

Legislative Subcommittee Meeting-20260415_120131-Meeting Recording

April 15, 2026, 7:01PM

1h 5m 48s

● **ALBERT Todd * PRA** started transcription

AE **April Ehrlich** 0:04

Other legislative concepts or?

Or start all over again with 1077. I think most of us wanted to just work with 1077, but I'd like to hear if anybody's kind of sat with those thoughts and has some stuff to add.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:22

April, sorry to interrupt. Before we jump in, just from a rules perspective, we need to review and approve the agenda, make sure there are no additional items that one would like to add before we get to the second agenda item, which is what you're talking about right now.

AE **April Ehrlich** 0:31

OK.

Yep, Yep, Yep, Yep. It's funny because I don't really. I always skip the first part when I'm listening to meetings, so it makes sense why I would want to do that now. So let's approve the agenda. Would somebody like to make a motion?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:48

So moved unless anyone has any additions.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 0:50

So.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 0:53

I'll second.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 0:53
One second.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:54
So OK.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 0:55
No, OK.

AE **April Ehrlich** 0:56
All right. Got a motion and a second. Everybody in favor say aye. Aye. All right, approved. OK, well, let's go back to the discussion about SB 1077 and legislative concepts. Shaxa, I imagine you've you've got some.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 0:56
OK.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 0:59
Alright, bye.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:01
Alright.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:09
Uh.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:13
Well, I was just, you know, I've been looking at the document that Todd put together after the last meeting. And so he had pulled out kind of three different concepts from 1077-1 and then there were several suggestions that I had, but I think the only one.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:14
Something sad.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 1:33

That might be actionable is the at this point is, you know, giving the PRA the same powers to inspect records that DAS and AGS have in the appeals process in order to facilitate resolutions.

So I guess I would propose that the council discuss kind of those four options. And I don't know, maybe Todd can put the document in the chat so we all know what we're talking about.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 2:03

Sure, I'll drop the link.

SS Scott Stauffer 2:09

Shasta, I just want to say I appreciate you putting those thoughts together. I found myself agreeing with the comments and of the suggested actions. I concur. There's a lot of really good ideas in those bullet points down there.

And some will take time as as you noted in there worth keeping on the radar I think and and I like the idea of working with 1077, especially the three bullets called out at the top and then the one you flagged just now about giving the PRA.

JB Jo A. Barker 2:28

Yeah.

SS Scott Stauffer 2:42

Those authorities. So thank you.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 2:46

Thank you. And I did, you know, you know, one of the things that we talked about a lot in the last meeting was making sure that this had kind of community buy-in so that we don't get blindsided by opposition. So I did kind of circulate these around to folks and make sure.

You know that there wasn't any kind of major upset and there wasn't. I did have a suggestion on that first one of the fee amount. You know that you have a I can't. That that the agency can't charge for the creating the basis of for the fee. Do we think that's something that we could add in there?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 3:37

I would have some concerns about that I.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 3:38

OK.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 3:42

I I think based on past experience with these legislative concepts, anything that would change the current fee scheme or require public bodies to do any kind of work that's currently acceptable but now says they can't charge, I think is going to be met with heavy opposition simply because.

The way Oregon system is structured is that even that type of initial review and preparation work has and is and always has been permitted. And as state and local governments are struggling to make up for shortfalls in their budget, I think.

To be realistic, just anything that would allow anyone to say this will.

Take away revenue or otherwise require them to use money they don't have. I think it's going to be met with a lot of opposition and I know that's an issue every legislative session and it's something we're always up against, but I just think in reality we don't have enough.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 4:34

So.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 4:39

I don't know what's the word like impetus behind us to convince others that that loss of potential income is more important than status quo. And I just think we're going to get people to come out of the woodwork saying that. I don't think it's a bad idea. I think there are, you know, if you compare it to the federal system or even Washington state and elsewhere, they already do that.

And but I just it's never been the case here and I think to try to make that change now is a non-starter.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 5:09

I hear that is, do you have any idea what the free structure would be for creating the

basis of a fee? I mean, it just seems like if you're already giving somebody a fee, then you already created the basis for the fee, like you already did that work.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 5:23

Wait, oh, I'm. I'm sorry, Shasta. I completely misunderstood what you said. You're saying that they can't charge for the time it takes to explain the fee estimate related to this concept. OK, I completely misread what you said as saying that an additional thing we should add is that public bodies can't charge for the preparation of like a public records request. OK.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 5:26

Yep.

Yeah.

The record now.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 5:43

I completely went way too far afield. You know, I would be. No, go ahead.

AE **April Ehrlich** 5:47

So what we're talking about, I'm sorry, I just want to make sure I'm following correctly. What we're talking about is this first bullet point on the 1077 thing that you've pulled out where the public body should be able to provide the basis for a fee. Is that is that what we're talking about? OK.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 6:02

Like the the reasonable explanation.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 6:05

Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 6:06

Yeah, they can effectively already charge for creating a fee estimate, presumably, which this would not touch. I'd be open to including that if then they were required to this next step of then explaining the fee estimate in a reasonable fashion that that

should not be included like.
Like in the determination of actual cost.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 6:27

Yeah.

I don't know. However you want to put that into legalese to put it in there. But yeah, I mean, basically, like, we don't want to create another step and another barrier where they're gonna be like, OK, sure, but it'll be money to tell you why it's money.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 6:28

I'd be good.

Well, that's that's why I sent it to. I think it would be.

JB Jo A. Barker 6:41

Yeah.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 6:43

Right. No. So that's why I said shouldn't be included in the calculation of actual cost because I think that would align with like sort of current language and it wouldn't require like too much heavy lifting to add it if approved.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 6:51

Great.

AE April Ehrlich 6:55

So, Todd.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 6:56

OK.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 6:56

God, I'm curious from the city's perspective. Oh, sorry, I was just maybe that's not for me to ask.

