

PRAC meeting-20240405_110101-Meeting Recording

April 5, 2024, 6:01PM

43m 25s

● **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

👤 **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** joined the meeting

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:14
So are we are we good to go here?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:19
Yes, we're at Quorum and recording and started and I see, Stephanie, I'm assuming you're here for PK?
Yes, we're more than good, mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:30
OK, great.
Well, good morning everybody.

👤 **CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS** joined the meeting

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:34
It is April.
What is it?
5th 2411 Oh 1A or PM am forgive me, just getting caught up here.
Obviously I've been on a bit of a break in a little very rusty.
I'd like to call the Public Records Advisory Council to order and to begin with, I think there we have some introductions to make, so perhaps what I'll do is I'll introduce myself and then I'll just ask Todd to call out the other individuals to introduce themselves.
My name is Mark Landauer.
I am the chair of the PRAC under.
Protest, of course.
That's a kidding, but I've been on the practice it's inception and I'm very honored

and glad to be here.

Why don't we?

Actually, I'm gonna take the privilege and just ask that representative Anderson introduced himself.

And we'll go from there.

Thank you.

 **tom andersen** 1:45

I'm Tommy Anderson.

I'm the representative for House District 19, which is basically all of South Salem.

I also happen to be a 47 year practicing lawyer and don't figure out how old I am from that.

 **Mark Landauer** 2:03

Great.

I'm.

I guess I'll just go forward a Stephanie, why don't you go ahead and introduce yourself?

 **Brent Walth** 2:08

Yeah.

 **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** 2:13

Yeah.

Hi.

Thanks everyone.

My name is Stephanie Clark.

I am the state archivist here at the Secretary of State's office.

Today I'm sitting in for PK Runkles Pearson, who is the secretary's designee.

But I was on the Council before and was even chair for a while.

 **Mark Landauer** 2:30

Indeed.

 **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** 2:30

So happy to see some familiar faces.

Thank you.

 **Mark Landauer** 2:34

Andrea.

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 2:37

Good morning.

It's yes, it's still morning.

Andrew Tipella, communications director at DAS.

 **Mark Landauer** 2:44

Scott.

 **Scott Stauffer** 2:47

Morning, everybody.

Scott Stauffer, I am the city recorder for the City of Milwaukee and I serve on the Council as representatives of the cities.

And I'm also currently the chair of the practice Bylaws Subcommittee.

 **Mark Landauer** 3:01

Thank you for that, Scott.

That was a much better introduction than I did.

 **Brent Walth** 3:05

Yeah.

 **Mark Landauer** 3:05

I should mention on the special district representative on the on the Council, Mr Glassman.

 **Will Glasson** 3:16

Hey there, my name is.

Will glasson.

I'm a assistant County Attorney with Multnomah County, and I'm serving as the representative for counties on the prep.

ML **Mark Landauer** 3:26

Welcome.

It's been a while since we had a county representative and we're glad to have you here.

Mr wolf.

BW **Brent Walth** 3:39

Hello, my name is Brent Walth.

I'm a professor of journalism, associate professor of journalism here at the University of Oregon, and worked talking about counting back years, 40 years as a professional journalist last night, though as a teacher or instructor.

Evo and I'm just I'm just joining us my first meeting.

I'm thrilled to be here, and Scott Milwaukee, my hometown.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:01

We're.

BW **Brent Walth** 4:03

Glad we have representation alright.

 **Dan Maguire** left the meeting

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:06

We're happy to have you here.

I saw.

I thought I saw Emily hiding in the background.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 4:13

Yes, I'm here.

My name is Emily Gothard.

I work for SEIU Local 503 and I'm on the Council as a representative of the public sector workforce.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:24

Umm, I don't know if Mr Crone is an actual member.

I'm trying to remember.

Michael is knowing that you're with the.

KC **Kron Michael C** 4:32

I am indeed, Sir.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:34

OK, good.

Thank you.

KC **Kron Michael C** 4:36

Nice to see you, Mark.

And everybody, Michael Crone with the attorney general's office.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:41

Great.

Turn out today and have I missed anybody on the Council itself?

Well, it's a great turnout.

Uh, thank you everybody for being here.

To those of you who are new, Mr Glasson, Mr Wolff, congratulations.

It's good to have you here and we're generally a pretty relaxed informal group, but today we do have some business to take care of and I hope you had an opportunity to review those materials.

