just wanted to raise the question. Don't touch it. Don't.

ML **Mark Landauer** 23:18

Don't touch it.

Don't, don't, don't touch it.

WG **Will Glasson** 23:22

I mean, I think we could censor someone. We can't take a jurisdictional action, but we can, for example, identify an issue and try and escalate it to the governor's office or another appropriate place.

At least, that's again based on the the work that I've done with these homelessness response committees, that that's kind of been the approach that's used.

ML **Mark Landauer** 23:43

But that but well, that would only apply to individuals who actually get nominated by the governor and ultimately approved by.

Confirmed by the Senate.

WG **Will Glasson** 23:55

That's correct.

These are going to be members.

These are going to be individuals who are existing in some type of statutory capacity.

ML **Mark Landauer** 23:57

Right.

Yeah.

That's a that's a tough one.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 24:07

If I just ask, Will can you elaborate a little more on that process?

WG Will Glasson 24:12

Well, we take we take attendance at at these meetings, we take attendance.

You know it's it's noted when people show up or don't.

Sometimes, in fact, I don't think I've ever seen this written down.

But I know that it's been a policy where someone just doesn't show up, say 5 meetings in a row. In these meetings were oftentimes working off of the the committee as was created under an IGA, and that IGA will say, well, these are the representatives of these parties.

Up with the party that was responsible for appointing that individual and say this guy just hasn't shown up.

And under the contract, the party that's appointed that individual has the ability to terminate their membership and then appoint somebody else. And that's typically what happens.

So you know we we can write this in if if that's the desire of the Council in a number of different ways, of course or not write it in.

But I think the communication process is is helpful and it also serves kind of a record keeping function. I'm going to meet myself.

SS Scott Stauffer 25:22

Todd.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 25:24

Thanks. Well, I mean, we could potentially then do something similar and just put and then make a report to the appointing authority about said number of absences. Like if we set it like an automatic limit six in a row, five in a row, it could be like sort. Of a blind, not a blind process, non judgmental process like it's just based on absences in a row and an automatic report to the appointing authority about it.

WG Will Glasson 25:48

That said, just as the kind of the county's lawyer, when we respond to some of these things, there have been instances.

Such as on the travel Portland, where there was a particular city Commissioner who had cancer and didn't wasn't able to participate. And you know in those scenarios we do want to be very careful about.

The the the perception that that we're taking some type of action that's related to a disability or or an illness.

ML **Mark Landauer** 26:19
Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 26:19
So maybe unexplained absences or something, but I'll shut up.

WG **Will Glasson** 26:21
Yeah that I think.
Unexplained, I think unexplained makes a lot of sense.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 26:27
Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 26:27
If I may are, are you folks done with that 'cause Scott?
I don't think we have the authority to.
Remove any member of the Council that's not in statute. I think that that is problematic.
So I I I don't feel as though we have the authority to actually remove a member under D. Perhaps what?
As the alternative.
You know, if after three unexcused absences.
And and I think we understand what unexcused would would be generally speaking.
You know the Council.
May.
Direct communication to the appointing authority, expressing concern for a lack of participation in the Council or something. To that extent, I think.
That would be within our authority, but the removal we I just don't think we have that authority.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 27:42
I think I think that seems we seem to be in agreement about that. the US doesn't say

to it and we can and I'm I'm getting an impression that the subcommittee here is is interested in in language. It talks about maybe some reporting of someone goes unexplained abs.

For a few meetings in a row and maybe we can put some general language about just a simple reporting to the the appointing authority.

Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 28:06

I think that that's fair.

Here's the problem though, of course.

And you know, and I'm not picking on anybody in particular, but but in Tony's instance where he's representing the public, I I don't know who who we would inform right.

But.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 28:27

Governor appointee, though, is that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 28:28

Yes.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 28:29

Yeah. So we might.

And the governor's office.

ML **Mark Landauer** 28:31

So again, the appointing authority there is the governor.