AE April Ehrlich 6:59

I I I just want to make sure I'm following. Like you're saying that they should not charge a fee for trying to for providing the basis of the fee. Is that is that right? OK, all right, good.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 7:14
Mhm.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 7:15
I I I wholly support that I I was just listening to the conversation. I like I you've charged a fee to explain why you didn't charge a fee. I I guarantee you and we all can you know think of these situations in our minds where that is probably happening. I don't know that personally in Oregon except the city level and I but I agree that's we don't charge a fee to explain why you need to charge a fee. That seems kind of ridiculous. So I I support putting into the law that you can't charge for that. I I don't think many cities would have heartburn over that.
'Cause that's just part of responding to records requests, basically.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 7:50
Yeah, I.
Yeah, I would agree. It's already a best practice to try to answer questions about your fees so you have a better relationship, right? And also, I've never to this date for public bodies that do engage in that conversation, I've never seen a single one trying to charge to offer that explanation. So hopefully they won't feel like putting that into the law.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 7:57
Yep.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 8:10
Would be something worth objecting to.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 8:14
OK, great.
um Can we move on to bullet point two?

AE April Ehrlich 8:30

Yes.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 8:33

So for this one, oops.

AS Andrew Smith 8:33

Um, so for this?

Oops, I have a question. Sorry. And I hit the thumbs. So on the bullet .1, just to flag, this is Andy. I work for Rep Anderson. So Rep Anderson may be with us. I'm not sure he was going to try today, but the time there was a timing element in what we were just talking about. I think it says 5 days in the draft.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 8:39

Mhm.

AS Andrew Smith 8:54

My first thought is that's too tight. But I mean, it doesn't matter. You have a bill that a legislators could public could say that's five days. Sometimes that's that's hard for a government to respond in five, even with an explanation. It just seems a little tight. But that was my first reaction. But that can all be tailored in the legislative process. But that's my first reaction.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 9:16

Can I follow up on that? Cause I I have some thoughts from when we drafted that portion.

Which was if a public bodies are already created a fee estimate and sent it without explanation, they should already know why they're charging those fees. And so the only time they would have to respond with more details if a requester asked and five business days didn't seem like a heavy lift because they should already know that information internally. It's just a matter of getting it to a requester.

Reasonable time, but I also hear what you're saying about legislature could do what it wants with that time frame too.

AS Andrew Smith 9:45

Hello.

Sure. No, and that I I understand what you're saying, Todd. It would just be let's say the supervisor's literally the person that does it is gone. I mean you in government pretty small. That's quite common that that person and I know there are other requirements around public records that maybe that's not a factor in response times, but for this particular one it maybe it's I I don't know what's right, but it just seems. I did work in the county world for a long time. Some county jurisdictions just don't have staff to do all kinds of stuff, and I know public records are kind of different and response times are set in statute. But this particular wrinkle, it just seems, you know, for a small jurisdiction, it might be a little bit problematic, that that's all.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 10:27

Uncomfortable. Go ahead.

SS Scott Stauffer 10:27

I I like.

Sorry Kasta, I I like the five day because it it keeps in line with the other five days to acknowledge. I think that there's sort of a nice consistency there and I think maybe we add language that says five days to have an explanation or.

It kind of like on a record, the regular records request process, provide the information or explain. Maybe we could add language of something like basically provide an update if for those cases where you have the one records person's out of the office until you know for whatever.

Maybe it's it's five days to provide an explanation of the fee or provide an update when the explanation will be provided. I don't know if that.

Makes it too vague, but I I personally kind of like the five day turn around because I think in a practical sense there will be a handful. When this is if this is implemented, there'll be a handful of reasons to justify a fee and cities will get used to having those certain bullet points ready to cut and paste in the response.

AS Andrew Smith 11:29

Yeah.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 11:30

Response. So it really shouldn't be too hard. Like Todd said, by the time they're providing that, they should already know what their reasoning is. So I kind of like the five day, but you may want to give it a little more vagueness to give more time.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 11:43

Well, also, I think they're going to be incentivized to answer within five business days because the clock to collect payment actually stops until they do.

So that that could get them on board. And look, let's be real, there's no cause of action if they fail to respond within five business days. Like you can't be appealed. It doesn't impact the public body other than that they can't get the money. And so I think for those few who can't comply or won't comply.

It's going to become as you know within five business days or as soon as practicable and then we're and then if it and then if we find that to be a true problem, we as a legislative legislative concept drafting body may want to revisit this section and.

Come up with additional language about either changing the timeline or some other, I guess, stick for not complying within that time period. But right now the stick is they can't collect the money till they do.

AE **April Ehrlich** 12:42

I think including this in the law will also incentivize public bodies to ensure that they have somebody as backup when the one public records person goes on vacation.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 12:42

Yeah, for my. Okay.

AE **April Ehrlich** 12:58

It seems like that should be something they prepare for.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 13:04

In an ideal world, yeah.

AE **April Ehrlich** 13:07

Andrew, did you have your hand up again?

AS **Andrew Smith** 13:11

Not on purpose, but you guys have all convinced me. So whatever, whatever I like two things that I would just say would do a defer to the that it would kind of conform to the other timelines #1 and what you said is reasonable. And then I guess I didn't understand that payment is linked to this I guess. So there it is incentivized and whatever you put in there, somebody's going to say.

It's too short. I'm just trying to play the perspective of a jurisdiction pretty quickly. We'll just say that's too quick. Whatever you pick, they're probably gonna say it's too quick. So I mean, what do we change it to? 5 1/2 days doesn't count weekends. I mean, so that's, I don't think you necessarily need to go there. I just know that for local government these are significant.

Resource more than you think. They're sensitive to this issue, so I'm just trying to preempt that a little bit, but I don't. I think what Scott said and what others have said makes total sense.

AE **April Ehrlich** 14:06

Any other thoughts on this second bullet point?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 14:11

Oh, are we on to the second one now?

AE **April Ehrlich** 14:14

I thought we were. Isn't that where we are? Or no, we're still on the basis. OK, we're not not moving on. Are we done with the first bullet point?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 14:15

No, I think.

Yep.

I think so.

AE **April Ehrlich** 14:22

OK, let's move on to the second one. So, OK, go ahead, Shasta.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 14:27

So this, well, I mean, Todd can explain it better than me, but this one seems to, you know, if there's a denial of a request for a fee waiver or a fee reduction, then the custodian provides an explanation of the denial. So this is kind of the same thing. So a colleague was interested in adding with its specific rationale to that language. So not just a written explanation, but like specifically why. So just kind of like adding more detail there.

