

# PRAC Legislative Subcommittee Meeting-20260611\_120206-Meeting Recording

June 11, 2026, 7:02PM

1h 0m 46s

● **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** started transcription

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 0:06

Okay, since we're recording now, get the meeting started. First we need to approve the agenda. Does somebody want to make a motion for that?

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 0:20

Move to approve the agenda.

**ML** **Mark Landauer** 0:23

Second.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 0:24

All those in favor, say aye.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 0:27

All right.

**SS** **Scott Stauffer** 0:27

Hi.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 0:28

And.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 0:28

Moving on. So next, we're going to do testimony and invited speakers regarding potential public records related legislative concepts.

**SS** **Scott Stauffer** 0:30

Ohh.

 **April Ehrlich** 0:40

Who's our invited speaker today?

Hi, Chris.

 **Scott Stauffer** 0:45

Hi, April.

 **April Ehrlich** 0:47

Why don't you go ahead and introduce yourself and yeah, go on ahead.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 0:53

Sure. So my name is Chris Stenson. I'm the State Records Manager. I work for the Oregon State Archives, which is a division of the Secretary of State's office. And I have been asked here to talk a little bit about our electronic records management project that we've been offering for a long time. And

I don't necessarily have prepared remarks, so I don't know if I was just here to answer questions or if you'd like me to give a little background blurb to start off. I'm at your discretion.

 **April Ehrlich** 1:22

Yeah, I think we were hoping to kind of pick your brain to help us come up with these legislative concepts. I see somebody had their hand up here. Was it Scott? Scott? There you are. Go ahead.

 **Scott Stauffer** 1:35

Can you guys hear me?

Yeah, okay. Sorry. I can hear you. I can hear you all. New computer. Yay for technology. I just wanted to do a quick preface that I, following our last conversation, I extended an invitation to several groups to come and be with us and chat about legislative concepts. And State Archives was able to join. I see a few city recorder colleagues have joined.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 1:37

Yeah.

 **April Ehrlich** 1:37

Yes, can you hear me?

Okay, great.

 **Scott Stauffer** 1:59

I also send invitations to city information technology managers. And a thing I think I talked about last time, the municipal research center out of Washington. And I didn't get much of a response. I heard from someone, but I don't know that they are on here. So greetings if anyone from there is on here. But I send the invitation to

 **nickbud5 nickbud5** 2:14

And.

 **Scott Stauffer** 2:18

I like these folks to be part of the conversation and sort of discuss the concepts. And I didn't mean to put anyone on the spot, Chris, or anybody in terms of providing an overview. I think maybe at most, I thought, especially archives with the Oregon Records Management Solution, Chris, if you can provide the 30 second elevator pitch about what ORMS is.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 2:26

Okay.

Yeah.

 **Scott Stauffer** 2:38

And I think that'll go other ways in helping the subcommittee and the members and the attendees appreciate how ORMS is an example of one of the legislative concepts. I think especially the third one. So that was my preface to anybody who wants to speak on that. And I appreciate Chris and anyone being here.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 2:45


Yep.

Mhm.


Sure. Yeah, so I can give a little blurb about this. I've done it plenty of times. So the

Oregon Records Management Solution, collectively known as ORMS, that's usually how you hear it referred to as, is a public-private partnership that's been ongoing since about 2011. It was


**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 2:58  
I.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 3:18  
up at the time as a potential solution for a variety of levels of government to have access to electronic records management tools that they would not necessarily be able to afford or implement on their own. So hence the sort of consortial approach. The key tenet of it is that our private partners at Shabs Consulting and Erican Incorporated, the two partner

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 3:21  
Yes.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 3:42  
entities, essentially provide the technological backbone, do the business side of it, and all the stuff going along with that, host the software. This uses an electronic records management system software currently called Content Manager. It's gone through a number of name changes over the years, but functionally it's a large, robust repository that allows agencies to track.

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 3:43  
F.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 4:03  
to manage and track records for retention, access, et cetera, for their whole lifespans. And by doing this sort of consortial approach, basically it operates where rather than having to procure the licenses, do the infrastructure, support all the IT themselves, public entities in Oregon have the option to sign on to it and operate it like a subscription as a service or a, yeah, subscription. Yeah, software as a service, brain's not working right. Software as a service model where, and that's all again handled on the private side. Archives is not involved in

that aspect of it. But it provides essentially for predictable and relatively low subscription fees instead of unknown infrastructure costs and all the technology and expertise that are required thereof, right? So archives is involved largely because.

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 4:34

The.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 4:49

since we're the ones that set retention for the state and we already advise agencies on how to manage that. We were involved very, very heavily in the early days with getting people up and operating, training people on it, getting operated. As the project has gone through a number of phases over the years,

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 4:51

You.

Yeah.

Yes.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 5:08

We now find ourselves in more of a records consulting role. We work with agencies to identify their areas of need. We help them with their structure and destructions of records and things like that. But a lot of the actual training of users and all that stuff has kind of been shifted back to our partners over time.

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 5:24

I.