So I I it makes sense.

I like that approach more than than trying to.

Do. Yeah.

Beyond informing the appointing authority, I don't think we can do anything beyond that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 28:54

Would be the conclusion we're drawing. So OK. Anything else on that that one?

I see will and Cameron has posted a few things in the in the chat.

Thank you both of you for that.

Minutes. I just wanted to confirm what I think are operating has been we consider the video to be our minutes.

Is this right?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 29:20

Yeah, we can choose otherwise, but generally for are we talking for the whole prac?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 29:26

Yeah.

Mm hmm.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 29:41

Unfortunately, our secretary has been largely MAA with our minutes, so we've been posting the video and transcript in lieu of minutes as just essentially our official record at this point.

So while they're going to have to appoint a new secretary, that might be a little more ready with the Minutes, or perhaps instead move to the video and transcript as our official record rather than minutes.

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:04

Todd, will you please place that on our agenda?

I think that that's. Yeah, I think that that's worthy of a conversation.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 30:07

Do it right now.

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:13

In light of our current situation.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:17

And that also raises to the point I don't think I was where we had a secretary.

So that's something that should probably be called out in the bylaws, so.

Good note there.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 30:28

Oh yeah. Sorry. Yeah, actually, sorry.

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:28

You catch.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:28

OK.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 30:29

Let's let's try to wrap this all together.

Yeah, because a few years ago we chose that.

We're gonna. Well, it's in statue now, but we chose. We will elect leadership statute, says chair and vice chair.

But within our meetings, yes, we did also say Secretary.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:42

Secretary.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 30:42

So I think that is a good thing to put in the in the bylaws and then for subcommittees. We, we've always gone with the video as the official record, not minutes. So we should say that we should make those designations per subcommittee as well, I think.

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:48

Well, well, wait.

Maybe. Maybe we need to have a discussion. Todd amongst the practice to whether or not we actually want a secretary before we put it into the bylaws because because if we choose to just go with the electronic route, I don't think we need a secretary at that point.

Is that is that a fair assumption?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 31:19

Yeah, you're right, Mark.

WG **Will Glasson** 31:21

Yeah, that's how. That's how we're doing. We've worked.

We've covered minutes in in many of these homelessness Response Council meetings.

We it's very simple.

You set record with GEM and I and some of the other AI assistants that are now pairing with meetings that will create a transcript that we've discovered has been pretty accurate, sometimes hard to follow, but.

That's that's all been adequate for record keeping as far as our record.

SA **Smith Andrew** 31:50

So our office represented just for what it's worth to the degree from a long term. Where is this going? Public public world. I think electronic records are better.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 31:50

Reminder.

SA **Smith Andrew** 32:00

They just the whole stat. You end up staffing meant taking minutes becomes a pretty significant function. And if we can use technology to take it away as a policy piece, I think we should lean into that.

But I think there's one complication for Mark and that is, I think the statute said that Mark Landauer was the secretary had to take minutes by law, right, mark?

Sorry, I thought I read that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 32:19

Yeah, it it if that's the case, Andy, we are not gonna have a very good record of our meeting.

So I I can assure you of that, because that is not my strong suit.

WG **Will Glasson** 32:34

Well, he can.

He can always click, you know, take meeting notes or a transcript on the when the meeting starts and consider his his task perform.

ML **Mark Landauer** 32:42

Yeah, unfortunately will.

I'm not that technologically savvy to even figure out where that button is so.

All right.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 32:53

As a as a professional minute taker myself, I will say that there was an error not long ago.

I would be very much.

I was much more more uncomfortable with the video being the the official record.

There's still a school of thought that the written a written record that not only accessible in terms of being something that can be read. Could a video can be a little cumbersome to scroll through. And I know video technology is coming a long way and AI is a.

Whole game changer.

But a written record that not only is perhaps more accessible in one in one format, but.

Is also something that the body, the Council, would actually have an opportunity at its next meeting to review and agree.