And to make sure that there's like actual communication instead of kind of a form letter.

Oh, you're muted, Tom.

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

I'm talking into the muted microphone. You know, this concept was largely drafted by a bunch of lawyers. And so what I had in my head was that the standard already is public bodies have discretion to deny fee waivers in the public interest.

But they have to do so in good faith. And it's basically a balancing act between the two public interests of disclosure over confidentiality that time versus like appropriate use of government resources. So they're only supposed to be denying it in the 1st place for that reason, like effectively in good faith. So I think we already had that standard in mind when we.

And you got to put that in writing to the requester, but I don't have any problems sort of, you know, including that other language here to make sure it's clear that a written denial in fact means that you've already like established a good faith basis for doing so.

If we're essentially just kind of restating the the requirement here, I think we can make that work.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 16:12

Okay, great.

AE **April Ehrlich** 16:18

Yeah, I don't have any thoughts to add. I I I'm fine with this first, the second bullet point.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 16:25

Hey, April, I see that we have a, I see we have a hand raised and I and I think it's a member of the audience. Do we want to remind folks that we'll take comment at the end?

AE **April Ehrlich** 16:26

Yes.

Yeah, yeah. I'm not familiar with everybody who's actually on the committee, so I appreciate you highlighting that we we have a public commentary section of this meeting after the discussion. So once we're done with this part of the agenda, which is discussing the legislative concepts, we'll move on to the public comment section of the meeting.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 16:56

And just before we leave this concept, do we want me to offer alternative writing where it restates the existing standard or are we OK with believing that this language would then connect to the existing standard?

Of denying a public interest fee waiver reduction.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 17:16

I guess I would be interested in seeing, you know, if it's not with its specific rationale, like literally poked in there, you know, if it's saying in accordance with, you know, this reference of whatever you're talking about, then I think that would be sufficient.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 17:32

OK. Do we need a vote or is everyone just pretty OK with that? I mean, yeah, there's four of us here. I'm OK with that. Offering some language, yeah.

OK, I will do that and get it to you guys as soon as possible.

AE **April Ehrlich** 17:58

So on the Third Point, I think it's kind of funny cause like, are there public bodies that

don't have websites? I mean, maybe they should have one. It seems like accessibility wise they should have a website.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 18:07

Yes, yes.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 18:12

I think the the example that will, yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 18:14

Some some public bodies don't have websites, or if they do, they don't have public records pages. Or if they do, their pages don't include their policies. And that includes some very large public bodies in Oregon at the state and local level. And even if they do include their policy, it doesn't always include their fee scheme.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 18:33

I think this is where Mark would say that of the 900 special districts in Oregon, there are some some ones out there that rely on other agencies to to kind of host their work and they don't have their own standalone. So you know.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 18:44

Right, but the good news about this is this. All this does is take an existing requirement and give it consequences. Because this is the requirement to post your policy, including how you charge fees and who your records custodian or contact person is. This has been part of the law for I don't know how long, but a very long time. The only difference is it's never had teeth.

AE **April Ehrlich** 18:45

That makes sense.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 19:03

So this just says do what you've you're supposed to have been doing all the time. And if not, I can't charge. And you know, that's why I don't know if this is really appropriate now, but I would say I'm not in favor of an E clause that says the bill

goes into effect immediately upon passage simply because I think public bodies will need a little time to.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:20
Sure.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 19:20
Run up their their processes for adding these concepts if it passes. Ultimately that's not really up to us, but if there's an option for us to weigh in on that, I'd be in favor of, you know, at least a several month period, if not a year before these go into effect.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:39
I agree all the way around.
Yeah.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 19:42
Me too.

AE **April Ehrlich** 19:46
And for the next, are we ready to move on?
For the next section, is this still this is not pertaining to 1077. These are just kind of new ideas that we can discuss. Is that right?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 19:51
OK.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 19:56
Cool.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 20:00
Yeah. So this was just kind of like my brainstorming around the results from the survey. They when I kind of looked more critically at them, I was like, I don't think any of these are ready for 2027. I don't think that these are things that we can propose right now.

Right this second. But I do think it's something that we as a council and as a subcommittee should be looking at. You know, I'm hoping to invite somebody from the IT systems to come and talk to us about what kind of technology solutions they're working on.

And what, you know, potential solutions there are for a lot of the tech problems that we identified in our survey. And then as far as like a grant opportunity or you know, some sort of emergency collaboration, you know, if there's like a spike of interest in a certain.

Agency. I think that would be a really good thing for Oregonians, but again, I don't think it's something that we're ready to like roll out, but something that might be worth scheduling some conversations about.

And then the other one is just, you know, the drumbeat over and over in responses from the survey is simplify the law, simplify the law. So, you know, in whatever we're doing, like, let's make sure not to make it more complicated.

Yeah.

AE **April Ehrlich** 21:31

Yeah, and I don't think that's just for the agencies. Like this is supposed to be a public service. It needs to be legible and understandable by the general public. Like people shouldn't read this and have their eyes glaze over and be extra confused. So I think.

That would be really great. You you wrote like a a note here. Where is the state attorney? Is that something that like who would handle like simplifying it and and is that like a skill set they have? OK.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 21:58

The Sunshine Committee. Well, I was just noting that the Sunshine Committee is charged with doing that because they're supposed to be getting rid of some of the 550 exceptions, but I'm have yet to connect with them, so I don't know where they're at in their work.

But yeah, I mean, I think that all of us in this space can contribute to trying to make the law more simple.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 22:22

April, I think you were referring to a red text on the on the document. I think those are those are comments from Joe Baker Barker.

AE **April Ehrlich** 22:26
Yes.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 22:28
Oh, I didn't see those.

