

WORKERS' COMPENSATION
MANAGEMENT-LABOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Full MLAC Meeting
 January 11, 2019
 9 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Committee Members Present:

Alan Hartley
 Kathy Nishimoto, Duckwall Fruit
 Kimberly Wood, Perlo Construction
 Aida Aranda, Oregon and Southern Idaho Labor-Employers Training Trust {via teleconference}
 Kevin Billman, United Food and Commercial Workers
 Ateusa Salemi, Oregon Nurses Association {via teleconference}
 Diana Winther, IBEW Local 48
 Tammy Bowers, May Trucking
 Jill Fullerton, Clackamas County Fire Department
 Lynn McNamara, City County Insurance

Members Excused:

Cameron Smith, Director, Department of Consumer and Business Services (DCBS), *ex officio*

Staff:

Theresa Van Winkle, MLAC Committee Administrator
 Jeff Roddy-Warburton, MLAC Assistant

Agenda Item	Discussion
Opening (0:00:00)	Theresa Van Winkle opened the meeting at 9:00 am.
Meeting Minutes (0:00:25)	Theresa Van Winkle noted minutes from the December 3, 2018 meeting need corrections and will be held over until next meeting.
Department Updates (0:01:13) (0:01:22) (0:02:03)	Theresa Van Winkle, Committee Administrator, made announcements and provided updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update on the forward looking administrative rulemaking calendar, there are no upcoming meetings scheduled for 2019 at this time. - Update on the Workers' Benefit Fund report recommendations, which were adopted at the December 3, 2018 meeting, the final report and executive summary was delivered to the Legislature on December 14th, 2018. Theresa is in the final stages of getting a vehicle for a bill session to implement the recommended statutory changes. Theresa is waiting for a green light from a committee chair and staff to get that done. Once she gets the information she will send it out to members - Diana Winther introduces the newest member of the committee on the labor side, Jill Fullerton with Clackamas County Fire Department. Jill looks forward to getting to serve the people in this

Agenda Item	Discussion
(0:02:48)	<p>role in the same way she looks forward to serving the people as a firefighter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theresa Van Winkle informs everyone that MLAC meetings are being live streamed and all future meetings will be live streamed as well. Audio will be posted on the web as a way to listen to the MLAC meetings later.
2019 Legislation Review	Theresa Van Winkle reviewed SB 355 which aims to change non-substantive language in ORS 656.005. MLAC review is limited to section 62 (starting on page 91)
(0:04:20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theresa Van Winkle stated that there are 11 total definitions that need modification. Corrections include removing an Oxford comma, correcting punctuation, and updating of word choice.
(0:05:59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lynn McNamara moved to approve SB 355, Alan Hartley seconded. The committee unanimously approved SB 355 (Kimberly Wood excused).
HB 2406 (0:06:15)	Committee begins the discussion on HB 2406 , which provides coverage for trainees in certain work experience programs.
(0:06:24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theresa Van Winkle describes that this is a bill from the House Business and Labor Committee. This bill changed terminology in ORS 656.033. It clarifies the scope of workers' compensation coverage for trainees that participate in work expectance programs.
(0:06:48)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bob Joondeph, Executive Director of Disability Rights Oregon comes up to testify. He states that the intent of the bill is to remove the term "mental retardation" from workers' compensation statutes, and update it with more current terminology.
(0:08:30)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David Barenberg of SAIF Corporation testified that he is 100% in support of this bill, but they have concerns about the definition on line 7 of the bill. - Alan Hartley asks if they are going to come back with a revised bill. Mr. Barenberg said yes.
HB 2087 (0:10:30)	Theresa Van Winkle introduced HB 2087 the Workers' Compensation Division's (WCD) bill increasing the cap on civil penalties that can be imposed. It is outlined in ORS 656.745.
(0:10:58)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lou Savage, Administrator WCD provides updates on the bill. Lou discusses how important it is to hold all parties to a high standard, and one of the primary tools WCD uses to do so is issuing civil penalties. The current cap for penalties is \$2,000 per violation and is capped at \$10,000 for every 3-month period which equates to about \$40,000 per year. The proposed new cap would be \$180,000 per calendar year and up to \$9,000 per violation. Lou discussed