I'm going to at this point, well, get to agenda item number 3 and provide an update to the folks, everybody on the public records work that actually we began well, it was back in 2000 what 22, I believe we really convened that that work group.

 **Dan Maguire** joined the meeting

ML **Mark Landauer** 5:45

So for the last couple of years, we as some of you know, have been working on a legislative concept to address uh charging for public records and the result of that

work ended up being a bill that was introduced into the 2023 legislative session.

If my memory serves me correctly, that was Senate Bill 417.

Umm.

And that bill, a great deal of work, had gone into it.

It was primarily the work of the PRAC and it was introduced.

It was heard and the result of that hearing was a well, I should characterize the hearing was conducted before the Senate Rules Committee, which is, I think, an important component here for folks to understand.

Of course, the.

Majority Leader in the Senate and those members of that Rules Committee heard testimony on the bill.

There were.

There were some concerns with the bill, primarily coming from government entities and as a result of that, the Majority Leader directed myself and a representative from the media, gentleman named Tom Holt, who represents SPJ, to convene a work group to work through the details of that legislation to try to come to some form of consensus.

Umm.

Through that work and we met for at least eight, I think it was eight formal meetings and there were a number of subcommittee meetings that took place during the session of 2023.

We almost got to the end, but we were not able to reach a consensus in time for that bill to be reconsidered.

And so that bill never made it through.

But I know that Senator Lieber remains very interested in this topic, and I anticipate that we will be directed by Senator Lieber to reconvene that group.

There are two, maybe 3 outstanding issues that we have to address in order to get to where both Mr Holt and I believe we need to be in order to request that that bill really be reintroduced.

And I will tell you that for those of you who have not followed that, that work, there is a copy of an amendment that memorialized where we were at the end of those discussions in 2023.

So we did not lose that work and I anticipate that we can get copies of that material to any of the members of the PRAC who may be interested.

BW Brent Walth 8:53

Look.

ML Mark Landauer 8:56

It's a matter of fact, Todd.

It might be wise for us to post that on the PRAC website for those who may also be interested in viewing that material.

Who?

Who may not be on the prack itself.

Now I have not been directed by Senator Lieber to reconvene that group.

However, it is my anticipation that I will be given that direction and I'll just make one more statement and and answer any questions at that point.

The former Co chair of the prac, Emily Harris Umm did make a request of me when that group got reconvened and and she will be a part of that if if she's able to.

I believe she felt that there was a lack of media presence and and I will confess that that the room was pretty full of of government types, right?

And I don't think it was any intention to.

To umm.

Create an imbalance of the interested parties.

Umm, I know that Steve Sewell was also an A very active member of that work group as well, but I I want to honor Emily Harris's request in making available more seats at that table for those discussions.

Now having said that, I also made it very clear to Emily that we are not going to plow old ground, nor are we going to take on new topics for this legislation.

Rather, we are going to address the remaining 3 outstanding issues.

And with that, I see Michael, you have a question.

KC Kron Michael C 10:56

Yeah.

Thank you, Mr.


Chair.


It seemed to me that the government people who win and negotiated at the legislature were largely government people who were represented at the PRACT and


were involved in creating the compromise that the PRAC recommended in the 1st place.


 **LUO Yufeng * PRA** joined the meeting

 **Mark Landauer** 11:14
Yep.

 **Kron Michael C** 11:15
It was a little bit surprising to me to learn that we were negotiating to a starting point for a second round of negotiations ohm and it felt to me like as a result we ended up with a bill that didn't pass.
At the end of the session, that was a.
Very watered down from a compromise that already contained things that you know, not everybody on the prack obviously was getting everything that they wanted.
In my view, I guess I don't think that the bill as it stands is the Prack bill anymore.
And so my question, I guess is whether you are proposing to pursue it as a prack bill, in which case I think we would need another vote on whether we support it.

 **Mark Landauer** 11:55
Yeah, yeah, yeah.

 **Kron Michael C** 12:03
I my vote would be no.
Or what?
What the deal is with that work group.

 **Mark Landauer** 12:10
No, that's that's a great question, Michael and I, I I appreciate your your question here and I'm I'm afraid we may run over our time here today.
That's a result of this.
So for forgive me.
But, Mr Crone, you're you're absolutely correct and I want to be very clear to those of you.
I believe that I may be the only remaining government individual who.

It was a part of all those conversations and and if I'm mistaken there, please please correct me.

But Michael, you are correct that we did introduce the PRAC bill.