AE **April Ehrlich** 22:30
Oh, I thought those were comments from you, Shasta. I was like, who's the stated?
Anyway, um, cool.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 22:31
Joe Barker.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 22:37
Maybe she can tell us or they. And then at our last meeting, Nick spoke up from the audience to say this, you know that we could expand the PRAS.
Capacity to look at records during a dispute. I think that's a good idea.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 23:01
I do too. I'm I'm curious if what Todd's thoughts on that one are.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 23:01
I don't think.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 23:07
I honestly don't think it's necessary right now or doesn't really connect to our current authority simply because we don't have the power to compel really outside of the formal dispute resolution process for state agencies in the executive branch. I have no authority to compel anyone to work with our office, so including any sort of requirement that.
A public body like must give me access to their records would go against the nature of our office and it was only I think frankly because of a watered down version of our

office was proposed that we got local support to create the office in the 1st place. So unless or until.

We're going to expand the duties of the office. Like, yeah, we like public bodies have to enter into mediation with us or we take over the A GS appellate process or something like that, or create an alternative system where we have more to do and others have to have to work with us.

I don't, I don't think we gain anything by requiring them to like give us access to their records. And I will say there is a process for submitting documentation to us for the formal dispute resolution process, at which point I could deem it confidential or not. So there is a way to handle records that we get.

Then I will say even when appealing to the A G or the DA, it's up to the public body to submit as much or as little information as they want. And that appellate statute actually says when necessary, they can actually they could just provide details about their records or otherwise summarize that information to the A G.

AG or DA. And I think that's because there are certain times when a public body cannot release confidential information under any circumstances. And so even there, if they choose to engage less with the AG or DA, the DA and AG still just has to go forward and make their decision with the information they have, which cannot work out for the public body, so.

Like, really, there's no reason to create parity at this point or even exceed what's required of the appellate process. Now I think it definitely is useful in a conversation about expanding our office's authority, like, for instance, in is it Massachusetts or Connecticut? No, Connecticut's Freedom of Information.

Office, I'm forgetting their official name. They have two branches. One side is like they started like us with one person and then two giving out advice. They now have an adjudicatory side that is firewalled from the advice side and it would make sense if we created a like a similar process to then have like requirements about sharing.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 25:29
Mm.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 25:35
Information, so on and so forth. But I think our statute as it exists works fine because I tell public bodies they don't have to talk to me, but I would like them to because I want to help and they do provide me with information sort of as needed or as much

as they're willing to.

I don't know. I just don't. I don't see a need. Plus I just don't know how to connect to like if we're like, oh, we can't make you do anything, but you have to give us this information and I don't really see how that connects to our current work. But I like the idea of discussing us doing more, having additional authority down the road and then.

Creating sort of information submission requirements go along with it.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 26:12

So in your experience, like 100% of agencies are like, yeah, totally, we'll work with you and here's why. And it seems reasonable.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 26:21

It's very rare for a public body not to respond to me at all or not to provide any information. Early on, I had a couple of public bodies say, how do I know you've been real and or you're a real government agency? And I would, you know, I would send them our website and say because I am. And then sometimes they would talk, but sometimes they won't. You know, some public bodies are very tight-lipped and just will say like, yeah, we think.

Think we did it right and don't want to participate. But most talk to us and at least provide explanations about why they're doing what they're doing. And certainly those that reach out to us themselves for help are rather expansive and provide a lot of information. But the truth is also a lot of these requests, like if a request involves someone who.

Ask for any and all emails between so-and-so over X amount of time and there's like 10,000 results. The issue really isn't me parsing those emails to figure out what isn't or what is or isn't responsive or what isn't or is confidential. It's more about like, is this an appropriate search? Are you charging the right amount of fees? Is a requester willing to pay that amount?

What's an effective way to review them for exemptions and then charge accordingly? So it's rare for me to have to look at the records themselves. And a lot of times public bodies are willing to share enough information with me to know what I need to know anyway when offering advice. So this hasn't arisen as an issue for me yet. I think I get where Nick.

Coming from because I think he'd like us to be able to do more, but adding this

provision to our statute on its own won't get us anywhere. Adding this would have to come with other things being added for us to do more effectively.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 27:53

Mhm.

Can you hear that?

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 27:56

And for the PRAC itself, we already have language in the statute that says public bodies are required to work with the council to the extent like, you know, confidentiality laws permit. So maybe even something like that for our office if we expand our abilities down the road would be enough.

SS Scott Stauffer 28:23

Enter.

AS Andrew Smith 28:25

Could I go back to, so this isn't on the policy side. So Shasta, the three of your first bullets to me, I mean the first kind of way for me to think of this, they don't seem to be policy or anything. It was about a grant, it was about flexibility and capacity. And the third one was about IT, right? So when you said they're not ready, what I thought in my head being staff is those ideas are plenty ready to get going in the legislative process because otherwise you're going to wait another two years. So if you wanted to try to at least get the legislature to think about those issues.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 28:46

Hmm.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 29:02

Yeah, you're the expert. Let's do it.

AS Andrew Smith 29:02

They could be in.

Well, we're not experts. We're the elected people who get to represent my bosses.

So, but no, the more you wait, the more it doesn't happen. So, I mean, you can put in

a bill that has a placeholder, potential IT discuss. I mean, you your bill doesn't have to be perfect. It can flag things that are essentially become an informational hearing there. I'm ready for.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 29:10
Yeah.

AS Andrew Smith 29:24
Bill, but you know, the bill will ripen or not ripen on its own. So I would just encourage you and my boss does this quite a bit. The bill does in some instances on policy, you want to cook the bill. But if it's not policy, don't wait to cook it. Just give it to us, give it, you know, it could be our boss, could be the agency, run a bill.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 29:28
Mhm.

AS Andrew Smith 29:41
And get the work going because it always takes longer than you think. So that would be my thought.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 29:49
OK, then let's talk about that. What do we think about forwarding on, you know, a policy on or a grant opportunities for agencies to hire and train public records coordinators?

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 30:05
My recommendation would be that would be a separate legislative concept from the from the three communication requirements that are more fully cooked because I I'm just really concerned about anyone getting ahead of us and trying to object to what are obviously grand ideas that need time to be developed but could ultimately result in some really good.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 30:16
M.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 30:24

Result in some really good outcomes. So I would, I just think it's important to separate them. Other than that, I mean, why not get the legislature talking? Even if they do know more than create an exploratory committee that some of us join and start building out concepts from could be great.

