

PRAC Bylaws Subcommittee Meeting-20240129_110215-Meeting Recording

January 29, 2024, 7:02PM

36m 2s

● **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

SS **Scott Stauffer** 0:06

All right.

Well, it is 11:02 AM on January 29th and I will call this meeting door.

👤 **Mark Landauer** joined the meeting

SS **Scott Stauffer** 0:13

I see Mark as popped on as well.

TA **Tom Andersen** 0:13

Yeah.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 0:15

Hello, mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 0:19

Good afternoon.

Or or.

No, it's still morning.

Forgive me.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 0:24

Still, in the final minutes of the morning, but yeah, I think we were just confirming.

We just, Todd just started the recording and confirmed we have a a quorum present.

I think the only one who's not present in terms for our quorum on the Subcommittee as Tony, but I do know that I see Emily gathered here, who's a member of practice.

So good to see you, Emily.

And we do have a little bit of an agenda.

We posted it online, so there's probably not too much surprise.

That's what we are gonna try to tackle and start this conversation off today, but as a reminder to everybody, this is the first feedback there from someone.

If if you're not speaking, maybe as a courtesy reminder, don't forget to mute.

Mute yourself if you're not currently speaking this for the good of the the audio sound.

This is the first meeting of the Public Records Advisory Council's bylaws Subcommittee.

We have a couple of of charges that we'll talk about here in a minute, but the ultimate goal is to create a document of course, of some governing procedural rules for our Council.

And so Todd, the first thing I have on the agenda and should I go ahead and share my screen, Todd, and advance the slides or do you want to do that or?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:38
Whatever you prefer, Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:40

OK, I will.

I will do it then.

And can everyone see?

OK.

I'm on the way from my side.

Can everyone see the uh the slides there?

Yeah. OK, alright.

OK.

So we've we've called roll already, but since it's the first meeting of the subcommittee, perhaps we wanna go around real quick and introduce ourselves and maybe just for simplicity of knowing who's going to go out, I'll call another mini role again.

Maybe just say hello and where you're joining us from today, so at the top of my list, I see Representative Anderson.

There's an Anderson.

Do you want to say hello?

TA Tom Andersen 2:19

Hello I am joining you from room 7479 of the capital.

I am a legislator who has the curse and the blessing of living closest to the capital, so here I am, the.

SS Scott Stauffer 2:30

Thank you very much.

Glad you're part of our group.

The next person I see is Andrea.

 **CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS** 2:36

Good morning.

Andrew Chapela I'm the communications director at the Department of Administrative Services.

SS Scott Stauffer 2:42

Chandra, mark.

ML Mark Landauer 2:46

Good morning, everybody.

Mark Landauer, I represent the Special Districts Association on the Public Records Advisory Council and I'm also the current chair.

Thank you.

SS Scott Stauffer 2:59

Thank you, mark.

Uh, do we have Tony on with us yet?

Don't know that we have Tony yet, but the other member of the subcommittee,

Todd, you wanna say hello?

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 3:12

Good morning, Todd.

Albert Public records advocate.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 3:16

Thank you, Todd.

And then I also see that we have frack member Emily gathered.

So Emily, good to see you.

You want to say hello real quick.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 3:24

Yes, I'm Emily gathered and uh and and I, I I unfortunately had a sick child at the last Prague meeting.

I know I had expressed by email that I wanted to participate on the Bylaws Subcommittee as well.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 3:39

Right, that works for me.

I don't know.

Uh, there's any other steps in that process, but I'm gonna add you to the roster.

So anyway, have injections can let me know, but did I freeze everyone still there?

Can you hear me?

OK, you off rose for a quick second.

So isn't technology fun?

Any other members of the practice that I'm missing that we wanna introduce?

So say hello to.

I don't think so.

OK, alright.

Well, then the next topic that we have going on is approval of the agenda and I pasted it there on the slide there.

Basically, we're gonna talk about the overall goals and tasks of the subcommittee, and that will probably be the the bulk of our discussion today.