I was very clear throughout that entire process that I was speaking on my own behalf rather than my client, and that that all of our that my client would be consulted once I had a final product to share with them.

And at that time my client made it clear that they had concerns, and I testified as such before the Senate Rules Committee.

As such, as I described, the Senate Majority Leader Kate Lieber directed both myself and Tom Holt not as a not as a prac, but rather as a legislative work group.

And Michael, you've been around for a long time.

You know how the legislative process works?

Oftentimes these things will be you, you you're told to go into a a locked room and until the white smoke comes out of the chimney we we work through and negotiate those items.

So the result of those negotiations, it's not a practical bill I would.

I would completely concur, and I would also concur with your statement that it is watered down, but at the same time it also addresses some of the concerns that the parties to those discussions had, and so this is the how the legislative process works, you know as well as I do that that's oftentimes how things operate in the halls of the capital and I'd be happy to follow up with any further questions that you may have.

KC **Kron Michael C** 14:22

But what I understand how the legislative process works, Mark, but I did not understand that we were here to negotiate a new negotiation starting point for government entities that didn't wanna see change in this area of law.

Like if we're I don't really frankly understand the purpose of our negotiations, if if at the end of the day the product we create is just gonna be renegotiated by people who are represented here but don't like the the compromise that was reached because it was a compromise, you may remember that Todd proposed that we moved to a FOIA fee structure that was too much in this.

In this body and we negotiated something that was substantially not that that was not that at all.

There was much closer to what Oregon already has that we felt we could get past and then that proposal was taken and and like renegotiated.

So I guess my question really is like what are we doing here if we're not negotiating with the people that you represent?

ML **Mark Landauer** 15:32

I well, Michael, that's a I suppose it's a fair question, but I take my role as in the Prek and I can't speak for others here who represent government bodies, right?

But I take my role here as representing the public.

That's my first duty, but I'm also here providing a perspective of local government from the special districts.

OK, but my first duty is to.

Represent the public at large in this role.

So, umm, you know I participated.

And in fact encouraged those discussions that resulted in Senate Bill 417, right.

The result of that was a build that was put before the body, my client, and frankly the cities, the counties, the schools, even the state had objections and concerns to the bill.

OK.

And I mean from that point on, we got a directed by the Majority Leader to enter into negotiations to try to find a compromise that all parties would be comfortable with.

I'm not suggesting that this spell.

KC **Kron Michael C** 16:49

Right.

But we already compromised here, right?

That was the point of what we were doing here that it felt honestly like a betrayal to me, of the work that the PRACK had done.

And it makes me really not understand what is the purpose of this body.

If the purpose is to negotiate a starting point from which government entities can just negotiate further changes, then why should the press or the Attorney general who cares about transparency be interested in negotiating in this body?

I don't understand how it can be that our collective product is one that you could then go and negotiate against.

That was just really disappointing, honestly.

ML **Mark Landauer** 17:33

Well, my call, I suppose that's for a further discussion.

I again have explained how this worked.

I have two different roles.

I tried to take each role very seriously and quite honestly, you know, I'm not as as the chair of the group that is trying to come to a compromise.

I'm not representing the prac.

I'm representing my client, but I'm also doing it in an even handed manner and we're having very well.

We had very productive discussions.

I can understand your frustration, but again, this was for an update, Michael.

It wasn't to have a debate about the process or anything like that.

This was merely an attempt to provide the prack and update on those discussions, and you're welcome to join those negotiations when we're directed to do so again by the Majority Leader.

And I I don't know what else to share with you at this point.

So that's my update on a on the public records bill that was introduced as a result of the PRAC work in 2022 and 2023.

And if there are further questions or not, we can go to the next agenda item.

BW **Brent Walth** 19:02

Yeah.

I've I have a quest.

ML **Mark Landauer** 19:08

Ohh yeah, please go ahead.

BW **Brent Walth** 19:09

Yeah.

So I can I come at think tanks?

I come at this with only.

Having watched some of this from a distance and not being directly involved, I would very much like to be part of any process going forward.

Umm, uh, I am gonna say quick clearly from the outset here.

As a working journalist for 40 years, I recall, I remember when the public records law worked when we didn't have government agencies turn to charge an arm and leg be obstructionists.

We've made real progress and actually getting a statutory deadline in the last few years, which actually is now working.

I can give you examples of how that's been effective on I don't know all the details of the incident amounts, but I would very much like to be part of this.