Agenda Item	Discussion
(0:18:13)	<p>there has been some concern about the per violation cap, and that WCD is happy to work with stakeholders to look at an amount that they consider reasonable. Lou indicated the division does not start at the maximum per violation amount.</p>
(0:19:33)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tammy Bowers asked if the per violation amount is increased to \$9,000 what will happen to the minimum penalty amounts. Lou responded the division has no plans to change the minimum amounts to start with, but if there is a problem we may increase it. - Alan Hartley asked how many have reached the maximum penalty of \$40,000 per year in the past few years. Lou responded there have been 10-12 insurers that have hit the cap over a period of years.
(0:20:22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diana Winther asked if it is safe to say that some insurers have assumed that getting these penalties is just a “cost of doing business” and that WCD is looking to try to change how they address their requirements. Lou responded that is what we are concerned about. The division is posting penalties on the web. - Diana Winther asked when the bill will come back to MLAC. Lou responded he needs to talk to people.
(0:21:52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keith Semple with Oregon Trial Lawyers Association expresses support for the bill. He does not understand why there is a cap on penalties for routine noncompliance.
HB 2424 (0:23:29)	<p>Theresa Van Winkle moves on to HB 2424 “come along” providers in managed care organizations. This bill permits an attending physician or authorized nurse practitioner to refer a worker to treatment by a chiropractor that is not a member of the Managed Care Organization under specialized circumstances</p>
(0:24:22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ann Klein from Majoris Health Systems comes up to testify. Ann discusses her concerns which are highlighted in the Majoris Testimony. Majoris Health System is opposed to HB 2424.
(0:31:05)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diana Winther asked what the time frame would be for someone going through the appeal process. Ann responded that the time frame is within 60 days, but generally it is as quickly as possible. If precertification, those take about three business days.
(0:32:33)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alan Hartley asked if there was any data on how often out-of-network requests are not approved. Ann responded she does not have data for precertification for out of network, as those are rare. For injured worker appeals, have had 13 disputes on out of network treatment.
(0:33:13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diana Winther asks how disputes regarding requests that are not approved are resolved. Ann responded that out of 13, one was overturned and the worker voluntarily transferred to panel provider.

Agenda Item	Discussion
(0:33:35)	- Alan Hartley asks how long the credentialing process takes. Ann responded if it is single credentialing, not long. It would depend on volume of requests.
(0:34:34)	- Tammy Bowers asks if MCOs have a cap on the number of providers in each area of their network. Ann responded that Majoris focuses on balancing access and choice for workers but making sure providers have benefit of being in MCO. Take various factors into account, but not every willing provider.
(0:35:51)	- Diana Wither asks how many chiropractors apply to Majoris MCO that are rejected on a yearly basis. Ann responded she can get back to the committee.
HB 2413 (0:37:00)	Theresa Van Winkle moves on to HB 2413 vocational assistance changes. Two items provided to committee members based on follow up information from the December 3 rd meeting when this bill was discussed. Theresa summarizes the two items that were passed out, vocational assistance outcome data and vocational assistance training plan information .
(0:38:52)	- Adele Bostwick and Susan Foster, Oregon Association of Rehabilitation Professionals testify on HB 2413. Adele talks about the modification that they have made to their request. Originally they had proposed three changes to ORS 656.340, which were highlighted in the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals proposal that they discussed at the December 3 rd MLAC meeting. They would like to drop the part of the proposal that would change the definition of “earned income” to include the cost of employer paid benefits. Adele reviewed the remainder of the changes in the proposal.
(0:45:42)	- Lynn McNamara asked about length of the training program and the approval of time loss. Adele responds that will be covered later.
(0:46:27)	- Tammy Bowers asks why the number of training programs available went from 247 training programs in 2015 to 182 training programs in 2018. Adele answered that fewer workers were found eligible and increase in claim disposition agreements. Tammy asked how much each factor impacted the numbers. Adele responded she said it is due to ineligibility and increase in minimum wages.
(0:47:00)	- Kathy Nishimoto asked if fewer serious injuries are happening. Adele responded the ineligibilities have increased.
(0:48:19)	- Alan Hartley asked what makes us know that raising the threshold from 80% to 95% will ensure that workers will be better off. Adele responded that the 80% is the litmus test to determine eligibility, it doesn't promise a specific amount of income after vocational assistance.