And then we'll take public testimony.

If there is any, and then we'll talk about next meeting date.

So it's pretty straightforward to do anything and we would like to change or add to the agenda.

If not, I think, uh, we adopt agendas by motion, so if not entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 4:42
So moved.

ML **Mark Landauer** 4:42
So move second.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 4:44
I've heard it's moved by Todd and seconded by Mark to approve the agenda.
Any further discussion, hearing that on favor say aye or raise your hand.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 4:53
Aye.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 4:56
Anybody who opposed to the agenda raise your hand now or say nay.
Hearing no objections, the agenda is adopted unanimously.
Moving on to the next slide, if I can figure out where the button is.

TA **Tom Andersen** 5:11
Excuse me, Todd, my understanding is I as a legislator on my non voting members.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 5:11
OK.
Yes. Yeah.

TA **Tom Andersen** 5:17
So I didn't take any action on this and Todd nodding his head.
OK, I'm just here to listen to you wonderful folks, and I may add some contributions,
but I will not be voting or making any motions.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 5:21
OK.
So noted.
Think you're opening Anderson?

Alright, OK.

So like I said, the goals that this subcommittee as as we've I think talked about it at the larger packed meeting and then as Todd might prepare for this meeting, I think there are really two charges assigned to this committee in the in the minute in the moment UH-1 may be more timely and time sensitive than the other.

But of course, the name of the Bylaws Committee is a bylaw, so we want to develop a set of rules that will govern the practices and procedures organizationally, of how the functions.

But as a part of that, perhaps, but also a companion with that is developing a hiring process for our public records advocate, as I'm sure most folks know, the PRAC has a unique role in that.

It is a directly charged now in hiring the public records advocate.

There are many other 400 plus more than committees in the state, and my understanding is that most of those councils on boards don't necessarily hire their own advocate or Executive director of their agency.

Most of those are then submitted to the governor's office or to the legislature and and those bodies act on that recommendation Slash nomination where we find ourselves today.

And that's, I think what has been done historically with the public records advocate too.

But with recent legislative changes come, and with the current term of our advocate expiring this year, the the PRAC is actually been charged with the hiring process.

And so we're in a unique position to be the first group of council members on this Council to figure out what that is, what that means.

And so, uh.

So that's kind of our first step is those are our charges and then thinking about this, umm, I kind of wanted to to ask the Council subcommittee here do we do those things?

Two things simultaneously.

Or do we take one on and then take on the other and just noting there is a time sensitivity because the current advocates term Todd's term expires at the end of October.

So we do want to have something in place, uh by then, and I see two hands raised, I'm guessing Representative Anderson, your hand was raised from previous, so I will. If that's the case, which I think it is, thank you, Mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 7:46

Thanks.

So my my.

Inclination is that we probably need to do these UM separately.

UM, I'm not.

You know we've we've operated since what, 2019?

Without any bylaws for the crack.

And so I'm I'm kind of of the opinion that we can probably go another six months without bylaws for the crack, but we do have to do something about Todd.

And so my my inclination here, Scott, is that we probably want to address, umm the hiring process 1st and then we can take on the bylaws for the PRACK itself.

Once we have a satisfactory product from the 1st.

A issue here in hiring the the PR a thanks.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 8:48

Perfect.

Thank you, mark.

Uh, Emily.

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 8:51

I agree with that and we'll want to put something into the bylaws about hiring the PR a I would think as well.

So it makes sense to start with that with developing that process to me.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 9:04

Thank you.

Might uh. Andrea?

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 9:10

I was just gonna say I agree to you not to be repetitive, but it does make sense to start with that process and then fold that into the the broader bylaws discussion, I think.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 9:12

OK.

Thank you, representative Anderson.

Did you have any thoughts on that question?

TA **Tom Andersen** 9:29

Just like everybody else, I think that's what we need to do.

And again, I'll look forward to whatever the vote is.

I do have a question I don't know.

As a state agency, not agency.