On the record that that is what happened versus just letting a video stand is doesn't necessarily require that so.

ML **Mark Landauer** 33:32

Actually.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 33:40

I I will say and I see your hand raised, Mike.

I would just say a few years ago I would be much more insistent that we we stick with written minutes, but I totally appreciate that the world is changing and and AI is playing a much bigger role and we get transcripts mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 33:54

So this actually raises something I'm dealing with right now in real life.

I do agree that it would be beneficial to have a written transcript of our meetings and here's why.

I'm writing the biennial Public Records Advisory Council report.

Which is due December 1st. If my memory is correct, Todd and I actually have begun to write it.

But being able to refer back to those meeting notes is gonna be really important for me to fulfill that requirement. And so.

Scott, I I I'm going to agree with you that just a recording of the meeting is not necessarily adequate. I do think that written transcript of the meeting is going to be helpful because ultimately.

Somebody's gonna have to write that biennial report and having that available to reference is gonna be critical in fulfilling that statutory requirement.

That's that's that's my feeling.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 35:10

Thank you, mark. And and just and I saw your hand raised to Andrew, but on that thought, if we're if we're writing a transcript or taking a transcript, is there a need then for the body to review that the transcript and approve it or is that just?

Unnecessary.

WG **Will Glasson** 35:29

I think it's always important for there to be at the beginning of the next meeting, a review of minutes from the previous one and and that would apply either for minutes that that are taken by a human being versus minutes that are taken by some type of bus.

Service.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 35:47

I I that's generally what I agree with him.

Andrew, your hand was raised next.

SA **Smith Andrew** 35:51

It just seems like we have the best of both worlds, so we have the recording for posterity that people can watch.

We also use this official transcript capacity, which AI can do.

Then we officially approve those, just like we would approve minutes.

So it's very similar when we approve it, we're saying that was accurate.

So we do have to read the transcript to make sure it doesn't.

AI doesn't go weird on us.

That being said, all of that together to me covers everything.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 36:13

It wouldn't.

I think Andrew, Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:20

So right now when I post the transcripts from either our PRAC meetings or subcommittee meetings, I always make sure to put in the title that it's unedited so folks understand we put up what was generated.

We don't try to edit it so we can decide if you know, do we want to.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 36:31

Transparency.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:34

So maybe we could have a secretary position just if we feel like it's necessary to clean up the transcript. But right now it's people know it's not.

It's not edited.

ML **Mark Landauer** 36:45

Oh, and this is the conversation that I want the prac to have at our next meeting.

It shouldn't be a long one, but I want to be sure everybody's comfortable with the path moving forward before we shoehorn it into the bylaws.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 37:04

I think the Minutes can reflect that.

We have discussed the Minutes.

Anything further on this one? For the record, no, no, OK.

Let me see. Did I flag anything else in here?

I don't know what I did. OK, so I think we've gotten through all the talking points we got.

I think we've got some answers and direction of taking a lot of notes.

I think the one thing we might want to circle back on before we finish is is the mission section.

Besides Mission statement, is there anything else in this or in bylaws in general that anybody wanted to talk about at this juncture?

Single hands raised. Let's circle back to the mission statement.

I.

I I know we talked about it whether we need one or not and whether whether there was some thought.

I think that whether we have one in general should be maybe a full Council discussion and maybe even a project in the future that would then perhaps inform could be added to a bylaw. So at this stage, does this bylaw subcommittee feel like we need to spend time?

Writing a mission statement.

Seeing one head now.

WG Will Glasson 38:11

So I don't, I don't think so.

SS Scott Stauffer 38:13

No.

Where for the for the for the straw man bylaws template.

It just has a purpose section which totally points to ORS and listing.

But we weren't.

For right now I mean.

WG Will Glasson 38:26

Yeah. And and again, if we wanna go further, I've seen values like the description of values added that are less actionable.

SS Scott Stauffer 38:38

Well then I think.

