

Transcript

June 24, 2024, 7:03PM

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:04

Agenda items that need to be modified, added or deleted are we?

Are we all comfortable with today's agenda?

OK, I'm taking that as a yes.

So let's open the.

Prac meeting.

Todd, are we gonna be recording today?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:25

Yeah.

Sorry, I did go ahead and start the recording when you wanted us.

When you started just now.

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:30

OK, very good.

Uh, I see that now on my screen, so thank you for setting the meeting.

I'll open the public Records Advisory Council meeting for June 24th.

It is 12:03 PM.

Welcome everybody.

We have agenda that's pretty brief and to the point.

Hopefully we won't take the whole time, but we have approved today's agenda and

we are now on item number 2 finalization of processing, including questions for agency Director, 360 review of public records advocate.

I gather that we're gonna have a yufang walk us through that.

Is that a fair characterization?

I'm hoping so.

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

Yes, mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:21

Excellent.

Well, I'm glad I haven't made any mistakes and we're only two minutes in, so thank you.

You, Fang, why don't you go ahead and and take it away?

I appreciate it.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 1:31

Thanks, mark.

Can everybody hear me OK?

ML **Mark Landauer** 1:34

Yes.

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

OK.

Thank you.

Uh, so at our last meeting, we agreed that there would be additional time for PRAC members to take a look at the draft of the cracks version of an Executive 360, especially the questions.

And I have received several pieces of feedback that have been incorporated into a second version.

That version went around.

I think it was last Friday and has since been posted on our PRAC website, so if folks have any have had the opportunity to review that and have any additional questions, now would be the time to ask them.

But I do also wanna take some time just to share my screen and go over some of the major, like a substantive changes that were made.

So let me go ahead and share my screen.

See.

OK, So what you should see in front of you is our version two of our uh review process.

I in the highlights.

I've uh pointed out some major changes, but most notable is kind of this

categorization of evaluators as well as the addition of an evaluator selection criteria. If you'll recall, at the last meeting there were some questions about, well, what are the categories of evaluators that we're gonna have that we ask to give a survey feedback and how do we go about selecting those evaluators and taking into account some of the feedback and really good observations from members. I've made some changes here as far as the categories and notable changes are that we've added a section for specifically for public bodies that have received trainings and the number of public bodies that will be surveyed for that will be around 4:00. And I'll go over the process as well for that selection.

But I do want to point out that we've also kind of in response to some concerns about, well, you know how balanced is the number of evaluators gonna be, especially requesters from who are members of the public versus requesters who are state and local public entities.

And I went ahead and kind of had the largest.

Umm.

Number that we kind of talked about at the last meeting, which was around 15, this is and I will note that in the official guidelines for the evaluator, 360 umm that come down from the governor's office, there is no CAP or minimum for the number of individuals surveyed.

It's really kind of based on, well, what, how does the agency operate?

You know what is the normal level of engagement?

And so we've just gone ahead and picked these numbers both as a fair representation of how many.

You know individuals we interact with in the office as well as out of a a thought for efficiency of process and kind of being able to complete this process with a fair and balanced number of reviewers, but also as a practical sort of adjustment.

So I've gone ahead and put 15 as the number for each category of requester for three and four.

These are folks that Todd has worked worked directly with Umm in the course of his work as the Advocate.

Now I'm gonna go on to the evaluator selection criteria here and the breakdown is basically 2 distinct types of selection criteria, and the first is for evaluator categories 1/2 and five.

So that would be all direct reports.

Easy, because that's 1/2 the voting members of the PRAC.

So folks here as well as members of the PRAC former members of the PRAC who have served their term within two years of our evaluation year.

So for those categories 1/2 and four, five, which is media representatives and Society of SPJ Society of Professional Journalists, representatives, those folks are already identified.

We know who those folks are.

Umm, so they will.

As a matter of course, receive a request or provide feedback.