SS Scott Stauffer 30:43

Do you? Do you foresee?

AS Andrew Smith 30:43

And I so I don't want to contaminate your your ideas that are practical and you want to go. I mean I think the idea Todd of two bills or the money component because you have money in your bill that always sends it a weird way. So yeah, the notion that you wouldn't necessarily pack it all in one bill, but the notion that you would bring ideas forward.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 30:53

Yeah.

AS Andrew Smith 30:58

Again, sometimes, sometimes things get traction sooner than you think or there's, you know, most of it depends on resource guys. So it's not the great session what's coming up at all for that. But nonetheless, I don't. I mean, there's a little bit of a downside that somebody has to kind of articulate these things. Somebody has to be ready to help educate.

SS Scott Stauffer 31:07

OK.

AS Andrew Smith 31:18

The committee, but isn't that part of the work we're supposed to do? I mean this committee, at least on the issues?

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 31:20

Sure.

Yep.

Yeah, I mean it does kind of go together with #2, but it, you know, all three of those could be bills that are separate. But you know, I think you probably, I can't remember the word you use, but like an emergency management.

Memorandum of understanding or something like some sort of.

AE **April Ehrlich** 31:48

Yeah, it's a mutual mutual aid is is kind of what like fire agencies do, but also emergency managers do it where if there's a disaster in a certain area, emergency managers from other parts of the state who work for different counties will come and and help them.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 31:51

Yeah.

Mhm.

AE **April Ehrlich** 32:04

And we could, you know, potentially talk to them about how that works, because I imagine it's it's a little complicated because they're going from one county to another county that has totally different systems, but they they seem to have figured it out. So I think it's totally possible for a public records person to be able to do that too.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 32:24

So Andy and Scott, like you guys work, have worked in those kind of systems. Like if Scott, if Oregon City needed help all of a sudden, could you guys go over there and help them with their systems?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 32:35

I'm limited fashion. I think it's definitely a a creative space to explore. I like comparing it to the mutual fire rate agreements and we we network with each other. We have a professional state association of recorders that very much do this sort of work in terms of supporting each other.

Whether in the actual concept of going to another city and then getting into the the

weeds or working with them would be would be new, but I think it'd be a great space to explore to see where that that discussion goes. I kind of get the sense that we're maybe looking at 2 legislative batches. There's the communications bill, right? And then from at 1077, then there's like like mutual aid and also like shared funding support that maybe all three of those first three bullets Shasta proposed could be a bill together or however that the experts in legislature want to package them. But I'm liking that the concept of those two pieces, those two groups.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 33:30

Mhm.

Yep.

Cameron.

M **MILES Cameron D * GOV** 33:37

I think the biggest problem you would have with a kind of mutual aid agreement is that you have confidentiality, you have attorney-client privilege, you have other things that would not transfer to that new employee. So you would waive all your confidentiality.

You would have maybe statutes violated for sharing stuff outside the office by bringing someone in that wasn't part of that office. So you would have to have it strongly written so that any confidentiality, privilege or anything, you would have to treat them as an employee of that public body that they came into in order for that to really work.

And so that and it is doable, but it would be very complicated. Like Scott said, it's not, it's not like going out and helping fight a fire or something. This is a different stuff when you're sharing confidential information.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 34:27

It's good to know.

AE **April Ehrlich** 34:28

That makes sense. I know I've seen that happen before between state agencies, but I would assume it's a more long-term thing. Like when DEQ had their data breach, they had somebody from ODOT for like a year or two who helped them with the public relations part of it. So I I think.

That's probably why they assumed that person as an employee, 'cause then they had some some confidentiality at that point.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 34:56

Yeah, that's why I like the idea of putting these all together in one legislative concept. So we could propose a suite of solutions that, if any and all are approved, it becomes a toolbox that public bodies could choose to draw on at their discretion and certainly.

Would they within themselves would have to then address things like confidentiality, indemnification and everything else, and that we wouldn't even necessarily have to get into the weeds on that because that would be up to them to work out amongst existing agreements. Although perhaps a further step of our office, if this were to become law, is that we could start creating some template agreements.

Well researched to help public bodies get started on creating these so it's not so scary right out of the right out of the gate. Not least of which because a lot of local public bodies are small and actually use contract attorneys as they're like, you know, city or county or special District Attorney. They'd want to work with them.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 35:51

Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 35:51

But if we could get them started, we could probably save them some time and money and make it more more palatable to do it.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 35:57

Is that something that, like, I'm just imagining that like, you know, this happens, that a public body gets kind of swamped with requests? I know it happened when Portland Public Schools got that lead in water scandal.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:01

Yeah.

Yeah.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 36:13

And would they like then be able to come to you as a public records advocate and be like, and then you go, you know what? I have this toolkit and here's here you go.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:23

I mean, honestly, I'm not trying to take this on without more staff, but I would be a resource to explain it. I would create specific trainings around it. I wouldn't run it. It would just be the law that permits them to do it. And we would do our best to offer best practices, you know, templates.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 36:27

Yeah.
Right.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:38

Etcetera. And assist them in that way. But yeah, definitely not administer it. And like for instance, if the state's going to start offering grants, unless they want to give me a new staff member to administer those grants and like, make sure the money's taken care of and everything else, we can't, we can't run it, but we could sure as hell help with it and explain it and you know, anything else that's necessary.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 36:54

Mhm.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 36:58

Necessary.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 36:59

Mhm. Yep.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 37:00

I don't know if it's exactly, it's definitely exactly the same concept, but there is Todd, as you you might be familiar with, there's the Oregon Records Management Solution, which is an IGA that is State Archives and a private consulting firm called ***** Consulting.

And then a number of local cities, Milwaukee being one of them and school districts

and state agencies where we sign on to a shared record to electronic records management storage system. And I would think that somewhere in that language of that that IGA there that addresses what Cameron mentioned in terms of confidentiality and.