Here's where I think we are and I will maybe stop sharing this so I can share a little bit a bigger screen.

I think we've got a template.

We've talked about some sections.

I've taken notes what I think the next thing that I was gonna have was discuss was writing assignments. Have folks take on different sections.

I feel like I took good enough notes that I can redline what you what that that document and then have Todd distribute it to the full the the whole subcommittee.

Again, we're waiting for some.

Feedback from the full council on next discussion on the Secretary on that part of it.

Maybe I'll do some redline and I'll share with the Bylaws committee and then our next meeting. We can continue to chew on the sections with some of the writing. I guess I'm volunteering to to do all that redlining.

Does anybody want to join me in that red lining work or is it is everyone comfortable with me making those red lines and sharing the document with everybody again?

ML

Mark Landauer 39:36

Scott. Yeah, I'm. I'm fine with that.

I'm just.

I'm quickly scanning through.

Through this, because I didn't get an opportunity to do previously.

Can I have you Scroll down to officers and assign duties on page four of five under sub four code of conduct?

SS

Scott Stauffer 40:01

Busters and duties.

Pass it code, conduct.

ML

Mark Landauer 40:08

Bottom of page for.

Council Member I'm looking at.

SS

Scott Stauffer 40:14

Oops.

ML **Mark Landauer** 40:18

Sub two there under 4 Council members will work on a consensus basis, subject to the Chair's directive.

I don't know if we need that sentence.

That is certainly been my.

My philosophy.

In trying to run the the.

The Council, but I don't know if if that's been my goal.

OK.

I don't know if we need that.

That first sentence in sub two there.

I think that the rest of that makes sense to me, right?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 41:05

I.

I'm pretty confident that I got this first sentence from our our last conversation, so.

Happy to Redline it out or happy to talk about it, Todd.

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

And not to disagree with you, Mark, but I will say that I think the PRAC as a whole and I'm sure you'd agree with this part, has prided itself on work trying to always work toward consensus. And I think that you know.

Even outside of your leadership on this, we've always sort of tried to do that and has been a general aspect of our culture and obviously there will be difficult conversations.

There will be times we don't agree.

Maybe something more like Council members will like strive to work in a consensus basis, subject to the Chair's directive or something like that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 41:52

I'm I'm fine with that, Todd. Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 41:52

You know.

ML **Mark Landauer** 41:56

I think it should be a goal of the Council to to be working on a consensus basis.
But I don't think you can.

I.

I don't think you can tell Council members you will work on a consensus basis, right?

I think that that was the point.

I was trying to make so I'm fine with that. That modification. I think it captures the intent properly.

So thank you for that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 42:24

Andrew.

SA **Smith Andrew** 42:27

So I was just typing in the chat, perhaps a little just a step back from strive. Seek to work. Strive to suggest that you're, you know, some.

The statute doesn't go way in one the other, so I think maybe a softer hint is a little a little more deft.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 42:49

Anything else?

Any other topic sections of the code?

The bylaws that we that draft to this point, anyone wanna talk about?

ML **Mark Landauer** 42:57

I will.

I will say that I am going to print the whole thing out and run through it and Scott, I'll share any further thoughts.

If I have any I I really, I really appreciate you putting pen to paper on this though and and I I'm really excited about that about this.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 43:19

Yeah, I I I realized I might have. Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 43:20

The one.

The one question I did have though for everybody we did.

Approve bylaws on how to hire the PRA.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 43:31

Yes.

ML **Mark Landauer** 43:32

And of course, those aren't included in this, but I I would presume that when we present this package to the Council that we would want to include the hiring.

Bylaws that that we have already approved.

But just so that everybody knows that that is a part of this package as well, if that makes sense.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 43:58

That's a really good point, Mark. And I think it's sort of like something I was right in front of my face and I didn't even think until included in this.

I know that the the bylaws that we drafted have references to hiring the PRA.

Does it make sense at all to put any of that?