Now the second sort of criteria is for evaluator categories 3-4 and six, so that is members of the public who have received assistance and state and local public entities, their employees who have received assistance as well as public bodies that have received training.

So those are a long list of folks, right?

So for example, category three, we have these requesters, members of the public, right, that's there's a couple of 100 in those in those categories.

So the method of picking 3 the evaluators for 3/4 and six will be at random.

It will be a random number generator between the total number and whichever number that lands up on will end up being the evaluator who is selected.

I will note that there is there are some discretion here on, I guess on my part, right in terms of picking these individuals.

If during the course of the randomized process we land on #66 and that's a member of the public who sent a request to Todd, but it turns out this was the wrong agency altogether, right?

And Todd responds, hey, actually your request should go to the Secretary of State.

And so this is a limited interaction.

There really isn't in my view, unless folks just great.

There really isn't any.

Umm in depth response that I think a request or would this level of engagement would be able to have with our survey?

So if it's in a femoral sort of limited contact where it was just, hey, let me point you in the wrong in the right direction or let me just, it's a really simple question, right?

What is?

What is?

UM, what?

What exemption talks about confidentiality?

Right.

It was a 11 sentence response right for those types of sort of limited interactions. Those at that point there might be a different number generated to fill that spot, but in consideration of transparency, if that kind of decision is made, if there is a new evaluator that's selected for those limited situations, that action will be tracked and documented, and there will be a reason given for why this was deemed a limited interaction that is not going to produce or is not anticipated to produce a sort of meaningful survey response to kind of captures what the information that the pack is looking to capture, yes.

ML **Mark Landauer** 9:17

You you thank sorry for interrupting.

I love the fact that you use the word ephemeral.

It's a word that's not used enough, but Michael Crone does have a question, and so I apologize for interrupting, but let's see if we can get Michael's question resolved.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 9:39

Please.

KC **Kron Michael C** 9:40

Thanks, mark.

I'm sorry for interrupting too.

It wasn't really clear to me that what the best way to do this was, and I I just before we the last thing you just said makes perfect sense to me.

And my question is not about that, but I did wonder like these numbers of evaluators, is that the number of people that we plan to solicit from or is that the number of responses were aiming to get as my first question?

And then the second question is, is even shorter, maybe is like I notice that excluded from this are the non voting PRAC members and I wonder if you would sort of be able to talk us through the the reasoning of that exclusion.

Sorry for the interruption.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 10:20

Yeah.

No, no, I appreciate that.

So for your first question.

This I think it's both right.

It represents the number that of of individuals that were going to seek a response from.

It doesn't capture how many of them are actually going to respond, right, because we don't know.

And part of my reasoning for umm you know that that last explanation of the random selection criteria is well if it's going to be a limited contact or if it's going to be sort of kind of a short.

Interaction then perhaps the chances of getting any response, let alone a meaningful one, are reduced.

Umm.

If if the proc wants to discuss kind of enlarging the total number of evaluators with the idea of hey, hopefully we send out 30 and then we get back 15.

I mean, that's something that we, you know, I'm.

Happy to entertain.

But again, it's just there's a degree of uncertainty about how many folks will actually respond.

That said, for the Governors 360 there isn't a minimum number of evaluators that must be captured, right?

So it kind of there's this.

KC **Kron Michael C** 11:47
OK, OK.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 11:48
Degree of voluntariness, right?

KC **Kron Michael C** 11:48
I don't.

I I don't wanna get us too hung up on this, but I do wonder, did do you happen to know if DAS has any experience, for example with how off?

How likely people are to respond?

Because that, to me would play into how many people we wanna ask.

I mean, we could do it a couple of different ways, right?

We could just decide we're gonna ask 15 people and we'll get the responses we're gonna get.

We can decide that if we ask, you know, like you said, that if we ask, we were likely to get 15 if we had some reason to think that or you could just ask a set of people and then figure out how many responses we didn't get.

And ask some more, but 15 feels like a lot to me.

Honestly, so.

So maybe 15 is enough, I just wasn't.