Yeah.


 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 5:28


So that's kind of the model was shipped a little. Scott, the city of Milwaukee was there in the early days and they remember, you know, the boots on the ground then. So currently there's roughly 100 implementations plus 100, 120. It flexed around a little bit across the state representing pretty much all levels of government. We've got special districts, school districts, state agencies, cities, counties, et cetera.

So yeah, that's essentially the kind of the broad strokes of it. Happy to answer questions you may have about how it operates or any of those things.


 **nickbud5 nickbud5** 5:53  
If.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 5:59  
Go ahead, Mark.

 **April Ehrlich** 5:59  
Quick.  
Yeah.

 **Mark Landauer** 6:02  
Thank you, Chris. It's good to see you again. And I represent the Special Districts Association of Oregon, and I know we went through some retention rulemaking not too long ago. I'm really curious about this system and whether or not you mentioned, I think, that some 100 other public bodies have piggybacked on to this. And my question is, honestly, this is the first time I've heard of this. And I think that that may be

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 6:37  
Mm.

 **Mark Landauer** 6:41  
a problem because if I don't know about it, it's likely that the vast majority of my members don't know about it. And I would suspect that that's the case with other local government associations being the school boards or the cities or the counties. I'm wondering if your office has any publications that the local government associations can put in their newsletters to make our members at the local level more aware of this opportunity because I think that this could be a very valuable tool to a lot of public bodies who frankly don't know this opportunity even exists. And so I would really like to potentially work with your office or those involved with this



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 7:38

No problem.



**ML Mark Landauer** 7:40

to get the word out about this, because sometimes just the lack of communication, it can be a stumbling block to transparency. And it sounds to me as though this is a unique opportunity for local governments to be able to piggyback onto something that the state has tried and tested



**AE April Ehrlich** 8:02

That's.



**ML Mark Landauer** 8:02

for over 15 years. And so I would really like to hopefully learn more about this and the cities, the counties, the school boards, and whoever, maybe the community colleges need to know about it as well as public entities who could piggyback on this.



**NN nickbud5 nickbud5** 8:16

But.



**ML Mark Landauer** 8:22

with very little fanfare and a lot of benefit at the end of the day. So thank you.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 8:28

Yeah, just all real quick. Short answer is yes, absolutely. We'd be happy to do that. Longer story is I would acknowledge that probably the special districts are the area in which we have made the least in roads, I think, over time. We were involved really heavily with OAMR early on, the city recorders group. So we're



**SS Scott Stauffer** 8:40


Yeah.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 8:48

We're well known within that community, and it's been kind of a slow percolation elsewhere. We have a few water districts and other special districts, but not a whole lot. So on my team, I have a OMS administrator that I can put you in touch with, and he's my guy that leads that project. I used to do that before I was the manager. And Matt is his name, and he can talk to you about providing a presentation or a demo for your members, however, whatever you might like. So sure.


 **nickbud5 nickbud5** 9:10  
The.


 **Mark Landauer** 9:17  
Sorry, just trying to find my mic. That would be really helpful, Chris. I think that that would go a long way for some folks who frankly just don't have the staff nor the resources. And this seems to me like a potential terrific ave for us to promote additional transparency.


 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 9:21  
Yeah.

 **Scott Stauffer** 9:23  
The.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 9:29  
Of course.

 **Mark Landauer** 9:40  
With the 4th leg of the stool being the special districts.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 9:45  
Great.

 **April Ehrlich** 9:47  
Shasta.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 9:53

Sorry, thank you. So my question is, what sort of like transparency by design concepts do you have in the ORMS system? Like, are there any ways in which your data organization is ordered around, you know, this is PPI?

We're not going to personally protected information that will never be released, but this is public and can be easily released.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 10:25

That's a good question, Shasta. Thank you. So this software, it's extremely robust. It's kind of a big empty box when you take it out of the package, so to speak. And we have configured it in such a way to make it as easy as possible. You can accomplish what you're describing through a number of means. The most basic thing is We build in asset classification levels, which roughly correspond to the state enterprise level one. So you have level one through 4 data. And that in itself carries certain levels of security. There are lots of different security groups that are created. And this happens with each entity that joins as part of the consultation, which is What kind of records are you going to be using this for, at least initially? What are the security and access needs of those, right? And so we help configure that as well as security groups within your user base, right? So if you have 10 users, there may be a couple of different security groups, so some people can see some things, some others. One of the notable things to your point is when you put information in there that is

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 11:08

Mmh.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 11:26


capital P public from day one, right? The sort of stuff, say board meeting minutes or things like that, right? Used by a lot of our city reporters for city council meeting, things like that. You can declare it published from Go. We essentially create a template that does publishing. And then there is a portal, a web portal called Web Drawer that proactively publishes it out.

And then you are able to, at your organization, are able to link to that. You can actually pre-create searches if you want to make it easier for your users. You can pre-

create searches and load those as hot links that people can click on, and it'll send them right to what they're looking for. Otherwise, it's a blank portal where they can search in it like any other search engine.