Agenda Item	Discussion
(0:50:08)	- Alan Hartley stated that increase may not improve the outcome for the worker. Adele indicated it will help more people get vocational assistance.
(0:50:29)	- Diana Winther states that it would allow more individuals to have the opportunity to regain the wages because they have vocational assistance to get a higher percentage back of their pre-injury wages. Susan Foster responds that the disproportional impact on low wage workers and that people can end up using other social services.
(0:52:00)	- Diana Winther asks if there has been any consideration of having a different percentage for the workers that are in a lower income brackets compared to those that are in higher brackets? Adele said they are willing to look at that. Diana Winther comments on the impact of minimum wage.
(0:53:44)	- Lynn McNamara asks if the people that don't have vocational rehabilitation, is due to the wage issue or them just deciding not to do it? Diana Winther said the department told her that without opening every single file they won't know the answer to that question.
(0:55:02)	- Susan Foster testifies on HB 2413 and the proposed changes to ORS 656.340(12) which addresses temporary disability compensation to workers actively engaged in their training program. Oregon Association of Rehabilitation Professionals is requesting that the statute be changed that compensation be paid during the entirety of the approved training program up to the maximum of 21 months. Susan outlined the issues with not having wage replacement while doing training.
(0:58:37)	- Lynn McNamara how often is the 5-month extension not approved? Susan responded that a 21-month plan would discuss that issue. There is an inconsistency between the rules and statute. - Lynn McNamara asked how often that happens. Susan responds she does not have data about that but doesn't think it is frequent. Adele responded that the department's data shows that 20 workers participated in programs that were over 16 months long.
(1:00:37)	- Diana Winther asks if this is addressed at the onset of the plan and how often does the plan get revised. Susan responds that it is usually addressed up front. Diana Winther asked if there is information about how often a plan is revised because of this limit. Susan responds that plans are interrupted due to summer break, for example, and the worker knows about this up front. Adele stated that "exceptional disability" is criteria to get a longer plan.
(1:02:37)	- David Barenberg and Jenny Bates from SAIF Corporation testify on HB 2413 and what exists for helping return injured workers to the workforce. Jenny thinks vocational rehabilitation can be effective but the system works better when worker and employer

Agenda Item	Discussion
(1:10:00)	<p>keep in contact. Jenny doesn't think there is a need to more eligibility for the vocational assistance. She believes the vocational assistance should be a "last resort" resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David Barenberg comments on the department's return to work programs. Jenny responds to question about ineligibility determinations and that they don't have data detailed
(1:10:50)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alan Hartley clarifies raising the percentage would reduce the return to work programs. - Diana Winther asks how does adjusting the percentage effect the low-wage workers. Jenny answers that the impact on low wage workers has always impacted low wage workers. Diana Winther asks for clarification. Jenny responds that if you were injured at a minimum wage job and you can continue to do a minimum wage job, then you don't need vocational assistance. David Barenberg offers to look at SAIF data.
(1:14:52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keith Semple with Oregon Trial Lawyers Association comes up to testify and show support for HB 2413. Workers that complete vocational assistance have better outcomes and there are not a lot of workers impacted even with the proposed change. Keith comments on the impact of the current threshold.
HB 2418 (1:18:10)	<p>Theresa Van Winkle moves to HB 2418, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) occupational disease presumption.</p>
(1:19:29)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lou Savage introduces Julia Hier, Claims Policy Analyst, WCD who gives a presentation on occupational disease claims and mental health claims.
(1:28:13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kevin Billman gives examples and asks about how some of the determinations of PTSD is made. Julia answers that factors are quantified by medical professional opinions.
(1:30:20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lynn McNamara asks how broad are the diagnoses. Julia answers that she is not sure how many would be covered and that it would come down to experts.
(1:30:23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diana Winther asks about specific conditions being covered and articulated in the presumption. Julia responds that the statute could list specific conditions.
(1:31:34)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lynn McNamara asks what is considered reasonable and unreasonable disciplinary action. Julia offers to get information back to the committee.
(1:32:00)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theresa Van Winkle provides additional data as a follow up from the December 3rd meeting regarding occupational disease data. Theresa notes that the groups listed in the employment data are more than covered by the proposal.
(1:33:28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David Barenberg, Annette Sjullie, and Dan Schmelling from SAIF Corporation give their presentation on claims processing.