I just was mainly trying to understand the number.

ML **Mark Landauer** 12:37

My Michael, I actually tend to agree.

I mean, I look at the numbers here and the maximum number we have are 56 individuals who would be surveyed and you know, you Fang I, I appreciate that you want to go through 56 evaluations, but it seems to me that maybe we might wanna reduce some numbers here just to make it a little perhaps more manageable.

I sort of tend to agree with Michael, but.

I also understand that we may we may may not have full participation as well.

So I get the sort of the struggle here with that.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 13:27

Yeah.

And the model that I kind of used for our numbers is based on kind of a similar.

Smaller state agency like the like our office, right.

And the number of surveyed parties right for that agency was around 40.

And they're actual results were around 40 as well.

ML **Mark Landauer** 13:46

Umm.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 13:49

So my thoughts are perhaps the number that we have here is a little on the higher end, but it would already take into account maybe a couple folks who don't participate.

So we'd end up getting fewer than 56, but we would still have enough kind of for for

enough information to get the data points that the crack needs.

And umm, I think my God, a second question.

So the I did not consider the non voting members of the project because it did not occur to me.

So I I think it would be fair cause it would also encapsulate individuals on a board or Council who worked directly with umm the executive director or or the agency director.

So I'm I'm fine with adding that to category 2.

ML **Mark Landauer** 14:47

And just as a reminder, I think that we only have two non voting members of the PRAC and that would be Senator Thatcher and Representative Anderson, if my memory serves me correctly.

Is that correct?

SA **Smith Andrew** 15:06

And Mark, the short irony would be that as non voting members members that the senator and then our office, my boss, we couldn't vote on this proposal.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 15:14

Ah well.

SA **Smith Andrew** 15:14

But I think my boss would like to be involved.

For what it's worth.

ML **Mark Landauer** 15:24

I I.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 15:24

I as well.

ML **Mark Landauer** 15:25

Or.

I I think we'll take that as a very constructive uh uh.

Input and perhaps we should include the non voting members provided.

Remember though, one of the things that that you Fang shared with us is that they would have to have served for two years.

I know Senator Thatcher definitely rings that bill, yet I don't think Rep Anderson has at this point.

I guess the question then becomes for everybody if.

Ohh, she has served within two years.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 16:08

Yeah, I do want.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:09

Not not having served two years.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 16:10

Yeah, right.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:11

OK, my my bad.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 16:12

I I yeah, I do want to clarify that.

ML **Mark Landauer** 16:14

My bad.

Thank you.

So so if if we could include the full prac, I think including the non voting members, I think that that would address that, that, that challenge.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 16:37

OK.

And I I don't have very much in addition to what's already been said to report, UMI will note 1 substantially different phrasing of a question.

Which was this question #7.

The original question was essentially something like, you know, does this individual

do their work in accordance with the governor and the enterprise?

Is vision of that work being done?

Which wouldn't be appropriate for a prac specific a survey, so that language is just been changed to acts consistently with the statutory responsibilities set out for the advocate in the statute and with the letter and spirit of Oregon's public records law.

ML **Mark Landauer** 17:24

Any additional questions at this point I I do have one, but I want to pause to allow for the Members to ask additional questions.

You think, could you continue to share share your screen?

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 17:44

Ohh yes.

ML **Mark Landauer** 17:46

And then, Andy, uh, why don't you go ahead?

I I know that folks, Andy is representing a representative Anderson here as a member of the practice.

So go ahead Andy.

SA **Smith Andrew** 18:02

Thanks mark.

Uh, so you think, could you go to?

I think it's the 4th page.

It's where the survey starts.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 18:09

Yes.

SA **Smith Andrew** 18:10

Yeah.

So I'm sorry if I'm late to comment on this, but for the first question you remember the pract.

There's a yes or no, and then I just, you know, I read the questions today.

ML **Mark Landauer** 18:20

Umm.

SA **Smith Andrew** 18:21

What might the board have done differently?