Better than state quasi governmental body.

Whether we there are procedures we need to follow, do we need to open it up?

Do we need to ask for applications or do we have some autonomy just to do what I think everybody wants to do?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 9:57

Excellent question.

I think that is the the rub of what we need to step onto next.

And so before we move into that, because I do have a little bit of report that Todd and I've done a little research to the state on that.

We still have Tony's Tony Stewart, Nolan and I.

I don't see the name yet.

Wanna make sure that if he is here wanna I don't see Tony other yet?

So Todd is the other member of this, do you have any concurrence or any other thoughts on which which to tackle first?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 10:27

Well, I I agree with the group.

I think we should go with hiring first because we have a time certain and it's new to us.

Even though the pack has handled some aspects of advocate hiring and reappointment previously, this doing the entirety of it is brand new.

So I think it's better to focus on that.

I will say, generally speaking, I'm in favor of less constraining sort of plug and play bylaws that Scott, I know you're familiar with and might not be too difficult to craft and adopt, but given this is our first go around, I do like the idea of focusing on

hiring, folding that into a bylaw and it adopting it.
And that'll pave the way for a future work on the rest.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 11:04

Excellent.

Thank you.

I think I'm hearing a unanimous approval agreement to proceed with the hiring process.

I think that that's where my my mind was going as well.

So I think, excellent.

We already made our first decision.

Nice work, everybody.

OK.

So we'll proceed with the hiring and then we'll revisit the bylaws.

Once that has been developed, I put together a timeline just so in my mind like it started to map this out and then hopefully it's helpful for the subcommittee and the public to understand where we we're probably going, I imagine meeting at least once every other two.

So every two months have a meeting to keep this process going.

Umm.

Today I see as as organizing, meeting and and getting our initial thoughts out there and and we can get some idea about the research that we need to do in the next steps.

So that's January, February.

Then we'll meet again in March and April and bring together some of the research that we put together.

Some of the processes that we want to borrow from and start drafting start the writing process, hopefully by May and June, we'll have some some draft documents to put our teeth in together as a group and and and wordsmith.

And then I believe the practice next scheduled to meet probably mid year in the summer time month.

So hopefully we'll have a status report on a hiring process that we can share with the full Council, then and then, of course, the hiring process begins.

And then we follow this timeline for the hiring process and we don't get to the bylaws till perhaps the summertime.

I'm not hearing anybody's too concerned that we don't get to it until then.
So any questions about basically a meeting every two months, about three times before the next pack meeting?

Any question concerns with that schedule?

OK.

All right then.

The task assignment.

So what?

When I put my head together about a hiring process and I've been a part of hiring processes here at the city and in other places before, and every level of government, every entity kind of has their own rules.

And so pulling together what those rules might be for a state board and Commission is, of course a natural place to start.

And so I think the research that we need to start doing is asking those questions of our sister boards and commissions and our other state agencies.

And to that point with thank you to Todd for reaching out, we did have a conversation.

Uh, last Friday afternoon with folks in the long term Care Ombudsman's office, I think I got that right.

The LTCL about their process and and we we learned some things.

We've got some notes that I can, uh, Tyler, I will share with you some things we took away from that group.

I'll share that with the committee.

Again, I think one of the things that struck me was underscored at the in that conversation was that, uh, they they are in nominating committee, so they nominate that their council, their board receives applications and then nominates to the governor's office with the nominates to the legislature for appointment.

We won't be in that position, but I thought what was helpful from them is learning how they started the process to begin with, which they began with a review of their current director.

They hired an executive director for their agency.

They do a 360 review and they do receive support from DAS HR on that and I forgive me if I'm getting the acronyms and agencies mixed up, but I think they do get that support and they do that review and then the reviews and provided in a report form to their board. Andrea.



CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS 14:33

I was going to say would it be helpful for me to check in with the Chief Human Resources Office to just kind of get a better understanding of if there is like a specific recruitment process for positions like this?