Accessing other agencies records. I know that's exactly not exactly the same concept of mutual aid we're talking about, but I got to think or wonder if there's something in that arrangement where it's the state, bunch of local school districts and cities and and a private consultant working in the shared records. Space.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 37:56

It probably does offer useful guidance and language. And you know, when we bring this, maybe when we if we're going to keep continue drafting this concept in the subcommittee, Stephanie's not a part of it. But of course she oversees ORMS for State Archives. So we can maybe get her to come as a guest and talk to us about some of that to better understand how they make it work. Coincidentally, our office.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 38:07

Sure.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 38:16

This is in the process of signing up for ORMS to archive all prior council meetings. So I'll be getting I'll be getting that assistance from archives too soon enough.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 38:23

Right.

AE **April Ehrlich** 38:26

So I'm I'm just trying to think about.

How this could help agencies when they are getting inundated during an event like the lead in the water thing and I I guess guidance I think is really helpful, but I'm sure what they really need is capacity.

And I think what might help with that is something like what the governor's office does, where they post all of the public records requests they've had and the responses to those requests. Because I think in in times of high volume, they're

probably getting a lot of the same requests.

And what could cut down on that workload is just sharing what they've already shared with others. I don't know, just thinking about in terms of helping with capacity.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 39:22

That might be a part of that. We lean into the the thought process behind the first bullet grant opportunities and basically how do you get more funding dedicated for records?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 39:23

Um.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 39:35

To respond to that the type of situations.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 39:39

You know, there is a timeliness factor to all this, though. So let's say like all our concepts succeed and there's now a pool of state money they can draw from and or a pool of potential employees that could be, you know, seconded from other state agencies or local governments to assist with public records requests. Public bodies still have deadlines to respond to individual public.

Public records request and I don't know how quickly we, you know, the state especially or any government can create a responsive process that would allow them to get help on a particularly onerous public records request and the time required by statute.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 40:14

Well, but the the release valve on that is that, you know, I can't remember what the exact wording is, but that yeah, it's like that you can't do it because you don't have enough staff. So this solves that problem.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 40:15

So yeah.

The safety valve provision.

I mean, maybe, you know, certainly OHSU got dinged by the Court of Appeals and in Defense of Animals versus OHSU for not hiring additional part-time staff to process that very large public records request that led to the lawsuit.

So, I mean, it's certainly something that's been thought of. Yeah, I don't know. It'll be interesting to see how that works out. And maybe that would become a factor in deciding if a public body responded in a timely, faster or not. Staff wasn't available, but they applied to that process or program and had to wait for an answer. Might become a reason why it's acceptable to delay.

Response to a public records request.

AE April Ehrlich 41:13

OK.

So to summarize what we're looking at here and what we've talked about, I mean, Shasta, could you help me out here? Are we talking about two different bills?

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 41:25

Yeah. So, yeah, well, I mean, so the the third one is around IT solutions. And I mean, frankly, I just don't know enough about IT to know what the solutions would be. But I know that we, you know, in the survey people were asking for, you know, more centralized tracking.

Shared, you know, software licensing, redaction systems, digital storage. And you know, I I also think that AI is going to be huge and we need to start utilizing those tools where appropriate.

So yeah, I mean, to me it's kind of like a a big question mark, but something that I'm definitely interested in pursuing and would love to get, you know, more knowledgeable people than me in the conversation about it.

So maybe folks on this room can help me out. So the state CIO is Terrence Woods, is that right at the enterprise or something? Because I reached out to them last week and I haven't heard back at all, so I don't know how to get a hold of them, but.

SS Scott Stauffer 42:26

Yes.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 42:29

Yeah.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 42:35

You know, it would be really good to get an update from techie type people on what's going on already in the state as far as records processing and transparency, 'cause I'm sure that we're not the only people thinking about this.

But for now, I mean, I feel like, you know, just kind of proposing, you know, sort of a, I like the way Todd put it like here's a toolkit and here's a solutions focused bill that's separate from the communication stuff that's already been vetted. But this is kind of our new vehicle, our new concept to kind of discussing.

You know the next wave of solutions.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 43:22

Maybe a way forward is, well, on the three communication requirements, I'm going to propose specific language about adding the rationale for denying public interest fee waiver reduction. And then we could, as a subcommittee, vote on those like, OK, we feel like those are ready to go. We're going to hold on to those, put them aside. And then we could start drafting our concepts that don't have to be fully developed, but understood by us for the second legislative concept. And we could invite testimony and so on and so forth as we work forward on those.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 43:57

Yeah, that sounds great.

SS Scott Stauffer 44:00

As a part of that process too, I was gonna ask. I know we've talked about the Sunshine Committee before and I I agree with your remarks there. Shasta about opportunity to work that that's the Sunshine Committee working also to make things simpler.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 44:07

Yeah.

SS Scott Stauffer 44:16

Is this an opportunity to make a connection with them? I I know we've talked about that and there's been, I don't know if it's historical, just to this point, we have the

PRAC and the Sunshine Committee haven't really connected as far as I know, but is this an opportunity to try to start a conversation with that group?

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 44:34

Yeah, I intended a few months ago to go to one of their meetings and I never end up being able to, but I'll look up again when they meet. I know Mark Landauer is on both Prac and Sunshine Committee and we were hoping that he would give us an update at the next in person council meeting.

SS Scott Stauffer 44:51

Right, Friday.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 44:55

Yeah, coming right up.

Yeah. So I think that sounds good. So Todd, so you'll send back and and would you, will you also do the language on around actual cost that this fee estimate or explanation thing wouldn't be included in actual cost? or however you want to put that.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 45:24

Yes.

I'll I'll update that too with some language.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 45:28

Hi Andy, thank you so much for your encouragement.

AE April Ehrlich 45:35

All right. Are we done with the discussion of legislative concepts?

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 45:42

Well, I I just want to make sure I understand our path forward. So at the next, before the next meeting, I'll provide updated language and then I suppose we'll start. Well, my suggestion is like I said, and I think it's pretty obvious, we'll then finalize the communication requirements.

AE **April Ehrlich** 45:42
Oh.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 45:58
Recommendations and then continue working on the 2nd legislative concept, which is potentially all three of chef's ideas in one. So do we have any April? Do we have any marching orders, duties or mandates to make that happen for the next meeting like?
Do you want to try to invite people or do anything else by the next meeting? Or do we want to just start talking about this more in the next meeting?