So obviously, the limitations as always are what kind of metadata is assigned to those records, how well titled are they? Because if you just give people a free search, if they're expecting Google, it's not that, right? It doesn't have the level of processing power. So it does have to match up some information. But if that's a known desire, we consult with agencies and talk to them about, well, like anything, this is how you should organize it.

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 12:12  
The.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 12:24  
This is your naming convention, so you can be consistent. So then you and your users can find it. So absolutely. And then on the opposite end of it, if you lock things down, yeah, thanks, Matt. Matt's throwing a link in there to show you what that looks like. If you want things really locked down, you assign them a higher security classification, and nobody that has those can see it. So there's no accidental. There's no accidental release of that information if it needs to be protected for one reason or another. So you say you've got HR information in there or legal information, things like that. To that extent, just as a side note on that, it's fully robust to be able to create, say, litigation holds and things like that in there as well, or if there's pending information requests, those actions essentially you create a tag and can tag groups of records, which will then suspend any sort of schedule destruction or anything like that until you release that tag, right? So it allows you to control, which also preserves those as legally required, you know, in those types of events.

**NN** **nickbud5 nickbud5** 13:27  
I...

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 13:28  
So, my understand, I mean, is the cost of obtaining this program like prohibitive to like smaller governments? I'd like to understand what the price may be.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 13:41

Yeah, so your mileage may vary because what is expensive to some people isn't to others. So generally speaking, it the it is there's excuse me, let me rephrase myself. It's Matt, can you help me out on what the current because the my brain is a few years old because there's been some cost increases with storage, but it's still roughly



**nickbud5 nickbud5** 13:53

Yes.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 14:02

But 400 and change a month is the minimum price because that covers 10 licenses. That's essentially the smallest that our partners can do and actually make it sustainable. So I think Matt can give me the currently. It was 37 for a long time and I think it might be 39 per user license now with a 10 user minimum.



**BROWN Matthew G \* SOS** 14:15

Three.

We.

39, roughly 39.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 14:21

So, so...



**BROWN Matthew G \* SOS** 14:22

Yep, sorry. Oh, that's right. It went from 37 to 39 per user per month, a minimum of 10 users.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 14:24

What was that, Matt?

Thank you.

Yeah.

Thank you, Matt. This is Matt Brown from my team. He's my ORMS administrator. So he's involved in the day-to-day operations of it these days. So yeah, obviously that's not a big slice of, say, the big state agency budget, but I do hear from some very

small entities and, you know, even that can be hard. It's just we can't operate it any smaller than that and actually remain above.  
Ground, you know.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 14:57

I mean, it seems like it'd be realistic, at least for cities and counties, like a good chunk of cities and counties. Shasta?

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 15:01

Generally so.  
Yeah.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 15:06

Yeah, thanks. So my other question was around public records requests and fulfillment. Is that like integrated into this? Is there a pathway for, you know, somebody who's requesting records from a ORMS using entity to like go into a portable?  
portal and request those records.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 15:29

it does not have that native functionality. So it's a back-end program designed for that. So you can identify, you can create a case in the system essentially for a public records request, create a hold for those records, but ultimately production of those records would involve pulling them out and providing through another portal. Or some agencies choose to do, you know, when somebody's asked for it, if it's not restricted, you just publish it out for all. You actually can do that as well, and you can then essentially create a saved search and share this link with people. But no, it doesn't track automatically. There are functions in it that would allow you to do it if you wanted to. You can create workflows, things like that.  
but it's not natively designed and that aspect requires some work and it's not the most, it's not off the shelf ready for that. Like you might picture a specific piece of software made just for public records requests.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 16:19

Okay, so a follow-up to that would be what would you need in order to make it do that?



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 16:26

That's a big question, and one which would really involve, well, that would really involve our partners more because there would be some sort of programming. We, excuse me, third party additions or modules, so to speak, have been created for this. There's an open API which allows the software to be plugged into all sorts of things. Can it be done in the specifics of each case really depends on a lot of different variables.



**SM Shasta Kearns Moore** 16:28

Andy.

Boo.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 16:48

And then there's usually, you know, there's some cost involved because they have to program it and support it. I think it's a conversation that our partners might be interested, are always interested in having those conversations, but we probably need to scope that a lot more specifically. And then they would have to look at what's currently available. It's a big piece of software that's used around the world. So a lot of people have used it for different things. But as you know, it's sometimes case by case.



**SM Shasta Kearns Moore** 17:16

Oh, so it's, so is there another name for it that's not ORMS?



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 17:21

Well, Content Manager, so it's currently, the software itself is currently owned by a company called OpenText, and it's just called CM, Content Manager. It's gone by different names over the years, used to be HP for a long time and other things. But ORMS is the name for our unique public-private partnership we operate here in Oregon.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 17:41

Yeah.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 17:43

But Content Manager is the software. So I think Matt's taking notes on this, I know, and certainly he and our will liaise with our partners. And if there's a desire to talk, you know, talk technical turkey, that's a really terrible, I shouldn't have said that, that was dumb. It just came out. I'm sure they'd be happy to talk to you about what kind of scope that would look like and kind of maybe talk ballpark.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 17:43

Mmh.