Agenda Item	Discussion
(1:45:27)	- Kathy Nishimoto asks why people are sent to an independent medical examination (IME), get a second opinion, or go to nurse staff, are they trained in these types of stress claims? Annette responds that the physicians they use are normally a specialist in mental health. Kathy Nishimoto clarifies there are specialists in trauma? Annette said there are and provides an example. David responded that it is important to have a mental health professional with diagnosis. Annette clarifies that there are not many close calls in making determinations for traumatic events.
(1:50:30)	- Alan Hartley asks how often does your initial decision against the injured employee go to the appeals stage? Annette replies it depends on the employee and the employer. The decision can be appealed or settled. David commented on settlements in various categories and appeals of decisions.
(1:53:15)	- Jill Fullerton asks what is the percentage of approved versus denied stress claims. David responds they are still refining their numbers and that the legislation uses a different definition than their figures. Jill Fullerton asks if there are different processes for people that have multiple traumatic experience in their career as opposed to just a single traumatic experience. Annette responds that they do look at them differently.
(1:56:31)	- Kevin Billman asks about professions having job descriptions that say they can be pulled off the job for stating they have a PTSD issue, what is the process of handling that and is that seen as a work correction. Annette responds that has come up but they have to look at all the issues and determine the balance of factors. Kevin Billman comments that the process happens without counsel. Annette said that could happen, but if the worker has an attorney they communicate with them.
(2:01:14)	- Sam Hutchinson from City of Portland Fire and Police Disability and Retirement Bureau gives testimony. He provides data from the City of Portland on mental health disorder claims filed with their Bureau and also some outcomes and number of members that are covered. He discusses their claim process and that workers are interviewed for these claims and sometimes by a third party if it is more comfortable. Sam explains the criteria for City of Portland mental stress claims is different than the chapter 656 standard. He reviews the statistics for recent mental stress claims and why claims are withdrawn.
(2:13:04)	- Diana Winther asks what would you consider to be the factors that create the reluctance towards filing a claim. Sam responds some of it is personal, skepticism of the process, workplace culture, and concerns about confidentiality. Sam responds that there would be more claims accepted.

Agenda Item	Discussion
(2:15:36)	- Diana Winther asks what effect this presumption would have on that reluctance to have the conversation. Sam responds the conversations would be the same as current.
(2:16:51)	- Diana Winther asks was the change in standard for City of Portland a response to something? Sam responded it was changed in 1990 and there were political issues at the time that some were abusing the system at that time.
(2:17:00)	- Jill Fullerton asks about other states that have adopted a similar presumption and the increases in claims, what are they considering a significant increase. Sam responds that they have one to three claims a year filed. He expects that number to double. Some other states started with no mental stress claims at all and added PTSD so their numbers went up significantly.
(2:19:03)	- Jill Fullerton asks if since the workers are exposed to higher amounts of stress are they expected to be able to handle more stress. Sam responds that the profession does have more stress, but is compared to others in similar fields, not to general public employees.
(2:21:06)	- Jill Fullerton asks how do they identify that the stressors are effecting their job. Sam responds that employees need tools to handle stress in the first case.
(2:23:00)	- David Barenberg from SAIF wanted to clarify that they do not share medical records with employers.
(2:23:44)	- Karl Koenig and Nelson Hall, Oregon State Fire Fighters Council discusses the bill language in HB 2418. Karl states that this is a rebuttable presumption. Karl states that the legislation specifies important benchmarks on what qualifies for an occupational event and a covered injury.
(2:27:52)	- Nelson Hall testifies about the context for the bill. He comments the claim process is adversarial by nature. He discusses the legal standard used for current mental health claims. Nelson comments the same standard is applied to all occupations. He indicated that a settled claim is considered denied. - Nelson discusses the details of the bill and the specifics of the presumption. The bill creates a separate presumption for a specific population defined in statute. The bill uses a definition of trauma and stress related mental health disorders. Workers are covered when stress arises out of performance of duties. It creates a rebuttable presumption. The bill does not change the processing of the claim – worker still needs to prove the need for time loss or permanent disability.
(2:45:00)	- Lynn McNamara asks what type of investigation is going to be done when someone files a claim. Nelson responds that it would need to be a medical or psychological professional. There would still be processing of the claim.