AE **April Ehrlich** 46:28
Not entirely sure. So we got you providing some updated language.
Uh, I don't know. Shasta, what do you think?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 46:40
OK, so you're gonna send the subcommittee out like the written, like edited version of those 3 concepts as one thing. And then us as a yeah, you right now.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 46:50
Oh, me. Oh, sorry. No, because there it's. I mean what? What? There's not much more to say at this point than what you've already put in there. So I'm, I'm curious. So I really don't think I have anything to do more on that at the moment, but I think we need to continue developing that and maybe Andy can help us in terms of.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 47:00
Yeah.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 47:10
Like how vague or how specific? Because I mean it could be something as simple as the legislature shall, the legislature shall direct whatever subcommittee or whatever to study blah and that could start the discussion. So I don't know. I think we need a little guidance on what form we want these concepts to take and therefore that.
Dictate what we need to do to get there.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 47:32

Oh, OK. I mean, I was just thinking like, so as a subcommittee, I don't think we're ready to vote on those 3 communication concepts yet because we don't have the final language. But once we vote on it, it will go to the full council and then the full council will send it to the legislator, right?

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 47:34

I think did he leave?

Agreed. Yeah, agreed.

Well, yeah, I mean the full council debate and vote and may change it further. But do we want to do that piece meal like we because we'll almost likely get the three communication recommendations ready first. So we could send that to the full council and so we could work on that while we continue to work on the other stuff.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 47:51

Yeah.

SS Scott Stauffer 48:02

OK.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 48:03

Yeah.

Yeah, I think that we should, you know, first get the communications ones out of the subcommittee, but I think we need another meeting so that we can vote on the final language to forward to the council. So that would be one agenda item and then the next one would be our kind of.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 48:29

Continuing and develo.

SM Shasta Kearns Moore 48:29

Next box of, yeah, legislative concepts.

AP ALBERT Todd * PRA 48:32

OK, yeah, so finalize and vote on communication recommendations and then continue drafting. Let's call it the toolkit concept.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 48:47

Yeah, let's call it that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 48:48

OK.

OK. And then we can come back to this at the end when we're discussing topics for the next meeting, but that makes sense to me as next steps. So thank you.

AE **April Ehrlich** 49:00

Did we? We haven't already scheduled another subcommittee meeting. Gray. Is that something we should discuss now or vote in a Doodle poll?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:09

Yeah, I think that's, I think that's, yeah, I think that's like our last agenda item.

AE **April Ehrlich** 49:13

OK, cool. Then I will hold off on that. Anything else on legislative concepts?

OK. Moving on to public comments. Hi, Joe, let me, yeah, go ahead and and go Joe and introduce yourself and all that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:24

Nope.

AE **April Ehrlich** 49:50

Todd, do you have the ability to unmute Joe?

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 49:55

I believe so. I'm gonna give it a try.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 49:59

I think I did it. I did it. Thank you. I had. I had the previous notes of control shift M
Thank you. Sorry, I get ready to talk and I get a frog in my throat.

AP

ALBERT Todd * PRA 50:00

Oh yeah, very good.

JB

Jo A. Barker 50:15

Todd, I want to thank you so much for passing out my grossly misspelled comments, and thank you, April, for raising the state Attorney General issue.

I do have a concern with the five day notification. Well, two points, one being a formal council person and subject to recall the five day provision for getting back to a public records response on that.

Is the dead-end deal. I mean, it's short, sweet, straight to the point, and I actually think that there should be an exception or exemption to public recall ballots.

When it comes to public records requests, because you, you know, as a recall council person, you have the right to know what someone is saying about you and you have the right to respond. Well, if they wait till the 5th day and your fifth day, your comment has to be up with this with the Secretary of State.

You're already behind the 8 ball addressing Andrew's issue and still playing nice with Scott on the five day provision. Andrew made a really interesting point.

Should we exclude weekends and a simple word of business, you know, five business days that makes it clear in most issues.

Um.

When it comes to the two bullet points under the SB .3 actually covers all of them because if.

A government body has a website or an inability to have a website. They have. They have to disclose how they come up with their fee structure, what is covered.

You know the time frame, the whole 9 yards. So that to me, bullet three should actually be the guiding light of the fee structure, this and that, because that's supposed to be included.

Within the disclosure of how public records are made, fee cost this and that instead of being caught blindsided.

You know, with, Oh well, we're adding, you know, 50% salary because this person reviewed. Then you're paying 100% salary of this. And when I say salary, I mean hourly wage, you're paying 100% of this person, then you're paying an extra 25 to 50. per page, anything over \$10, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Some agencies that I have heard make comments state that anything under 10 pages is gratis. That does cut

into the financial bottom line.

Under Todd's concept, but it would appear fair for the larger inundated records request for emergencies such as the lead fire, whatever.

Then the last comment, Shasta, I like your ideas with the grant opportunities because I can see both sides one for.

How it's to be created and how it's to be funded. I also see Todd's point of who's actually going to be involved in this and if we have a floater where someone from Prac has to go.

To a hot spot.

They need it. They need bodies themselves because Prack itself, the the advocates are actually the designated go-to person. They're pretty much vested with privacy, confidentiality issues. At least in my mind, I could be completely wrong.

But that's an ideological thought in my world, so I would actually change the word agency to government body.

That way it covers everybody without saying, well, you got agencies and departments, and those two things mean different concepts depending on where you're at in the government structure. The executive branch has departments, agencies.

They're both state and federal, depending on which arena you're coming from, but that's just me. Um.

Shared software that gets into some real sticky issues with connectivity and linking, and we're no strangers to data breaches, whether it's Experian, our banking institution.

Chins.

Our go-to service providers like, well, Walmart, Target, you know, I'm just throwing companies out now without pointing fingers.

I think just a basic high-level security requirement, you know, double firewalls without actually infringing on the sovereignty of the governing body on what they deem is.

High security risk issues, nationally poor access to the financial government, you know, financial budget that is definitely that needs to be put in a sealed vault in my mind.

But yeah, the state attorney general issue, that's basically in concept. So there's like 3 separate parts within the public records request where at one point at least 50 to 75% of these meld as to.