I know there's nothing that's exactly the same, but I can check with folks and see if they have a good idea.



Scott Stauffer 14:53

I think that be wonderful.



CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS 14:53

OK.



Scott Stauffer 14:55

I think I think the big take away that I'm gonna ask folks to think on the neck before before our next meeting in March is to do just that.

Who do you know in your world?

And you know worse can provide us some some context and guidelines, Todd.



ALBERT Todd * PRA 15:08

Well, Andrew, you could certainly, you know, start at the top and probably get an overview.

But we do have an ADAS, HR business partner or assigned to our office.

So I could provide that persons name as well and you could interface with her.

Maybe she'll know.

Or maybe you'll have to take it higher since we are pretty unique and everything we do is new.



Scott Stauffer 15:26

I think that was my main.

Thank you, Todd.

I think that was my big download from our meeting.

Did you want to add anything, Todd or Lufeng?

You were there, too on Friday.

Anything else?

You took away.

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

I would just say I think the the board was very thoughtful in their work because I it sounds like they too were being involved for the first time in reappointing or hiring a director.

And so they sort of took a look, realized they didn't have anything much like maybe we don't in terms of being on anecdotal information about how they're director was doing.

And so they chose to do a 360 review of his work to actually have a basis for making a determination.

And then waited for that and it's results before deciding if they wanted to go the reappointment route or opening it up as a general hire for which, of course the current candidate could apply as well.

So I think it is useful to gather information before making these decisions.

But yeah, I like.

I liked what they did.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 16:18

It seemed like a good base model to start with the review of what you've got.

So you have a lay of the land and then uh, then they report to the the Council kind of within triggers, sets up the, you know, the, the the hiring decision point.

Have one thing to note at which I think most folks who've interfaced with government before just but just they were underscored it to to Todd and laughing and I on Friday either public processes and there are there are mechanisms and reasons and situations where interviews and hiring can happen in closed session as allowed in state laws as we're all familiar but it can also be done very publicly and in a public meeting so probably a an obvious thing the state but it was something that a lot of folks forget even when you're thinking about hiring process.

You're hiring a state public official, and that's generally done in the public setting, which can be a little awkward to talk about people on there.

But that's sort of the reality of it.

Those are the big things we took from mtco.

I think we've got maybe some other ideas, Todd.

You're going to reach out to a couple other groups criminal Justice Commission to see what they did and things like that.

Umm, but that's all the research I've done today, except I guess I should mention here at the city we've well, I guess that's bylaws.

So I won't talk about that.

Never mind.

Yeah.

Any other.

OK.

So that's where you are.

So the next the next step that we're gonna have to work on the chair next meeting now in our next meeting is research.

Uh, Andrea noted.

Who she can reach out to.

Todd got some thoughts if anybody else has thoughts about who you can reach out to in terms of the PR, a hiring process, that's what we want to do between now and then the other.

The other point that I was going to ask folks to talk about now is what are your thoughts about the hiring process you've heard Todd and I and Andrew talk a little bit about the process.

What?

What thoughts do you do the rest of the subcommittee have about important elements to include in this process, or people we might want to reach out to in this research phase.

A representative Anderson.

TA **Tom Andersen** 18:36

Thank you.

I presume we already have a job description of of of what the the staff the would do and if that's the case, I mean that's obviously where we start if we don't have a job description, we better get one, especially if this ends up being a, you know, a a public idea as opposed to an automatic.

Not automatic, but a rehire of somebody who's already on the position.

So we better have the job description.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:06

Agreed that I would probably look at Todd to make sure that the public records had we get office might have that for inside of those materials and if they do, we'll get copies for that subcommittee.

Joe Barker.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 19:20

I I ohh sorry.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:20

I see.

Yeah.

Sorry, go ahead.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 19:22

So I was gonna say I think I still should have a copy of the prescription position description.

I was hired under.

Most recently, but if not, Stephanie Clark, state archivist, was chair of the project during that period and any remaining legacy members who also participated, like Mark for instance, might still have a copy.