Agenda Item	Discussion
(2:47:22)	- Lynn McNamara asks how will the employer get the medical evidence to rebut the presumption. Nelson answers that there is nothing that limits the processing of the claim or getting an IME.
(2:48:00)	- Lynn McNamara asks about the broad statutory definition of who is covered, and how many Oregon workers would fit in that definition and how many private entities would be covered by the bill. Nelson responded he doesn't have a precise number, but the definition uses an existing statutory definition.
(2:50:04)	- Lynn McNamara asks why the DSM and trauma and stress related disorders aren't referenced in the bill and how many different diagnoses there are. Nelson cites the language from the DSM guidelines.
(2:51:25)	- Lynn McNamara clarified that the bill does not require that you are exposed to a trauma. Nelson said it requires a trauma or stress disorder. Nelson said that the language is specific to trauma and that it repeats the existing statutory language for mental stress claims.
(2:53:15)	- Lynn McNamara asks about rebutting the presumption. Nelson responds that the threshold is very low. There was a compromise on the cancer presumption for a different standard. He comments that the evidence has to be objective evidence.
(2:55:00)	- Alan Hartley asks if you have to prove most of one's trauma came from a work related event. Nelson compares the question to the Federal Longshore Act standard. The carrier would have to prove it is unrelated. Nelson answered that it would have to be investigated.
(2:56:00)	- Alan Hartley asks for clarification about what share of the mental stress has to come from work. Nelson responded that the bill is intended to reduce the forensic investigation, it will still happen. Nelson responds that it is for trauma related issues and the threshold is low.
(3:00:16)	- Alan Hartley asks how many people in the state would be covered, in both the public and private sectors. Nelson responds that the scope is taken from existing statute.
(3:01:40)	- Diana Winther asks whether the presumption is about the worker is getting time loss or disability and if they have to prove that they can not work or is it about their medical care and access that they are receiving. Nelson responds that it is no different than any type of claim. The bill is to recognize the mental stress is work related and address culture of workplace.
(3:05:13)	- Ateusa Salemi asks the rationale of corrections workers being covered but not nurses and do we have any data on other places that have enacted a similar bill. Nelson responds that some nurses should be covered, and that some may already be covered by the definitions. He said he is not sure about other states.

Agenda Item	Discussion
(3:07:33)	- Alan Hartley comments that cancer is different than mental stress claim. Nelson responds that the list of trauma disorders is short and will still need a diagnosis.
(3:09:18)	- Tammy Bowers asks for clarification on who exactly is covered under this presumption. Nelson replies that the definition is supposed to be narrowly defined, he indicates that could be a further discussion.
(3:12:44)	- Alan Hartley asks if corrections officers would be covered. Nelson responds they are covered.
(3:13:04)	- Tammy Bowers asks how is this bill going to change the culture of workers coming forward with issues. Karl Koenig answers that it will change the culture. He provides example of the new EAP services, peer support, certification processes.
(3:16:00)	- Alan Hartley asks in regards to the culture of the workplace, does it put the workers in a position where they can't be honest about their mental health issues they are experiencing because it could get them pulled off the job. Karl agrees that is possible.
(3:17:00)	- Tammy Bowers asks if this bill will effect the reporting and certification. Karl said he thinks that it will and provides some examples.
(3:19:00)	The committee took a brief recess. Theresa Van Winkle resumes meeting and continues the topic discussion on HB 2418.
(3:20:32)	- Undersheriff Troy Clausen from the Marion County Sheriffs Office gives his testimony opposing HB 2418 on behalf of the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police and the Oregon State Sheriffs Association .
(3:29:13)	- Alan Hartley asks if the focus should be more on prevention. Undersheriff Clausen responds yes that early intervention is important and having access to trained mental health professionals.
(3:31:00)	- Alan Hartley asks what keeps workers from seeking help. Undersheriff Clausen responds that there are pre-employment evaluations and follow up wellness visits.
(3:32:30)	- Jill Fullerton asks what is proposed when the prevention programs and safety policies still don't work. Undersheriff Clausen responds that those doing IMEs for example should be trained in mental health issues.
(3:34:16)	- Diana Winther asks about having a task force. Undersheriff Clausen responds that they need to talk more.
(3:34:51)	- Kimberly Wood asks if any research has been done to support that workers' compensation system addresses needs appropriately. Undersheriff Clausen responds that he does not have a lot of data,