Yeah.

But...

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 18:04

realistic, you know, if it can be done or not.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 18:06

Okay, thank you.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 18:08

Mhm.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 18:09

Tom?

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 18:12

Hey, Chris, good to see you. Thank you for joining us today. This is incredibly helpful, especially because as you may know, our office will be onboarding ORMS soon to primarily store all of our meetings records, which I think is great. I just want to circle back for a minute to the license question. So there's two of us. There's only going to be two of us for a very...



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 18:14

Me too.

Yep.

Yeah.



**ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 18:31

time. I had to pay for a minimum of 10 licenses and I get it like that's sort of like the bare minimum price point where it's still functional and maybe profitable.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 18:32

Yeah.

Yeah.



**ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 18:42

Is there an option for sharing these licenses? Like if two other small public bodies that also only have one or two people wanted to get in on our 10 licenses and share the cost, is there a way to divvy that up or are those 10 licenses in some way sort of like locked into our agency and our needs and our, you know, in our computer system?



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 19:01

Thanks, Todd. That's a good question and actually one we have fielded quite a bit over the years. There's sometimes been discussion that could you do essentially like a little local consortium, right, of small entities, things like that. It could maybe be done. The chief barriers against it are there's a certain amount of infrastructure necessary for connecting to different sites.



**ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 19:10

Mhm.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 19:24

And part of the cost is involved with, so say if you're on a different network than those that are, you're within a different network than those that you are partnering with, essentially that's a second setup and a second set of permissions and things.

And so there's costs associated with that, which is part of it. Now, I'm not going to say it's impossible because there are certain circumstances where maybe it could. And Matt, I'm.

Just thinking out loud here, maybe this is another one worth following up on. The improvement to the web client version of this thing over the years used to be you had to have a thick client, you had to have it installed in your machines, and that necessity then meant that that's a lot of work to make sure it's supported and on the local networks. It's possible.

that utilizing over in the web client used to be insufficient. These days, it's pretty robust, and certainly the manufacturers are pushing people that direction. So it's possible with that more flexible model, it might not be as daunting to set up multiple locations. However, that's as far as I can speak to it right now. I think that that'll have to be a follow-up, and I would not want to speak on behalf of the technical folks that have to do it.

I just know from my experience what were the barriers in the past.

 **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 20:29

Right. No, that's great. Thank you. And actually, so let me put this bug in here. Maybe there could be tiered pricing. Like if one agency is doing a 10 person, you know, 10 license price, that's one price. And then there could be a consortium pricing where that bare minimum price is actually slightly higher because of the addition of other machines that it has to run on or something. Just an idea.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 20:48

Yeah, oh yeah, and sorry, I just, I did see a comment. Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. My bad.

 **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 20:49

Anyway, yeah, go ahead.

No, no, no, that was fine. I was going to pivot to just one more question before I went, but if you had something else to say about it.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 20:59

I just, I saw a comment in the chat there and they mentioned talking to Eric and which is the technical side of the operation about. So an example of where this has

been done to an extent is we have a few educational service districts that are members and they, we have had some that they're under a master contract and then some of the school districts under them or some of the schools and school districts under them have joined and others haven't. Now I think to some extent they share a technological backbone which makes that easier nonetheless. Sorry, I'll pass it on.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 21:23

Mm.

No, thank you. All right, so this real fast. I do want to talk technical turkey for a minute, if you don't mind, since you coined that term. You know, with the advent of AI, do you think it's possible or foreseeable to use AI or something else to bridge, say, RMS to something like GovQA? So it becomes a front-to-back solution from

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 21:38

Yeah, oh God.

Yeah.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 21:50

request through search through production. Is that, I mean, look, this might be beyond what you have to deal with on a daily basis, and I'm curious if that's even something that's ever been hinted at that you've seen as something maybe on the horizon.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 22:02

AI is definitely a topic that comes up a lot, and because this is not the only technology project with the archives are engaged with, right? We work with the state with M365 for all state agencies, and our involvement varies, but it's certainly something we watch. You know,

Would it be possible? Yeah, almost certainly, I think. I think the bigger hang-ups often come to the different legal and security necessities of the member entities. And so the first thing that I would raise an eyebrow, or not even, the first thing that would have to be identified, which is what's the use case? And when we say AI, what are we talking about?

what are the guardrails around this thing? Is it in a box or not, right? We need to

make sure. So certainly with like the state, for example, you can't use it for many types of information. So the other question is, ORMS works as an economy of scale in many ways because we share large resources and then have security partitions to separate people out.