But I'll I'll look through my stuff and see if I have one first before anyone else has to start digging.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:49

Thank you, Todd.

I'm Joe.

I see your hand raised.

I was just gonna say public testimony is the next step, so I want to make sure the committee has an opportunity to talk amongst themselves before we take public testimony.

But you can go ahead.

Leave your hand raised if you'd like.

Until we do that next step.

So any other open brainstorming thoughts from subcommittee members about the hiring process?

Anything you want to get out there before we get too deep, mark?

 **Mark Landauer** 20:15

Well, just a thought and I'd you know, I'm pretty open to.

However, we want to do this quite honestly.

I do think we need to provide some guidance for a future project Members on this.

Umm.

But I do think, Scott, that we may want to have as a component of the hiring process and the opportunity for the public to also provide some input at some point during that process, whatever it may be, that's really the only thing that comes to my mind, frankly, I'm I'm pretty open to.

However, this group wants to go forward.

It you know, I want it to be efficient.

I want it to be.

You know, easy for people to participate and feel as though their input is being heard.

But I I just think that as we are the public Records Advisory Council, we tried to allow for the public to participate in our meetings and I do think that they should have a role, albeit probably small role in the hiring process as well.

Thank you.

 **Scott Stauffer** 21:41

Thank you, mark.

I think I can carry you.

And I heard efficient, easy and open.

I think those should be our somewhere by words.

Thank you, mark. Andrea.

 **CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS** 21:51

I don't remember the recruitment last.

I mean, I remember the recruitment last time, but I wasn't on the track at the time.

But I I'm thinking back and wondering how many applicants there were and if the fact that the process was completely public hindered any of that.

And just to consideration to throughout there that like some folks may not apply if it is completely public because they you know are either currently employed or you know don't wanna have that out there.

And it's just something we think about when we're thinking about hiring practices in general.

So just to consideration to think about at this point.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 22:31

Sir, a very public process definitely has a double edged sword in terms of the pool that you recruit.

But the thoughts mark.

ML **Mark Landauer** 22:46

Well, yeah.

Here, here's the challenge, though.

This is a little bit.

This is different than hiring a new public records advocate because we have one right and this this process is going to be about do we retain, Todd, sorry do we retain Todd?

I mean, that's really what we're doing here.

We're not going through a whole recruitment process, so I Scott, we may have to address a situation whereby we're reviewing the existing PR a versus hiring one from whole cloth, right and.

And so I think that there there's probably going to need to be a sort of two sections, 11 if we already have a sitting PR a versus if the practice decides to.

And and Todd, I don't anticipate this if we were to let Todd go, what's the next thing we have to go through an entire recruitment process and I would imagine that that would be a national recruitment process that would seek to receive applications, CV S, et cetera.

So I think they're gonna be a A2, very different processes that are put together for this effort.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 24:22

Yeah, I think that's fair.

And and you know, we do have our current public records advocate on this

subcommittee, and we were talking to the comp long Term Care Ombudsman last last week.

They they mentioned that that is something that you we the committee and the hiring panel and the Council needed to keep that in mind that the the current person's in the job and and doing review and and and I have no doubt that we will navigate this well, but it is a very part of this, Todd, in the middle of this conversation and Todd is in the is the conversation by virtue of the role so well pointed out mark and you thought your hand raised and lowered anything.



CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS 25:00

I I was just going to say that it makes sense to have the two scenarios of because we're writing the bylaws or the rules or whatever we want to call them around the hiring process, assuming that it is a general process and that we won't, you know, if we're writing this for future, I'll call it future generations.

Umm, you know, we want those to stand on their own and then have a separate process right?

For if there is a current sitting because there may not always be a current sitting, you know Todd might decide to win the lottery and move to a private islands like there's there's scenarios there.

I think that come into play.



Mark Landauer 25:39

Take me with you, Todd.



CHIAPPELLA Andrea * DAS 25:41

I know take all of us with you, but yeah, I was just gonna point that out and then Mark said it.