What portion of this entity's records are not to be released? Health inspectors? You're not allowed to give out their badges. You're not allowed to give out investigative issues, blah, blah, blah, blah, who their clients are, but. You know, those span across all three and and I think if those were mind melded together for simplicity, it might help. But you know, I'm sure the state Attorney General has reasons why they shouldn't be. So thank you for letting me babble. Oh, one other thing on the last bullet on the appeals process, I can see two arenas here. I can see the administrative appeal process. You know, that's just basically among Pratt local agencies.

I should say governing bodies. And then there is also the litigation side that creates a whole completely different issue with respects to confidentiality, lawyers negotiating amongst lawyers what's being presented.

But it also creates A liability indemnity issue with Prac if one of their employees is called to testify or be an expert witness. So I think I and I do like the concept that you raised Todd with Connecticut, I really do.

do like that concept. That sounds something to really look forward to. But yeah, I'm not sure if, yeah.

AE **April Ehrlich** 58:37

Thank. Thank you, Joe. I'm gonna, I don't mean to interrupt, but we have a couple other folks who want to give comments and yeah.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 58:44

No, I understand that and I do thank you for allowing the time.

AE **April Ehrlich** 58:48

Great. Thank you, Mindy.

L **LANE Mindy J * WRD** 58:54

Good afternoon. I apologize I stepped here in the middle, but there were three topics that I felt like we could relate to here at Oregon Water Resources Department. I'm a former public records coordinator here and I'm currently in a limited duration.

JB **Jo A. Barker** 59:00

OK.

L **LANE Mindy J * WRD** 59:13

Role as supervisor supervising the public records coordinator. So our agency just got a dedicated public records coordinator position within the last two years and we can relate to the struggle of getting in on dated.

With requests and especially the thousands of emails, we recently got a request that came back around 40,000 emails because it couldn't be narrowed. And so the Third Point I wanted to say that we can relate to is we sometimes have to use that release valve as you called it that.

We just don't have enough staffing. So I was, I'm glad I was here today to hear that the precedent from OHSU, Todd, that you mentioned. Thanks for letting me be here.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:00:04

Thank you. Next we have Alex. Could you introduce yourself?

DA **Downing, Alex** 1:00:11

Hey, everyone. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak today. My name is Alex Downing. I'm the City Recorder at the City of Corn of Vallis and I know a couple of you on this call. So hello. I serve as the Records Manager for our jurisdiction and I just had some comments I wanted to share specifically relating to your.

Discussion of Shasta's proposed legislative concepts, I think the IT solution that you've been discussing.

What I understand to be sort of like a public private partnership for a soft software that would help agencies with submitting tracking and fulfilling records requests similar to like Gov QA or next request or one of those solutions. I just wanted to speak in strong support of that legislative.

Concept. I think it is really. It's like a win win idea for both requesters and agencies. I just, I see this as being something that would be really widely supported and I think it's the most direct and high impact solution to.

The responses that you collected in your recent survey, and I also think that there's a model for it with the ORMS product for records management. So I think it kind of provides that same support to.

The public and agencies, but on the on the disclosure side. And then I also think it especially supports smaller jurisdictions with limited budgets and resources, which I think comes up a lot as as that's an issue that this group and others are trying to

solve.

And then I saw in the chat, I think Lila had commented that Oregon has an enterprise contract with Gov QA, which I didn't know about, might be something worth exploring. I do know in my own experience and information from colleagues that that software is.

Cost prohibitive for a lot of jurisdictions. So focusing on a solution that would be have some cost savings there I think is a good idea. So just wanted to again love this idea. I think we have a lot of there's a lot of people across the street state that would be willing to.

Work on it and partner on that concept. And then the other ideas that were brought up, the mutual aid idea, I do think it's it's interesting to think about practically. I have a a hard time envisioning how that would work.

Like that at just at a local government level where you know a town of 60,000, if we got inundated with requests trying to onboard somebody who doesn't understand our system and you know a lot of the systems aren't super well organized or intuitive. So it's really.

It would be hard to have somebody who could be really helpful in that moment. So that that one I do have some questions on, but I do think that grant opportunities concept is a good one to explore as well, especially funding for training for people because I know that's always a need.

I don't know what. So thanks for the time and for the discussion.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:03:43

Right. Any other public comments?

Alright, gonna close that part of the meeting and now we will talk about when we will meet next.

So do we wanna meet in like 2 weeks?

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:04:00

Uh, it's.

Yeah, I was gonna say next week I'm out, but this day and time works pretty well.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:04:10

I am out that week after next.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:04:13
OK.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:04:14
Maybe first week in May.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:04:17
That works for me May 6th.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:04:19
Works for me.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:04:20
Oh, you're proposing that you said May 6th?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:04:24
Two weeks, 3 weeks from the day May 6th at noon works.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:04:27
Yeah, I can do that.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:04:30
I just need. I just need to check my calendar. Sorry, one SEC.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:04:30
Yep.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:04:35
Six. Oh, I'm actually out of the office for the second-half of the day, but I could do 11 with a hard out of 12 on the 6th, unless you guys can do the 5th or the 7th.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:04:52
I can do either.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:04:53

I can do the 5th.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:04:55

Me too.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:04:59

Yeah, 5th at noon.

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:05:00

I guess.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:05:00

May 5th at noon. OK, I'll send out an invite. I mean, we don't. We don't have Mark's feedback if he's available or Rep Anderson, but maybe I could. Maybe I could send an e-mail to them first, making sure they're available. What do you think? OK.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:05:03

Hey.

Are you guys also available on the 7th at noon?

SS **Scott Stauffer** 1:05:17

Yep.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:05:18

OK, then maybe let's let them pick from those.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:05:18

I am.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:05:21

Good idea. I will do that. Let me just open an e-mail before I forget. Next meeting. OK, I will send it to them and hopefully they'll be available.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:05:23

It.

Okay. Thank you.

AE **April Ehrlich** 1:05:36

OK. See you all Friday. Bye.

AP **ALBERT Todd * PRA** 1:05:36

All right. Thanks everybody. Take care.

SM **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:05:37

Right.

● **ALBERT Todd * PRA** stopped transcription