 **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 22:48  
Mm.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 22:57

Can we, could an AI in there be kept within a box so it can't jump jurisdictions, right? That's one of the biggest concerns, certainly from a cybersecurity front that the state has about making sure that these things can't access information that the users that are using it can't, right? So it doesn't bridge. And I think that's probably the primary, as far as a technological ability,

Oh yeah, and you know all the big software companies are working towards that. I think it's not about the capabilities of it. It's can it be done in a secure manner that does not otherwise infringe? And what might have to happen in those scenarios if there was a real push in this direction and it were being developed is we may have to develop more sequestered data sets.

for that purpose. And that has been done, for example, with law enforcement entities we've worked with. So we have CJIS data sets, Criminal Justice Information System certified, and that's a very stringent protocol. And when that first came on our plate back in 2018, I think maybe is the first time we really went into that, we went through a whole process to get it all certified.

But those have to be fully sequestered data sets. They cannot share any. So there's a separate thing involved with that. And in that way, we're able to keep those much more protected. So there are ways and there are ways. I would never say never, but I think the biggest one always is that element of, okay, it would have to be looked at really hard, identify where it comes from.

and what the guardrails would be.

 **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 24:19  
Thank you.

 **April Ehrlich** 24:21

Yeah, I think we probably have a lot of other things we need to discuss today, so I don't want to spend too much time on this. I did want to just like make sure I understand this concept. So we have a state program or MS or whatever, ORMS. It's a state program, but it's not offered at each state agency. In fact, each state agency is a customer of.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 24:35

For America, yeah.



**AE April Ehrlich** 24:42

a state program and they're treated as individual customers and they're not all offered the same. That's just really strange. Why would we create a state program that doesn't work with all of the state agencies? I mean, is it possible that our own state program that we've just created called ORMS



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 24:46

Mhm.



**AE April Ehrlich** 25:03

Um...

acts as one cohesive body for all of the state agencies. I mean, they're all technically under the same state governing state government under the state employer. So it's just really strange to me because it's not like they're separate governments. They're all working for the same government. So I don't know. I don't work for state government. So maybe this concept is just something I don't understand, but it's just strange to me that we have a state program that doesn't work.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 25:23

Yeah.



**AE April Ehrlich** 25:29

help all of our state agencies.



**STENSON Kris \* SOS** 25:32

So I will tell you right now that when this was first envisioned, that was a desired goal

of the creators. However, it is an option, right? State agencies are not compelled to use this. This was originally the state archivist at the time and working through the Secretary of State, really worked hard with statewide information systems and everything else.

But we could not go out there and require everybody use this. A lot of state agencies, the big ones, already had their own solutions in this sector, and they had no interest in switching over. So I think what happened over time is, so the state's not a monolith that way. So while they are, well, for example, I work for the Secretary of State's office. We're a separate constitutional office. So we're actually separate from statewide IT. We exist outside of that.

realm. And while we use some of their services, it's as a customer relationship. And state governments charge each other, state agencies charge each other for different services they may provide. So it's a lot more of kind of a confederation of semi-linked entities than it is a monolith. Nonetheless, yeah, I think the early goals were to do that, but that's a big lift.

considering the amount. And the other part was the amount of people we had to throw at it were quite small in the grand scheme of things, right? So statewide, you know, state IT has hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of technicians. We have six people, you know, that work on this max on our side of it. So I think it's a scale thing. It is still available to everybody. Anybody can opt into it at any time.

What we actually found then, though, was our core customer, the core member, really were a lot of those mid-sized cities jumped on early and they've been with us ever since the beginning, right? A lot of those, those became our bread and butter early on. State agencies with bigger budgets like to do their own thing in a lot of cases. They don't, you know, and the necessity of a shared environment means that you can't customize it every which way you want, right? It has to work.

for everybody. And when you have the resources to do it yourself, they often choose to do that so they can make it exactly what they want. Where when price is more of a motivating factor, folks are willing to, you know, allow a little less customization, a little more centralization to work. But yeah, I think you could talk about that a long time. I think you'll see lots and lots of.

a very, lots and lots of correspondence to that effect early on and things like that of people wanting to try to do this, trying to get through it, but it's a big lift and it was just hard to get doing it. It was a new thing. It was a little bit looked askance at early

on. People at the statewide apparatus were like, I don't think this is going to survive, you know.

 **April Ehrlich** 27:58

Yeah, I guess I'm just thinking in terms of like the public records advocate where we, you know, it's a state agency that only has enough, only has two employees. And so we have this program that can help do records management, but it's not designed to help an agency like the public records advocate. So I don't know.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 28:16

Mhm.

 **April Ehrlich** 28:18

I think maybe, yeah, Todd's idea of a tiered system or something that would actually make it work for all of our state agencies would make sense. Matt, Matthew, did you want to comment on something?

 **BROWN Matthew G \* SOS** 28:34

Yeah, some of these questions are really good. I'm keeping track of them. I'm going to talk over them over with Chad Harley, my contact at.

Eric and Schatz Consulting about some of them, particularly the consortium, the differences between, you know, some of the issues, some of the barriers to having... one large system, and some of those barriers include different agencies have different security needs and or different retention. But at the same time, there is a lot of possibility for that, including web drawer, the public facing website. If you go to one of those web drawer sites, you can search all.

participating jurisdictions for the same keywords at once, which is a bit of consolidation. I mean, obviously, we'd like to see more. But yeah, that was all I wanted to mention there.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 29:30

Thanks, man.