Just operate there and what has the board done or well, so to me if if we could tighten those up.

So in the context of what if the board done differently with respect to what?

So when my when my boss looks on that I'm not sure he's gonna know how to respond.

ML **Mark Landauer** 18:32

Yeah.

SA **Smith Andrew** 18:35

And then the second one, I think maybe that's more self explanatory, but for both of those, maybe certainly the first one, tighten it up, if we could, what would be the goal of the question and the context?

ML **Mark Landauer** 18:49

Yeah, it's funny, Andy, because that's where my questions were exactly is well, you, you, Fang.

I I tripped on the on question number one as well particularly.

After that, the first question what might have the borne done differently?

That was confusing to me.

Umm and uh, similarly UM, what is the well, what is the board done well or effectively to support the director?

Umm, I don't know if that necessarily is a question that helps in the evaluation.

Uh, maybe I'm wrong here.

And what support is needed from the board moving forward?

Umm, again, I don't know if those second two questions are.

A providing much insight into the Advocate.

So I I'm I'm certainly open to keeping these in place whatnot, but I did wanna have a bit of the discussion about these because I don't know if they land much insight into

the advocates work.

So just open that up for a quick discussion if we may.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 20:20

Yeah, I do wanna.

UM, I suppose by way of explanation these are additional questions.

We're just kind of the generic questions that were populated in the in the Executive 360.

I think the idea behind the first subquestion at least contemplates, you know, what would the board have done differently?

You know specific to, I guess, the direction of the Executive director, I I think some, some boards and councils probably work differently than the PRAC.

I think we're pretty unique animal here.

So it I agree that some of these sub questions probably are not going to be particularly helpful, especially not for evaluating.

Executive director.

So it you know if UM.

After the discussion, if the board finds its appropriate that you know we do away with these additional questions or.

Consolidate them into one, then that's makes sense to me as well.

KC **Kron Michael C** 21:27

I'm not gonna raise my hands and ohh Shasta did.

So I'm Shasta.

Did I'm gonna defer to Shasta?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 21:35

Thanks.

Yeah, I feel like, I mean, I think maybe the thrust of the like what we're trying to get at is, is there anything that the board is there any role that the board has played in, how the Advocate has done their job?

Is that what we're trying to find out?

You know, so just giving people an opportunity to say like maybe this is kind of on the Council and then, you know, so maybe just one question that says, you know, how has the Council?

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:07

Yeah.

Yeah, I I think I.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 22:14

Affected, you know, either positively or negatively, the ability of the directive to perform their role.

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:23

Yeah.

KC **Kron Michael C** 22:24

It's not.

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:24

It's just I think I I kind of tend to agree it might be that we wanna eliminate the very first question, what might the board have done differently and just leave the remaining two questions that might be a little bit more.

Helpful I suppose.

It it it, at least in my mind.

KC **Kron Michael C** 22:49

It still feels to me, mark, like kind of an odd place to start the evaluation of the director.

I guess I like and I guess my my sort of even prior question is like are there really questions about the directors performance that we feel like the PRACK members are in a unique place to assess and and if so like what are those and those feel like the things that we should be asking about or the questions that should be presented only to members of the PRAC?

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:56

Yeah, yeah.

Umm.

KC **Kron Michael C** 23:27

Umm, you know, we could certainly ask about Todd's performance in our meetings, for example, which most of the people who interact with Todd wouldn't have, you know, any likelihood of knowing anything about it, though, of course, everyone is welcome to watch our meetings and see how it Todd serves us.

But maybe we wanna ask sort of those sorts of questions about his work sort of guiding our meetings, doing, you know, background work for our meetings and sort of helping us be prepared for them like things that only we can really assess of his performance.

ML **Mark Landauer** 24:05

Yeah, it it may be to pile on a little bit that you know as he met expectations for providing training opportunities to the public and to the media.

I things. Uh.

I has he, you know, regularly been reporting his.