Umm, with and just Full disclosure and uh, when government agencies act as if the public records law is a problem.

And then, no, once a burden, I think they are missing the point that they have a legal obligation to carry it out and trying to shift these heavy fees, large fees on to members of the public press, whoever it is effectively to stop disclosure.

Umm my role I see here is to help stop that to you know and or to to create a system that's logical and fair, then increases transparency.

And I'd very much like to be part of me.

Negotiations going forward and I'd love to hear more about the the history of how we all got here.

But I see this is something most critical work with.

Prat can be doing this year.

ML **Mark Landauer** 20:49

Well, Mr wolf.

That's why his chair.

I was happy to entertain having a discussion about introducing legislation to address fees.

BW **Brent Walth** 21:01

Great.

ML **Mark Landauer** 21:01

OK.

And I made that commitment in my first term as the practice chair back in, I believe it was 2019.

So umm, it's taken time we're moving at glacial speed, but we are making progress, Andrea.

 **Brent Walth** 21:15

Yeah.

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 21:22

I was just going to point out that I think in the past when the Prague has supported a bill, it's never been unanimous and maybe that kind of a tipping point issue where.

 **Brent Walth** 21:22

Can I?

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 21:36

I don't know kind of seeing the perspectives of of Michael and Mark and.

If we had unanimous support for something, it would be a more unified voice going into the legislature, but it hasn't been.

I don't think it's ever been so I just just pointing that out.

 **Mark Landauer** 21:57

Yeah, Michael.

 **Kron Michael C** 21:58

Well, I just wanna point out that in fact, every government representative voted in favor of the proposal.

The only vote against it was from the SEIU.

Representative and SEIU, as far as I know, anyway, was not involved in trying to renegotiate the deal at the legislature.

So I I just wanted to clarify the record and response to Andrea's comment.

 **Mark Landauer** 22:27

Alright, well.

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 22:28

I believe I abstained last time when we voted on it.

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:33

Ohh, we're gonna let Andy Smith and OK folks, I think we've.

 **Smith Andrew** joined the meeting

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:41

Probably squeezed all the juice out of that grape.

And why don't we head to the next agenda item and that's gonna be an update by Scott on our proposed subcommittee.

By laws for reviewing and hiring, the public record advocate, I wanna before that begins though, Scott, I wanna thank both you.

Todd and I'm trying to recall who else was serving on our subcommittee.

Was it Emily?

And forgive me, help me out here.

 **Alyson Sneider** left the meeting

ML **Mark Landauer** 23:24

Scott, take it away.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 23:26

Representative Anderson was there at and there was at least a couple other names that I'm thinking on to, but yes, I I think you chair Landauer and thank you to the members of our Bylaws subcommittee for our our newest members.

ML **Mark Landauer** 23:27

Ohh yes so.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 23:40

Just a quick overview, we I think we reconstituted the Bylaws Subcommittee last year it had existed in previous attempts to draft bylaws.

The Council's operating without those written bylaws at this moment, so we reconstituted it last year and one of the immediate remediate thing that popped up in terms of urgency was developing a hiring process because our public records

advocates contract is set to expire this October.

And one of the unique things amongst many unique things about our Council with and a new thing for our Council is that we get to direct, hire the agency head of the public Records Advocates Office, the position held by Todd Albert presently.

And this is the first time that we'll be doing this process without us needing to see governor appointments or legislative approval for the appointment.

We we have a direct hiring powers as a Council and we've not done that before.

Previous hirings were through the usual governor's office and the Senate appointment process, so this is new for us and I thank the Members that we've mentioned for being part of our work so far.

And to be clear, the other part of the bylaw subcommittee is gonna be working on a set of bylaws, but we wanted to get this done first.

So, and I know that we've got 4 minutes for and the time, so I'll try to be quick.

The Committee subcommittee met a few times in the last few months.

We set about doing research.

Basically, we investigated Todd and I and Lou Fang had a couple of conversations with other government agencies who perhaps didn't have the exact same hiring authority that the Council does but have relatively similar the long term Care batsman office is when we talk to, we got feedback from a couple others.

I'm blanking on right now.

Which agencies?

Those were but they rather state agencies, boards that have hiring authority.

And then we also spoke last week to the Parks Department of Administrative Services, Human Resources, Dash, HR representative, and we got some information. And then the count at the subcommittee meeting earlier this week, we got, we got uh, uh input.