But we the process that we put together, should we put that in the bylaws or just refer to it as a separate thing?

ML **Mark Landauer** 44:23

I think maybe as a separate chapter, if you will.

You know, I I I don't.

I have no strong opinions one way or the other, frankly, but it it just seems to me that this is sort of a package and all ought to be under the same sort of cover, if you will.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 44:47

Yeah.

I can do that.

I I probably should have done that emergency.

So good call. It is 1246, no one.
No respect, folks that we gave it an hour for today.
So.
Thank you.
Thank you for the vote of support, Andrew.

ML **Mark Landauer** 45:03
What's an orange whip?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 45:06
I'm thinking a drink.

ML **Mark Landauer** 45:07
Oh, gotcha.

SA **Smith Andrew** 45:08
Those brothers.
It's a Blues brothers John Candy reference.

ML **Mark Landauer** 45:09
Alright, OK.
I got it now.
Don't have to go any further. I got it.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 45:16
So this has been great, really good conversation.
I appreciate everyone's dialogue on it.
I think I was summarizing earlier.
I'll. I'll go ahead and do some red lines. Share it with everybody through Todd and then when we do our next meeting.
I guess I'll. I'll go through this, but as we so we're we're at the compiling and writing section and I'll do some more red line share it out and then our next meeting will continue to review.
The sections and then talk about it.
Uh, we'll give ourselves at least one, maybe two more of these type of dialogue

sessions to to to edit it.

Does that sound like OK?

Does anybody really wanna join me in in editing and writing? Doing some of the red lines? I'd be happy to have it, but I can also, I think put these red lines together pretty quickly too.

So any objection to that plan?

ML **Mark Landauer** 46:03

No. And again, Scott, all all strive to review that quickly today and and share any further.

Comments.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 46:14

And I do see a hand raised and I believe it's from Joe Barker, who's a member of the public. So Joe.

If there's no further discussion from the subcommittee, I do think we're ready to take public comment and so go ahead, Joe.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 46:28

Thank you, Scott.

I don't mean to sound nitpicky or anything like that, but in context to conduct of the whole board.

And when the public gets to speak, I think there should be a designated specific time, like within the last 15 minutes of a meeting or something like that.

That's to assure the public that they're guaranteed a specific time slot to speak.

Otherwise, if you have like 5 people and they're granted 3 minutes each.

And crack members stop speaking at 5 minutes before the end of the meeting.

There's going to be people left out from not being able to speak.

And that's not fair.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 47:30

Sure. I think, yeah.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 47:34

You guys banter around concepts and philosophies and things like that.

So you know, I I I would appreciate a specific designated time for when public is to speak.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 47:48

Sure, point point. Well taken. I know that it our chairs have always driven our thought as hard as they could to make sure that the public has had a good time to speak. But including language in the bylaws that set up an expectation for the public and for the board to be honest, to commit to council as to when public commentary would take, that's a good idea.

SA **Smith Andrew** 48:09

John, I was calling about the Sonata for K Smith.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 48:10

So I I I can.

Sorry, Andrew, you're you're not muted.

ML **Mark Landauer** 48:15

Sorry.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 48:17

Can we?

Can we mute Andrew?

OK.

Maybe he's not there. Thank you, Joe.

Good comment.

Did you have anything else you wanted to say at this point, Joe?

SA **Smith Andrew** 48:25

OK.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 48:29

Are you asking me?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 48:31

Yeah. I'm sorry. Did you have anything else to say?

JB **Jo A. Barker** 48:34

Yeah, I do have one more comment and it deals with.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 48:36

Yep.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 48:39

The removal process of members.

I mean, we're all cognizant that that there is.

The ballot on the ballot, where if members if, if the legislature is not in attendance for 10 meetings, they get removed.

Maybe something along those lines, deferring that to the non no. OK, I can understand that.

Mark I.