Mediation.

Umm uh.

With with a state and local governments and and the public to the prack things of that nature that would directly sort of reflect upon his work, I think is what you might be driving at.

Is that fair, Michael?

KC **Kron Michael C** 24:56

Yeah, those are great examples.

Just sort of.

If we're gonna have questions specific to the Council, those to me feel like the kinds of things to ask only Council members cause.

And those are great examples.

Yeah, mark.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 25:14

OK.

I'll.

I'll go ahead and add 2.

How about that?

The first being has the in the.

Uh provided.

The UM and it's a statutory requirement for the advocate to to make that presentation to the board.

I believe those annual DM.

Sort of.

ML **Mark Landauer** 25:44

Yes.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 25:44

How the yes, uh, the.

Uh, that's torally required.

Reporting on the.

Work.

Of.

To Wrap, has the individual provided the statutorily required reporting on the work of the Office of the Public Records advocate to the PRAC, and then in lieu of this box, it'll just be a yes or no.

Multiple choice, right?

And I'll add that in a second and then umm, yes.

KC **Kron Michael C** 26:33

Before we move on from this, like that's that's a way to frame the question.

Ohm well and I don't wanna say this in a way that suggests I think that, you know, we think Todd is doing what he's statutorily required to do.

And no more and not in a way that really makes us feel like herd and talk to as a board.

But to me, that's not a that's not a very useful evaluative question.

Like, did he do thing a or thing B?

Really were, I think, interested in like, how thoroughly, how well, how, like how satisfactory was was the performance of the work right.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 27:16

Right.

And it wouldn't.

It wouldn't be or be yes or no sort of the evaluation.

It would be.

It's tiered like the other questions are.

Umm, would that address your concerns?

Or do you want?

Do you think the question needs to have more greater specificity?

KC **Kron Michael C** 27:37

I think if you have more than a yes and no, that probably is sufficient.

It is a little awkward.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 27:43

OK.

KC **Kron Michael C** 27:45

Has the individual provided the statutorily required reporting unacceptable like?

I mean, I guess that means no, but it just feels.

I mean, you can do it that way and I will understand it and use it.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 27:56

How well, how well as OK.

KC **Kron Michael C** 27:59

I think that's right, right.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 28:05

I don't know if I can copy and paste all of this at once.

Let's see.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 28:07

There's that.

There's a pretty good version of a question in the chat.

I think Andy put there.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 28:12

Ah dear.

That let me look at the one of the chat.

For put the board I like.

I like that language.

Oh dear.

I'll use that language, or folks agree to that.

To carry out at Tarley.

I'm sorry I'm unable to copy and paste so so that's where responsibilities of the office.

Other recommendations?

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:03

I see Senator Thatcher's hand, please.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 30:11

Well, OK.

And I lost my page here, but I was just pulling straight off of the Oregon public records advocate the site and under office of the Public Records advocate.

It lists the things that the Advocate is responsible for, and I I think that's kind of the direction you're trying to go is to pull out the actual responsibilities, maybe break them down further.

But I think that should be the the rest of the questions and you might even put a numeric.

You know, rubric or whatever you want to call it a along with the unacceptable, acceptable, effective, very effective, you know, maybe do a A1 through five or zero through four or something.

I don't know sometimes that's used in a valuations and then you can have this numerical thing to look at and then you can have a place for comments at the bottom.

ML **Mark Landauer** 30:58

Yeah.

I actually like that idea.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 31:05

Sure.

And that that probably would be a practice specific question, I think that.

I think perhaps that's a breakdown of what's currently question 7 UM, this again, statutory responsibilities is is rather broad.

So what I could do is I could break down question 7 into each of those.

Umm, listed numbers that the the senator referenced and then have that as a separate question.

For each with a with a numerical breakdown.

ML **Mark Landauer** 31:43

Well, here, here are a couple of you.

Fang, if I might go back up to question one again, forgive me umm, because it seems to me that this is coming from the members of the Council, you know, here's a question.