We presented what was shared with uh, the whole Council online and the subcommittee unanimously endorsed the hiring process.

That was put forward question I see from Andrea is contract the right word in this process?

Umm, I've been operating with that word.

I I believe that Todd and the public record jobs could have a contract with the state of Oregon.

If there's a different word I'm I'm opening to that Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 26:19

Yes, statutorily it's a term I'm appointed for a term of four years.

So I'm a full time state employee.

I think contract might employ otherwise, but I mean it's all kind of the same in the end.

But yes, we term might be closer to the statute.

 **CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS** 26:33

My words person.

So I was like, wait, what's that mean? Yeah.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 26:37

And we want to get it right one absolutely it right.

So in this document and maybe if I if no one objects I'm going to share my screen real quick.

Just to be clear about what we're showing here.

So all that to say, we did research, we put together a proposed process for hiring the public records advocate and we tweaked it a bit for those on the subcommittee.

This version does represent the changes we talked about and agreed to.

I did rework some of the wording down below.

So you see this flow chart here and then down below.

I hope you saw the in the document that was posted by Todd.

They're sort of explanation that follows the flow chart.

I did rework that part just a little bit and I hope it reflects what we discussed and if we need to talk about changing out the word contract for term, I'd be open to that.

But in a very quick nutshell, basically the process starts with the public records advocate, the incumbent and declaring their interest in the position.

And obviously, if they're not interested and I think the Council would jump to the recruitment part, but if there is interest in the public records advocate, they inform the Council one way or the other, that would then trigger a 360 review, which is a concept we heard from the long Term Care Ombudsman office, that they've done that at least once and they found it useful.

And we've heard from Daz HR that a 360 review is something that's being instituted for directors across state government and it's their.

Their recommendation was that we do it too.

So the second step would be doing the review and in this case the staff person in the public records advocate who has agreed to do that for the Council, should the Council wants to do that, is the Deputy PR a Lufeng and we appreciate her willingness to conduct that.

And there's some information in this document which I'm not going to go over it line by line right now, explains a little about the 360, then the 360 review results are shared with the PRAC and I kind of proposed that we start with that an executive session to kind of take that information.

But we also want to make sure that that review receipt and review of that review information is also done in a public setting.

So the public has an opportunity as well to weigh in on the PR A and then after that information is received, any public comments received, then there'd be a decision point for the crack in step four as to whether the practice is interested in recruiting for a PRA or moving on to determining a developing a new term or contract with the PRA.

And then as you can see in the flow chart, if there's a recruitment, we would work with Dash R to develop a recruitment plan worked, identify any funding that's required for publicizing that recruitment and go through all those steps would be an interview process.

Umm.

And then, uh, stuff decision points in that in terms of what the Council wants to in terms of hiring in the recruitment and negotiation of a contract or a term, there is notes in this document about a subcommittee being formed, not this would not be the entire full Council negotiating or even being necessarily involved in all the steps of a recruitment process, both the recruitment and the contract term negotiation in this process proposed would call for a subcommittee of the Council to do that.

Uh, one thing we learned is there's a difference between a 240 an RS240 agency and a non RS240 agency.

We are a non RS240 agency which means I think we have a little more flexibility as my general take away.

There was some guidance that the chair and Vice chair of the Council could would should lead such a subcommittee, but it's not required.

The Council could designate a subcommittee of 2-3 or whatever members doesn't necessarily have to be the Council chair of Vice chair, but there could be guidance to

that would make sense.

So we'd work through those processes with the help of desk HR and hopefully at the end we would reach an agreement upon term slash contract for a new PRA to start and schedule wise the current contract term expires in October.

And so DAS strongly recommended the Council initiate this whole process.

If this is a process that the Council agrees with, but we wanna start this by June to make an October deadline, I think uh mark and Todd, I'll, I'll lean on you to.

To fill in any gaps I forgot, I think what we're asking for today is feedback from the Council and ideally a motion to adopt.

I suppose this process with making it.

Yeah.

And I see in a comment from Stephanie about replacing a point appointment with place of or using appoint appointment.

We can clean up the language in terms of the term and the contract, but uh.

Yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 31:18

I I suppose at this point, Scott, I should see if there are any questions from the Members.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 31:19

So yeah.

ML **Mark Landauer** 31:34

All right, that was a sufficient awkward silence.

So I gathered there aren't at this point.

I just quick reflection, I think that this is a good product.