 **April Ehrlich** 29:31

Okay, so in the interest of time, maybe we could move on. I don't know. Does anybody have any other questions for Chris or Matthew? Yep, Scott.

 **Scott Stauffer** 29:41

April.

I don't have a question. I just want to thank Chris and Matt for being here. And as a full disclosure, Milwaukee has been drinking the ORMS Kool-Aid for a long time. And I will always preach its benefits and working, getting the opportunity to meet with state archives and talk records in general with them is one of the greatest benefits in addition to being in one of these great resources. So

 **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 29:53

Yeah.

 **Scott Stauffer** 30:05

Thank you, Chris. Thank you, Matt, and thanks for contributing the conversation today.

 **STENSON Kris \* SOS** 30:09

Yeah, thanks for having us. Appreciate it.

 **BROWN Matthew G \* SOS** 30:11

Yeah.

 **April Ehrlich** 30:11

Thank you.

What is next? We need to discuss the public records toolkit legislative concepts. Somebody want to start it off?

 **Shasta Kearns Moore** 30:25

Yeah, I can do that. So I think that is a great intro to this, and hopefully if Matt can stay on and, you know, hear out some of these ideas, especially #3 is to expand ORMS.

use it as a backbone system for records management while adding shared tools and services that support the full public records lifestyle, intake, tracking, review,

redaction, and disclosure, and leveraging that state contracting purchasing power to modernize records management. So, you know,

This, what we just heard is that, you know, some of these things ORMS is already doing, they're just maybe not doing it for the entire state or every single agency. So like that API level integration, they already have that. So.

and this awesome search tool that Matthew already shared. So, you know, I think kind of, you know, the kind of new concept here would be more that records retention and requests, or I mean not retention, but that record request system.

and also kind of developing AI assisted tools to kind of make that more robust.

So that's kind of like if we wanted to like just go whole hog and go crazy, that's kind of the big idea. But then there are two other concepts, a public records capacity grant program that would incentivize, you know, supporting staffing, training, and system improvements for public records compliance.

and sort of having a prioritization in the scoring of those grant applications for smaller and backlogged jurisdictions. This would be administered through the Public Records Advocate Office or a DOJ equivalent office. And again, these are all like concepts that we're discussing. So there are like alternatives kind of included.

in each concept.

And then the second concept is a public records mutual aid and surge support program. The idea here is, you know, if you have some huge, you know, media interest or something happens that that small agency is overwhelmed, maybe we can like

get some support in there from either similar agencies or like strike team of experts in records management to be able to come in and help. You know, we heard a little bit last.

session last meeting about how difficult that might be if you're not on the same programs, but maybe there's a way to identify folks who are on the same program.

So those are the kind of high level of what those concepts are. So I guess, you know, I put the link in the chat and people can discuss what they think.

**AE** April Ehrlich 34:09  
Tom?

**AP** ALBERT Todd \* PRA 34:10  
Sure. Since someone else was talking, I figured I'd share my thoughts. You know,

these are only concepts. We don't know what the legislature is going to do with them if they'll want to even go forward with them, implement work groups, shape them differently. So overall, you know, I really don't have a problem with moving forward with any of them, especially if we're just trying to come to some sort of concept statement that we would then introduce as our legislative concept.

I will be realistic. I don't think I'll ever be bearish on the notion of a personnel strike team. I do think implementation is logistically impracticable and we'll just really not, I just don't see that moving forward in this current climate or really ever because of, like we saw within state government, for instance.

They're like different fiefdoms because we're all supposed to pay our own way, even though a lot of agencies are, you know, are funded by the general fund. It's all the same pot of money, yet we're treated for like business purposes as different enterprises. And so to think about then trying to integrate employees between those agencies, let alone the state and local governments, just.

just doesn't seem like it's going to ever be able to go anywhere. Again, I'm open to discussing it further and for introducing concepts. I think it's worth sort of tossing against the wall and see if it sticks. I do like the 1st and the third one though, and I think my opinion is we should focus our attention on maybe developing those further as we move forward.

**AE** April Ehrlich 35:31

I can see what you're saying. It would be nice to hear from somebody who has, who is a public records person for like a county. I mean, are we talking about in terms of the mutual aid? Is it between

Any sort of government or is it just state agencies?