So there you go.



Scott Stauffer 25:48

Great.

Thank you, Andrea.

Thank you, Mark, Emily, and he thought or any any anything you want to make sure that we think about in this process as we get started.

ES Emily Gothard - She/Her 25:59

Umm I I just agree with what has already been been raised about both the concerns about how public it is and I and I mean and I'm a mixed mind on that.

Ah, I wouldn't want us to not be able to consider candidates and like also thinking if we're talking about like if we had a vacancy because I agreed that the processes should be different.

Umm, depending on the circumstances.

And I did find the the PR a job posting from 2020 that I dropped in the chat.

SS Scott Stauffer 26:37

Thank you.

Thank you, Emily.

All right, I am any other representative Anderson, I think you have.

You had a chance to to weigh anything you want to add at this time.

TA Tom Andersen 26:53

Surprisingly, no, and I think you're all on the right track.

And I I I don't think I I do have some advice.

Of course, there's some comments.

I don't think we want to overthink this.

SS Scott Stauffer 27:06

Ohh.

TA Tom Andersen 27:06

Umm, you know, we've we've got somebody in in place now and I presume there might be something in this that various hiring guidelines.

You look at that the first choice is do you wanna open the position up at all or do you wanna move forward with the the person we already have?

And so that could make make everything a whole lot more streamlined, you know, and I think that's a decision that the voting members of the committee should be able to reach by the next meeting we have.

SS Scott Stauffer 27:41

Great.

Yes, I agree.

Thank you.

Representative Anderson, I still don't see Tony, so I won't ask that, but uh, alright well any Todd.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 27:53

Sorry Scott, an email literally just came in from Tony apologizing for his absence due to personal circumstances.

He won't be able to make it today.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 28:01

Thank you.

Hope everything's OK with them.

Uh, any other final brainstorming?

Research thoughts I've really appreciated all the the feedback.

It's been great so far.

If not, then if I can be so bold as to assign the subcommittee members a bit of a homework assignment?

Uh, when you have your free time and you're thinking on this, if you could reach out, go do some Google searching or whatever you have access to, do a little research on hiring practices and put together some thoughts.

If if you find a good resource and you wanna share with us, please either send it a toddler or share it with the rest of the subcommittee and make sure it gets posted online with our next meeting packet and shared with the public.

So do a little research, put a little thought into what you think.

A high timeline should look like and what we should think about as we go forward, but I think I I'm agree with the consensus.

I'm hearing that I think we're we're on a good start.

We're we're in general agreement on what kind of things we wanna have and we don't want to overthink this.

We want to be like Mark said, efficient, open and easy.

So those are your charges, at least in my opinion.

Those are charges for the next couple of months and then I just have it's grayed out there, but you can see just setting this up.

So it's not surprised once we have our research, then we're gonna need a couple members to probably start writing something, putting things together, and then we'll do a review and then we'll present it and we can talk about who, who does the reporting to the Council and the summer.

So uh, that's really the last thing I had for the the subcommittee.

I'm gonna move on next to public testimony, and I know Joe.

I know it's not as hard when it's electronic, but your hands been raised for quite a while.

I'm sure it's getting tired, but Joe Barker, I see a hand raise.

Would you like to make some public comment?

JB **Jo A. Barker** 29:46

Yes, thank you, Scott.

Well, first question I have is, is there going to be a standing order that that the public be hidden last year?

Chairman Mark had indicated that that was the preference and I'm just clarifying if that is still the preference this year.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:08

Public hidden.

I'm.

I'm sorry I'm not a bit.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 30:11

Yeah, like this.

Hello I didn't do it right like that.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:17

Oh, you mean on teams?

On teams with the video off like that.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 30:21

Well, if I turn if I, if I turn my video off, then sometimes it gets weird.

I'm working on an old laptop.

OK, so it has issues at times.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 30:30

OK.

Sure.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 30:34

Umm.