My personal opinion, I really appreciated Scott and Todd diving into this and really presented what I think is a practical common sense achievable.

A process on this and umm uh, unless there are any other comments we would like to put this process in place.

And Todd, I'd like to make a note for our next meeting for the agenda, because June will be upon us sooner than than we might all expect that.

And I don't know when we will be having our next formal full PRACT meeting, but I do think that we need to appoint a hiring process committee.

At our next meeting so that we can assuming that these bylaws are adopted, that that committee can begin its work.

So at this point, folks, I'd certainly entertain a motion.

Unless again, there are any questions, comments or concerns.



CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS 33:03

I just put something in the chat.

I don't know if fix the eyes is completely accurate, but I'm noted I'm not a HR professional.



ML Mark Landauer 33:06

Ohh forgive me.



CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS 33:14

I think there's other things there that could at like, I don't know if we need to call out anything specifically in this process either.

So keeping it more general maybe better for flexibility.



SS Scott Stauffer 33:23

And you're.

I think that's fair.

That was probably just a note I took at some point in this process and left it in here, but I I can see it not necessarily being part of part of that if nobody.



CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS 33:30

Yeah.

Yeah, because there's a lot of components that are at play there.



BW Brent Walth 33:38

OK.



SS Scott Stauffer 33:38

Yeah, I think what I'm hearing and if the if the Council approves of this process, I'm gonna swap out the term contract with perhaps with term and then the appointment has noted in the chat by Stephanie and then remove that part.

But I think that's fair.
And thank you for that.
That note Andrea.

 **Mark Landauer** 34:01

Yeah.
Thank you, Andrea.
OK, still awkward.
Silence, anybody.
It is our folks comfortable.
Can I get a motion?

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 34:21

I missed that being.

 **Mark Landauer** 34:21

Well, the chair, the chair with the chair would move that.
We adopt this as, uh, the process going forward and if there are further refinements that can be made or need to be made that we can consider those at the appropriate time.

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 34:43

I can.

 **Mark Landauer** 34:45

I heard a second who was the 2nd.
Please Andrea.

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 34:48

Me.

 **Mark Landauer** 34:48

Thank you.
And again, I generally like to do these things by unanimous unanimously.

I hope that there aren't any concerns, but all those who are supportive, please indicate by saying aye or raise your thumb.



CLARK Stephanie * SOS 35:05

I.



Emily Gothard - She/Her 35:06

Hi.



Scott Stauffer 35:07

Aye.



Brent Walth 35:07

I.



Mark Landauer 35:09

And well, you had.

Did you have a question?

OK, that was an.



Will Glasson 35:13

They're gonna say please your hand, but I raised my hand.



Mark Landauer 35:17

OK.

Very good.

Thank you and anybody opposed?



tom andersen 35:21

Of Mark, I'm not opposed or for it.

I'm an ex official member, so I just wanted to be clear that I'm not taking any votes here.



Mark Landauer 35:25

Indeed.

Thank you, representative.

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

And and Mark, I'll be abstaining from the vote.

ML **Mark Landauer** 35:29

My my yes.

Yeah, that makes sense as well, Todd.

Thank you.

So let the record reflect that the vote was unanimous, with Representative Anderson and the Public Advocate records advocate abstaining.

Umm, alright, thank you everybody for the work and again Scott, thank you for really digging into that.

Really helpful.

I appreciate it and I'll be looking for more volunteers on the Bylaws Committee, which is another item that I'd like for our next meeting as well.

Todd, let's see if we've wrapped this thing up looking for my agenda.

Public comment for those in the public if there are any comments that you would like to address the public Records Advisory Council now is your time.

You may raise your hand and we will provide up to two minutes to address the Council.

OK, the long awkward pause has been completed and it looks like we are now prepared for a next meeting date and topics.

Todd, I'm gonna perhaps lean on you for that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:53

Potential topics.

ML **Mark Landauer** 36:55

Well, I perhaps more of time I am.

I would perhaps between now and the next full PRACK meeting, we'll solicit members for potential topics, but I do I would like to try to see if we can get something at least a general calendar.

Do you have an idea of when we might want to meet next?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 37:23

Well, let me ask you this, should we set as it feels weird that I'm making these suggestions, but should we set a date by which I express formal interest or indicate I will not be continuing after which if I express formal interests to, maybe we could volunteer.

L Scott and you Thang to work out a timeline for the 360.

Just a suggestion, doesn't have to be Scott.