Has the advocate been responsive to individuals of the prack and to the practice as a whole?

That's sort of a broad question, but as members of the prack, I think it's a relevant question for us to pose.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 32:27

Responsive.

ML **Mark Landauer** 32:29

To individual members as well as the full crack.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 32:38

I'll change this as the.

OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 33:34

Looks good to me.

I guess another question we might be able to pose is.

Hmm.

Has he been prepared at our meetings?

I think that that's a pretty straightforward evaluative question.

And I'm going to see if any other Members have a questions that would come from the Council members.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 34:18
To.

ML **Mark Landauer** 34:29

Uh, directly about Todd's performance.

Any other questions that the Members would like to pose here?

Not hearing a lot.

Ohh Shasta, thank.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 34:53
Shasta.

ML **Mark Landauer** 34:54

Thank you for bailing me out.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 34:57

Sorry I don't have a ton of good ideas, but I did like senators Thatcher suggestion of. I mean, even if it's not in the questions like just kind of giving people a reminder of what the duties of the public records advocate are, those kind of four bullet points there maybe at the top because you know, so people can be thinking about like what are the outcomes that we're looking for and what are you know and like that, you know, just kind of reading those generic questions.

I'm kind of like what are what are outcomes?

I don't know.

You know, kind of drilling down more specifically into, you know, transparency and dispute resolution and all that kind of stuff I think would help kind of get people thinking.

ML **Mark Landauer** 35:49

Yeah.

Thank you, Shasta.

I do see Senator Thatcher again.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 36:02

Yeah.

Thank you.

On some of these things, depending on who's responding, they may or may not have experience or a point of reference to be able to comment whether it's acceptable and acceptable or ohh you do have that in there.

Never mind.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 36:19

Ohh.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 36:19

It's really hard for me to see the screen.

It's tiny, but you say no opportunity to observe.

So right on, that's all I was gonna comment on.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 36:27

Ah.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 36:28

Thank you.

Oh, that's much better.

Thank you.

ML **Mark Landauer** 36:38

Any further UM input on the questionnaire, folks.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:54

Hey, Mark, it's Todd.

ML **Mark Landauer** 36:55

Yes, Sir.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:57

Just a quick point, I looking at the website gave me an opportunity to update it because the advocate no longer leads the Council.

So I changed that to serving as a voting member and Executive Director of the Public Records Advisory Council, because the the the Advocate is no longer the automatic chair.

Type.

ML **Mark Landauer** 37:26

To.

I don't think I need to respond to that, do I?

Alright folks, we're getting to the point where we're having some long and awkward silence with a whole bunch of people here, so I'm going to.

Call.

The question I suppose at this point is everybody comfortable with the questionnaire at this point?

All right, I'm going to.

Uh, we do have a quorum.

I would.

Uh, certainly.

Entertain a motion at this point.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 38:13

Air Mark, I will most move to accept this 360 review questions as presented by staff and direct staff to conduct the interview the review process.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:26

Thank you.

Scott, do I hear a second?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 38:28

2nd.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:30

And that was.
Was that Shasta?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 38:31
Shut down.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:32
Just for the OK, I just wanna make sure we have it on the record here.
Once we get notes taken, OK, we have a second.
All in favor, please respond by saying aye, aye.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 38:45
Aye.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 38:46
Hi.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 38:46
Hi.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:47
And he opposed.

WG **Will Glasson** 38:47
Hi.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:51
You Fang's uh, I think we can consider the questionnaire completed.
Do you need any further?
Direction from us at this point.
Or are you feeling comfortable with the product?

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 39:07
I'm.
I'm comfortable.

I'll just clarify that with the addition, there will be some, this is not the final form of the survey.