You know, Shasta.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 35:53

I mean, the concept is like, you know, what I can envision is there's a small, you know, special district somewhere where it's literally just one person operating the whole thing and then all of a sudden there's some media interest, maybe data center or something, and now there's a ton of interest in their records.

you know, can we have some other entity share their staffing who knows that same system to be able to come in and do that, but, you know, create a way for them to get paid because they're not going to do it if they don't get paid.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 36:29

Well, if I could just \*\*\*\* back in for a second then, like Shasta, you as a member of the media, let's say you've made a public records request to that tiny public body. Are you willing to accept as a good faith delay for like maybe a week or more in your public records request? They have to submit an application to get that help, wait for someone to be available.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 36:29

Yeah.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 36:48

like chosen, wait for that person to be available in terms of being able to do the work and for that person to get trained up on the local system, whatever it is that holds the records, to 1st look for that large media request. Or are members of the media, perhaps rightly so, going to say, well, why would I wait? You know, there's a deadline under the law and I want to pursue my rights to appeal if I have to sit and wait for them to go get someone from God knows where. and get them up to speed to fulfill my request.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 37:12

Right, so my thought was that the triggering event for this would be them claiming the safety valve provision, saying we don't have enough staff to do this. So then that would be, okay, you don't have enough staff, then you need to apply to this mutual aid program.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 37:30

Stop.

**SS** **Scott Stauffer** 37:32

Yeah, thank you. I want to very much kind of echo Todd's sentiments. I support pushing all three of these, continue forward. I think, I think if, and I don't know if they're in any particular order besides one, two, three, but I almost think the order of how this would flow in a holistic big level ways is you start with one, get funding to agencies of all sizes, cities,

counties, special districts, state to close their records gaps. And then you continue and it's a long journey. Chris referenced it, mentioned it in the city world. We've been in this conversation and

encouraging cities to adopt this statewide model for a long time. But you continue that push. So it's almost like you, number one, seems to be a very, a concept that can get to an actual program, assuming the legislators wanted to give money, and that's the whole thing there. But that seemed reasonable and addresses the immediacy.

you continue to beat the drum about creating these statewide systems, ORMS. And I was hoping to get IT managers here. And so if there's somebody on here that I don't know who's an IT manager, this would be a world that I would like to pick their brain about. Like besides records, what else is there that could be out there for systems?

You get pushed and develop those. And then

Circling back to number the constant #2, it's where you have a growing number of people who are on the same platform who've been the reason reasonably expecting folks from other agencies to be able to come and strike help because they use they also use ORMS and so their familiarity with using the same system. To me, #2 is sort of the aspirational

much longer term goal to get to once you've got enough a critical mass of people all using the same thing. And we've got, you know, ORMS is an example of what we've been trying to work on. As Chris mentioned and Matt mentioned, we've hit headwinds with that. Even, you know, within the state government, there are different entities that compete with each other.

And so to speak, every single 240 city, or each 240 city across the state, we're all different. We all have our own charters and our own directives. Every, all Marcus 900 special districts have their own directives. There are consortiums and likenesses, but it's an ongoing battle. And we're competing, you know,

The space isn't empty, so to speak. There are a lot of people who don't have any systems in place. And then there are a lot of people, for example, in the cities, and forgive me if I'm rambling, but for the cities, it's something like a third of us have adopted ORMS. A third of us don't have anything. And then the third big player in the space in Oregon is a system called laser fiche.

that acts and looks a lot like ORMS in a lot of ways, and what it does and its capabilities, but its funding structure is very different. It's not a subscription. You buy it outright, and it could be 10s of thousands of dollars, and then you're responsible for managing it, but then you own your system. So one way of saying, I kind of want

to echo Todd, I think

One, I think, is is is I can see an outcome there in in a near term, so to speak, and then I would probably put concept three and then two in my in my thought process, but yeah.

**AE** April Ehrlich 40:48

Uh, Mark?

**ML** Mark Landauer 40:50

Yeah, I have to sort of agree with both Scott and Todd on the surge proposal. You know, the state's facing a pretty significant budget challenge, and I just don't see this as rising to the level of securing general fund money in this current environment. And I think one of the biggest questions legislators would be asking is, okay, if you don't have a surge going on at some public body, What are these people doing in the meantime? Because if you don't have this kind of circumstance happening, I'm just curious, you know, who these people, where these people are coming from, where are they housed? who's paying when they're not, who's paying and what are they doing when they're not addressing A surge? So I think that there are still a lot of questions. I don't quibble with the concept. I think it, I've seen plenty of instances out there where a public body will get overwhelmed with public records requests. And so I certainly understand the need and the desire for something like this. I just don't see it necessarily coming to fruition because of the questions of what are they going to do in the meantime when there isn't a surge. And so those are just my thoughts. Thank you.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 42:31

Yeah, so that this wouldn't.

Yeah, so these just wouldn't be like people just sitting around waiting for an emergency to happen. It would be people that were identified statewide who are experts in records management or something. So say there's somebody from the city of Milwaukee who can go in and, you know, help out Boring, Oregon. when they're having some sort of surge. So it would be that a wave, just like an

emergency management mutual aid agreement of, you know, this place isn't having a crisis right now, so they can send their people over.