ML **Mark Landauer** 49:06

Yeah, it it the the problem, Joe. And I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, but this this statute doesn't give us the authority to remove a member.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 49:16

No, no, no.

I was just saying refer to it if that section does get passed not stating that PRAC has that authority, but if the legislature itself determines that a member of the House of Representatives or senators has not been in attendance for 10 meetings, that sort of like automatically Remo.

Them from.

Prac.

No. OK.

OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 49:44

That that, that ballot measure only applied to elected members of the legislature. It doesn't necessarily apply to boards or commissions of the state.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 49:58
OK, OK.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 50:00
And guys pick the bottom. I think the bottom line, if you don't have the authority.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 50:00
I'm OK, I OK.
OK.
No problem.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 50:09
OK.
Thank you, Joe.
Anybody else from the public have any comments to this time?
Seeing, yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 50:19
I just wanna thank you, Scott.
This is really good work.
I appreciate your, you know, digging into this and and really producing something that frankly I think we're ahead of our timeline quite honestly.
And so I I wanna compliment you on that.
I'm not necessarily in a rush to adopt them, but I was.
Almost at the point where I think we're close enough that we could almost share the bylaws with the PRAC.
To for them to review, but I know we want to do a little bit more work on it.
So, so maybe your timeline is gonna actually result in being a lot shorter.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 51:05
Thank you, mark.
I I appreciate those comments and I I think I agree with you. I think at least one more

good conversation.

Let's get some.

I'll do some red lines.

That's that to revisit this early in the new Year and then and then maybe at our at the next meeting, the full Council in June or whatever that is, we can present something to it. But and certainly we're gonna look to see what the full council discusses at. Our next meeting in December about about the secretary position too, so there's some feedback to be taken as well, so.

ML **Mark Landauer** 51:29

Yeah.

Yeah, yeah. Great.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 51:34

OK, so the the the last step there I I had a note on the previous slide to talk about next meetings. I think if Todd would be so kind to put a pull out in the not too distant future, we can set a date for maybe late January.

Or February.

That'd be good.

ML **Mark Landauer** 51:49

It's.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 51:49

OK, although we'll be legislative session right, Mark?

ML **Mark Landauer** 51:52

It, yeah.

So I'm I'm I'm gonna it. Provide a little input on this one just from a timing perspective if we can do it before January 21st which will be the.

First day of legislative session.

I I might even go so far as to say and let me look at the calendar here real quickly.

I might want it the week.

Let's shoot for the week.

Of the 6th pod.

And the reason I the reason I say that is that the week before session begins, it's likely they'll have a 1000 bill plus bill drop.

And Needless to say, I'm going to be reading thousands of bills that week.

So let's let's shoot for January the week of January 6 if if that's OK.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 52:48

Sounds good to me.

I think I my plan would be to get some red line at you guys in the next week and then yeah, pretty much after that.

But we wanna make sure that that PRAC has a full after the Council meeting in December before.

Yeah, well, that sounds good. If if, Todd, you could put out a poll for that first week in January.

ML **Mark Landauer** 53:05

Awesome. Thank you for for accommodating that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 53:08

Well, I I know.

We know for certain that you're not the only one on this call that's gonna be impacted by our legislature convening so.

Great. Well, I think that's it for the meeting. I did set up a a motion to adjourn.

So if somebody wants to motion to adjourn, we can we can wrap it up.

ML **Mark Landauer** 53:24

So moved.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 53:26

And moved.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 53:26

2nd.

ML **Mark Landauer** 53:26

I beat you all second, Todd.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 53:26
And seconded.

WG **Will Glasson** 53:28
Seconded.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 53:29
Any further discussion on the move to adjourn any further discussion, seeing none all in favor say aye.
Raise your hand.

WG **Will Glasson** 53:38
Bye bye.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 53:38
We are adjourned to 12:54.
Thank you for a great discussion everybody.

ML **Mark Landauer** 53:41
Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 53:42
Have a good day.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 53:47
Hi everybody.

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** stopped transcription