ML **Mark Landauer** 39:10

The.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 39:14

The with the addition of those four distinct criteria that are identified in all the website at providing dispute resolution, providing training, providing guidance, serving as a voting member, those will be added to the survey subsequent to this vote, but the Council has authorized me to use the form of survey once that's completed and the survey itself takes roughly 14 kind of days to go out and receive the feedback and my report will take probably a couple weeks to generate as well. So in terms of a deadline for me to present the information to the PRAC, what does the prac have in mind for that?

Because my thoughts are that this would probably be an August.

Uh, presentation.

ML **Mark Landauer** 40:13

Thoughts.

Feedback. Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 40:15

I'm trying to go back and find my my timeline with that.

That sounds to me about right where we thought we would be.

This would be happening in June slash July and then August, September.

Do you see that information?

And the Council would have an opportunity to here at publicly, perhaps an executive at first, if if that's what we want to do.

But then here it receive it in a public meeting ultimately, and then make a decision about how to proceed.

So August, September for next steps sounds makes sense to me.

ML **Mark Landauer** 40:43

Great.

Any further discussion?

We have already approved the questions.

We're just getting clarification on the process at this point.

Alright, I think folks we can come to the conclusion that we are done with the questionnaire and now I'm going back to my.

Agenda for today.

Forgive me folks, popping around discussion of ideas for continuing work of the bylaw subcommittee.

Well, knowing that Mister Stoffer is the chair of the bylaws Committee, I'll put him on the spot and ask you, Scott.

We still have a set of bylaws that have eluded us for eight years now, and now I think we can begin the actual process of composing some bylaws to guide the the public records ad Public Records Advisory Council, I believe is what we're trying to accomplish here.

And so I think, Scott, what we'll probably need are some volunteers to sit on bylaw committee, not for the purposes of hiring the Advocate, but rather for the purposes of providing guidance to the Council as to how we actually operate is, is that a fair description of what we're trying to accomplish?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 42:25

Yes, thank you, Mark, that I think summarizes exactly what I was gonna offer.

So I think there are two questions.

Yes.

The next step I grew up with, Mark said.

Where is this actually start drafting bylaws?

I kind of anticipate given how things go for all of our schedules, that will probably take us in the next year.

And so hopefully by early second or third quarter of next year, no later than the year from now.

ML **Mark Landauer** 42:43

Yeah.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 42:47

Hopefully we have something for the full Council that you want.

So two questions started prompted by Mark.

We did have a standing committee.

Subcommittee was set up to be bylaws, and then we we got focused on the hiring process.

So I if this is an opportunity for the Council to volunteer, if you've not been on that Bylaws Committee or revisit your membership on the Bylaws Committee.

So I don't know if we want to take a moment and say, raise your hand if you want to be on the bylaws Committee, I'm certainly willing to continue to to be a part of that.

I see.

Will, uh and I see Mark if you, Todd, anybody else and I see Senator Thatcher.

ML **Mark Landauer** 43:27

I also think and Scott, I I think that rap Anderson had expressed previous interest in serving on it as well.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 43:33

Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 43:37

Andy I I think he shared that with us in a previous meeting.

So I just wanna make sure that we don't miss Rep Anderson and I think I saw shastras hand go up as well or no, forgive me it was Emily, forgive me.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 43:50

No.

ML **Mark Landauer** 43:52

Sorry about that, Emily.

I think raised her hand.

I don't know if that's for volunteering or for asking a question though, really.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 44:01

Yes, it is for volunteering.

ML **Mark Landauer** 44:03

OK.
Very good.
Thank you.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 44:05

Right.
And I think that's 123 at 6:00.
That's seven of us.
I think that's a decent subcommittee.

ML **Mark Landauer** 44:09

That's that's more than enough cooks in the kitchen, I'm sure.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 44:14

So if you if anyone has any questions about being honored or off it, maybe email Todd and I after this and and mark.
But the other question and that maybe kind of relates to what we just took action on.
When do we want to start meeting?
I had in the back of my head that I would revisit the question of scheduling a bylaw subcommittee meeting more towards the fall, September, October to get that process going, and especially if the Council is going to be meeting again next month or in August, and the next couple of months to get the hiring process, I don't want to and do it.
That will folks up on meetings, but I guess my my original thought was we we kicked that off sort of September, October.
Is there any objection to that?
Then we want to get it moving on that sooner than September.
Thinking about his taking no.
So if that's the case, then I will put a note for myself to ask the public records advocate in August to send a doodle pull out to that subcommittee and we can start certain things in September, October.