But I was just curious on regarding the hiring practice.

Umm.

Is it going to be by Carmel?

For example, will there be an actual uh employment committee that will review the tentative applicants once they're scaled down?

Then will that process go to the larger PRAC board for review, consultation and their ultimate choice?

I I do sympathize both with with Emily Gothard and Adrian dealing with other other employment factors.

If someone does make an application and they are currently employed in another area, umm, that might be something that you want to consider as an exception to having the meeting open in public.

Umm, which under open and public meeting laws we all know that there is the discretion of whether an individual which is go into executive session or in open meeting. Umm.

Based upon my experience as a City Council person.

Umm, applications after a job description is is designed our posted for about 3 months at the end of that time.

Then it goes to an employment Committee for review.

And then the final recommendation to the City Council that would appear to be the standard method of operation for most municipal governments.

But I could be completely wrong.

Public sectors a little bit different, to my understanding. Uh.

It could be as short as two weeks, up to 30 days or until the post is filled with someone that meets the criteria that has been mandated.

So that's about all I have to make a comment on and thank you for allowing me to comment, Scott.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 32:56

Yes, absolutely.

I think the this bylaw subcommittee agrees with our larger Council that taking public testimony is critical part of our processes.

I will just say in terms of hiding your your photo during committee meetings, I don't remember exactly what chair Landauer said.

Under that and he's here.

So I would defer, of course anything, he recalls.

But I I think it's just part of a, perhaps a best practice that the the committee members would keep their camera on.

If you remember the public and you can turn your camera off, that's probably a preferred best practice in terms of being on a zoom or teams or hybrid meeting video conference call, so I'll just leave it at that.

I think if you have the ability to, it's probably a good practice, but I'll see other points, Joe.

I think those are all really good observations and that's really the heart of what the subcommittee is going to be working on the next couple of months is answering those exact questions.

I mean, is it a public private?

How long does the job description get posted?

Do we form it hiring subcommittee of the Council to look at this in the future years, all good points and all things that we will chew on and right on the next couple months.

So thank you for your comments.

Uh, I saw another hand raise briefly there.

Any other members of the public who are here, who would like to speak?

If not, then I will say that the final piece of business with the Subcommittee today is to discuss our next meeting, and I found that he's just way to handle that is to tend to doodle poll out.

So you will hear from Todd and then I'll stop sharing.

You will hear from Todd in the coming days with that poll and umm with that?

Uh, I am open to any other final thoughts or comments from Todd or any of the members of the committee.

Saying that, I just want to say thank ohh Tom get representation yes.

TA Tom Andersen 34:52

Yeah.

Yeah.

Thank you very much.

I just want to let people know that there's a fairly decent chance that I may not be here after the short session.

I'm taking a little R&R from the mid March through early April, so I may not be here, but I have extreme confidence in everybody on this committee that that you're gonna do a terrific job.

So thanks.

SS Scott Stauffer 35:18

Thank you, Sir.

Thank you for that.

We certainly wish you safe and happy travels and a safe and productive legislative session as well.

Alright.

Well, any other final thoughts from anybody else in the committee?

 **Erica R. Tatoian** left the meeting

SS Scott Stauffer 35:32

If not, I wanna say thank you so much for signing up to do this this work.

This is obviously not always the most interesting work.

Creating bylaws and hiring processes, but it is very critical to the success of our Council and our and our function.

So thank you all for being here today.

Thank you to the members of the public for joining us.

We will see you in March.

ML Mark Landauer 35:50

Thanks Scott.

 **Tom Andersen** left the meeting

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 35:52

Thanks, Scott.

Take care everybody.

 **MERCER Kristen * DEQ** left the meeting

 **LUO Yufeng * PRA** left the meeting

 **YELLESETTY Leela * DEQ** left the meeting

 **Mark Landauer** left the meeting

ES **Emily Gothard - She/Her** 35:55

Thanks, Scott. Bye.

 **CHIAPELLA Andrea * DAS** left the meeting