ML **Mark Landauer** 37:46

Well.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 37:47

It does have to be you thing, because she graciously stepped forward to draft it, but just some ideas to float.

ML **Mark Landauer** 37:51

OK.

Sounds like a plan.

What would you suggest, Todd?

I I suppose by the end of May.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 38:04

Yes.

How about and?

This eventually become part of our bylaws or something like X amount of time before the end of the term.

Advocate expresses interest etcetera.

How about this time?

We say, you know, May 31st.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:16

Sounds good.

And perhaps what we can do, I don't.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 38:17
OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 38:20
I I worry a little bit if we require that too far in advance, right?
That notice, Todd, that's perhaps something that we can have further discussion, but
but I think for our purposes now may 31st sounds like a good time, umm and then
ohm I suppose when would we wanna do our next full meeting?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 38:51
Well, I don't pay you thing on the spot.
I don't know if she's been able to give it any thought to drafting the 360 as of yet,
because it's all been very punitive, so maybe we could get just a little idea if she has
any.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 39:05
I think drafting it is we have a road map.
From what's been done by other agencies already, the most time consuming portion
might just be waiting for responses and this will be dependent on the number of
interested parties and stakeholders and folks that we end up surveying but.

ML **Mark Landauer** 39:17
Yep.

LP **LUO Yufeng * PRA** 39:27
Some time before June, right, it would have to be done so we can.
If you set a deadline for me, I can accommodate that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 39:43
And Mark, you know, is your preference to have you finger you, Fang and others
come up with potential stakeholders ascend it to would you like to counsel to
decide? OK.

ML **Mark Landauer** 39:50

Yes.

Yes, I I would like to.

I would like to you thank to perhaps bring a proposal before the the Council, I think that that would probably be the most appropriate and transparent process.

So perhaps what I'd like to suggest is we have a meeting in early June.

In Umm if if that makes sense so that we can get that sort of update provide the prack some input into the process as well UM and and then.

Perhaps then we'll have some further work.

Uh, that we can take on but.

I also wanna try to get a broader bylaw committee moving as well.

We've been talking about that for quite some time.

Umm.

And then any other subject matter that the members of the prack may feel interested in discussing, I haven't given a great deal of thought to what our next agenda would be.

But I do know that we have work with regard to this topic that we talked about today and I wanna make sure that we're staying on track and on time.

So it may be a very yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 41:12

But I'll send out a doodle poll.

ML **Mark Landauer** 41:15

Yeah, let's do that.

And it may very well be a short meeting, but but in early June, which is fine, I don't think anybody wants to meet just for meeting sakes.

But so long as we have an agenda that, well, we will have a few agenda items that we have to discuss.

So I'm perfectly fine with the short meeting as well, just to keep our work moving forward.

And and Todd, I guess I guess my last question is, do we have a full we have a full Council for the first time now in a in a couple of years, isn't that correct?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 41:53

Yes.

 **Mark Landauer** 41:56

Well, that's a relief.

Good.

I'm glad that we could get.

Mr Glasson and Mr Walt aboard.

I appreciate you folks being willing to serve and is there anything else, I suppose for the good of the order?

Well, I apologize that we ran over a bit today.

Umm, I appreciate everybody being here.

Thank you so much.

And I'll take a motion to adjourn.

Ohh, OK, thank you.

 **Dan Maguire** left the meeting

 **Mark Landauer** 42:30

No need for emotion.

Alright, very good.

I'm just gonna call this meeting adjourned.

Thank you so much.

I hope you have a wonderful day and weekend.

Lots of basketball to watch.

Exciting women's basketball.

I'm just gonna say so.

Enjoy your weekend and I hope you and your families are well.

Thank you so much.


 **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** 42:53

Mark.

 **Will Glasson** left the meeting

 **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 42:53

Thank you.

 **Mark Landauer** 42:54
Ohh yes.

 **tom andersen** left the meeting

 **Kron Michael C** left the meeting

 **Mark Landauer** left the meeting

 **Brent Walth** left the meeting

 **Smith Andrew** left the meeting

 **CLARK Stephanie * SOS** left the meeting

 **Emily Gothard - She/Her** left the meeting

 **CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS** left the meeting

 **Scott Stauffer** left the meeting

 **ALBERT Todd * PRA** left the meeting

 **LUO Yufeng * PRA** left the meeting

 **ALBERT Todd * PRA** joined the meeting

 **ALBERT Todd * PRA** stopped transcription