ML **Mark Landauer** 45:14

Yeah.
And on that point, I would like to avoid.

We would, Scott.

I'm just looking at the legislative calendar to be sure that we don't have any conflicts so early to mid September.

I think we'll want to avoid late September.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 45:33

Yep.

Yep.

ML **Mark Landauer** 45:39

Uh.

SA **Smith Andrew** 45:42

That's right, Mark Ledge days that start the 23rd, I think Monday the 23rd.

So that that would not be the week to do it.

ML **Mark Landauer** 45:49

Yeah.

Yeah, I'm just.

I think I'm looking at the wrong interim calendar.

I apologize.

Yeah, you're correct.

So, you know first, second or third week of September.

Scott is ideal if you get into the 4th week of September.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 46:03

Sure.

ML **Mark Landauer** 46:06

We're gonna have a lot of missing people.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 46:09

Uh.

Likewise, I know that's uh recorders to recorders conference week.

Is that 4th week and I know that we bump into other things like League of Oregon

Cities Fall Conference too.

So point taken, maybe I'll work with Todd earlier than that just to get it pulled out soon.

So we can set a date into timber.

ML **Mark Landauer** 46:25

And and Senator Thatcher, please.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 46:29

There is one day set apart and I know that doesn't work well for everybody's schedule, but they they do set aside a task force day, which can be, you know, all kinds of things like this where umm, legislators are involved with it, they might have might schedule it for the 26th is the day that they have scheduled for that during legislative days.

ML **Mark Landauer** 46:38

Yes.

Yeah.

ST **Sen Thatcher** 46:54

So just throwing that out there, you don't have to completely eliminate that last full week of September.

There's a day.

ML **Mark Landauer** 47:02

Yeah.

And in fact, that following day is the request deadline for bills.

So, well, I'll be very, very busy that week.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 47:15

I'll.

I'll work with Todd.

Point well taken.

Thank you.

I'll work with Todd to get a pull out maybe soon, and we can just settle that in.
So I think that's it for the the bylaws of the committee.

ML **Mark Landauer** 47:25

Great.

Alright, I think we are now at the point of the agenda where we would accept the public comment as is customary of the public Records Advisory Council, we do set aside time for the public to address the Council and we ask that the public limit their comments to two minutes.

But I don't think we have a big public attendance today, but I do want to to make this time available for anybody in the public to address the Council.

If you would like to do suit, do so, please raise your hand.

I don't see anybody at this time seeking to address the Council, so unless there's anything else for the good of the order, and I'll give a quick pause here, I will move to adjourn.

Nobody's raising their hands, so I would take.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 48:31

OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 48:33

Oh yes, Shasta.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 48:35

2nd is that what you need?

ML **Mark Landauer** 48:37

Oh.

Ohh OK, I moved to Shasta.

Seconded.

We are adjourned.

I hope you all have a wonderful week and enjoy the sun as much as you can.

Thank you for your time today.

Good work.

You thank thank you for all your work on this.

I appreciate it very much and we'll see you at our at Todd.

I guess the last thing I'd asked, do we have a meeting scheduled at this time?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:05

We do not.

ML **Mark Landauer** 49:07

OK, I guess I will talk with Todd about when we will convene the next meeting of the PRAC and we'll reach out to everybody and with a probably some kind of a doodle poll to make sure that we can get a critical mass.

So thank you everybody for your attention today and we'll be in touch.

Have a wonderful week.

Thank you.

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

Take care.

SA **Smith Andrew** 49:35

Thanks everybody.

□ **ALBERT Todd * PRA** stopped transcription