Agenda Item	Discussion
(3:37:00)	<p>but he has some information about Marion County. They are interested in data as well. Kimberly Wood asked if they can bring information back. Undersheriff Clausen said he can follow up.</p> <p>- Jay Bozievich, Lane County Commissioner and Co-Chair of Association of Oregon Counties Public Safety Committee. Jay discusses the contents of his testimony on behalf of the Association of Oregon Counties. He discusses Lane County's experience in becoming the healthiest large public employer in Oregon by focusing on wellness programs. Lane County is a self-insured employer so has a unique perspective.</p>
(3:42:57)	<p>- Hasina Wittenberg provides Special Districts Association of Oregon testimony opposed to HB 2418. She clarifies she is speaking on the portions of the bill that relate to fire because rural fire protection districts are the largest type of special district that belongs to their association. Hasina indicates the bill will cover at least 11,000 firefighters plus many others under the definitions in the bill. She outlined their concerns relating to who is covered and the burden of proof. Hasina commented the references to DSM V are not in the bill language. Her association is concerned that the coverage starts on day one of employment and the presumption applies forever. She provides data about SDAO claims. Hasina described the EAP program for all paid firefighters.</p>
(3:56:00)	<p>- Tammy Bowers asked about the EAP program. Hasina responds the information is in the packet.</p>
(3:56:20)	<p>- Lynn McNamara comments that her employer is planning to join the EAPs.</p>
(3:56:50)	<p>- Alan Hartley asks if the EAPs are confidential. Hasina responds yes and they want to prevent issues.</p>
(3:57:01)	<p>- Tammy Bowers asks about the 7 settled claims that have a DCS and where do they amongst the other claims that were listed. Hasina responded they are not in the printed data she provided.</p>
(3:57:48)	<p>- Kimberly Wood asks for clarification on the document and which claims were denied and which were settled. Hasina responds that she needs to confirm.</p>
(3:58:24)	<p>- Scott Winkles with the League of Oregon Cities testifies in opposition to HB 2418. They have concerns about the bill as it is drafted and claims are currently processed under the law. Traumatic events need specific mental health care. He cited example of wellness program at City of Bend. He indicated the culture is shifting. Scott expresses concern about medical records becoming public record. He also is concerned about day one coverage.</p>
(4:04:50)	<p>- David Barenberg from SAIF Corporation testifies that they are opposed to HB 2418. He will send something in follow up. He indicates it will impact State of Oregon agencies plus many private</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion
(4:10:43)	<p>businesses. David said that prevention up front is important and make sure people are getting proper treatment. Asks for a work group on this topic.</p> <p>- Alan Hartley asks would the bill cover private security firms? David responds he thinks it does, but they are reviewing the language.</p> <p>Theresa Van Winkle submitted Oregon Trial Lawyers Association testimony for record. They are in support of HB 2418.</p>
<p>General Announcements (4:11:00)</p> <p>(4:13:10)</p>	<p>Theresa Van Winkle states if there are stakeholders that want to submit written comments should please submit them to her and she will distribute them to the MLAC committee and they will be posted on the website as well.</p> <p>Theresa states that the January 25th meeting has been moved to January 23rd (That meeting has now been cancelled and the next meeting is February 8th)</p>
<p>Meeting Adjourned (4:13:35)</p>	<p>Diana Winther adjourned the committee at 1:24 p.m.</p>

*These minutes include time stamps from the meeting audio found here:
<https://www.oregon.gov/dcbs/mlac/Pages/2019.aspx>

**Referenced documents can be found on the MLAC Meeting Information page here:
<https://www.oregon.gov/dcbs/mlac/Pages/2019.aspx>