**AE** April Ehrlich 43:08

So, I mean, this concept came out of the idea of emergency managers doing the same thing. They're all kind of, they all help each other. So if there's a big emergency, they all go there and they help each other. And they do have their own systems that they're working with, right? It's not just going out and turning on a hose and helping put out a fire. Like they are also working with different systems in different cities and different counties and somehow they're able to make it work. So I think

I think it's maybe worth talking to them to figure out how they make it work to see if it is something that's possible or if it's something that's totally not applicable to something like this. I mean, I've had my recent experience with the big eruption over in Longview. When that happened, they kind of created...

a cohesive system where all of the media requests were going to one like email address, but that email was being managed by state, city, I forget what else, a water district. So they kind of created a sort of a strike team there. And I think that that is something that we could potentially do if maybe we talk to people about how possible it is. I mean, I feel like we're kind of just surmising based on our own, you know, basic knowledge without actually talking to the people who would be doing this on the ground.

Somebody's got their hand raised. I see Scott's, but who else has their hand raised?

**SS** Scott Stauffer 44:35

I think it's I think it's you and me, April.

**AE** April Ehrlich 44:37

Oh, is it me? Oh, I need to lower my hand. There it is. Okay, Scott.

**SS** Scott Stauffer 44:41

Yeah, and I was just going to, emergency management response is actually a very good example because they, emergency responders, folks may know this, but they, after 9-11, pushed to adopt A national framework called NIMS, the National Incident Management System. FEMA runs, it's called NIMS, and maybe that's not acronyms, but it's exactly the

the concept of creating a system where all saying the same language and responding in the same way and doing the same trainings, so that when incidents like Longview happen, they set up, I'm sure, an incident command center, an operation center, and that's very much the NIMS playbook. So that's a really good example, and I think it underscores the idea that we kind of, we run as hard as we can and then ORMS and others have, but as hard as we can at creating that statewide framework so that we can have that folks who can jump from different agencies when they have a downtime to help somebody who has an emergency going on. So yeah, the emergency framework, the NIMS idea is the exact same model that I think is laid out in these concepts.

**AE** April Ehrlich 45:47

I do see the point of maybe wanting to figure out which ones we want to prioritize and it sounds like this is maybe something that's still an idea worth working on, but maybe not as like the top priority.

**SS** Scott Stauffer 46:03

I think to that point, I agree. I think that number one finding, and it's that in itself is not until battle, as Mark and others have pointed out, trying to find money from the legislature right now. But that to me is like the clearest, and there's some stuff to figure out there too, of course, but get folks, help folks fill in the gaps that I agree with that sentiment.

**AE** April Ehrlich 46:28

Okay, go ahead.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 46:28

And you know, it might take a few bites at the apple, you know, I mean, this is just this year. So, but yeah. I also have an idea for revenue if we want to move on to the next topic.

**AE** April Ehrlich 46:44

Yes.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 46:46

Oh, we've got Andy's.  
And up.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 46:50  
Andy.

**SA** **Smith Andrew** 46:51  
Yeah, thanks, guys. So I work for Rep Anderson. Just wanted to share an idea in terms of maybe briefing the legislature perhaps earlier than you might, which would be during legislative days in September or December, that these ideas could be presented in a committee. It might give you a little bit of a running start. So just kind of an open offer if the group is interested.  
In doing that, I could try to help facilitate discussions with appropriate committee chairs.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 47:18  
I think that would be great. I think we're trying to get this out of the subcommittee and approved by the council so that we could have it in time for that. So if we want to schedule time, that would be great.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 47:34  
Shasta, did you want to go ahead and move through the revenue? And I think there was going to be a presentation on net metering the legislative concept. I don't know if we have enough time for that, but go ahead.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 47:43  
Yeah.  
Well, it's the same thing. So this is a concept out of Frank Lamonte. He's A Society of Professional Journalists and has been working in public records for a long time, but he was a utility lawyer, so worked in that.  
space for a long time. So this is kind of marrying those two concepts. So net metering, for those who don't know, is like, say you install solar panels on your house and you actually generate more electricity than you earn or that you need, then you get to sell it back to the grid. And the whole concept is that you're providing a public good and so you get

paid for it, you know, because now we have greener energy. So the idea here would be, you know, so a journalist goes and requests a data set, and they clean it up, and they make it publicly accessible, and now it's available for everyone, and it's a public good.

And so now the agency pays for this, you know, creation of this open government public good that just occurred. So, you know, there's a lot of like interesting stuff in here. It's A 46 page white paper, so I definitely haven't read every single word.

But I have been kind of like noodling around on how this might work and how it could fund these public records grants that we're talking about. So I think kind of the basic idea would be, you know, in some capacity, we would have to figure out a way of

assessing these situations, like, you know, did the journalist create more public good than the agency did? You know, what would the, you know, consequence be of that? Is it a percentage of public records fees collected that they get?

you know, docketed on, is it a, you know, if you take them to court and there's court fees and they have to pay attorneys fees, is it a percentage of that? I think there's a few different ways that that could manifest, but just kind of wanted to talk about that as a concept because the way that we have it.

now is that the incentive structure is kind of reversed, where if the data is really disorganized, it takes hours and hours for the agency to collect, it costs a ton of money to the requester, and this kind of flips that on its head. So saying, you know, the incentive is for more transparency.

Rather than less.

**AE** April Ehrlich 50:37  
Any thoughts?

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 50:53  
Yep.

**AE** April Ehrlich 50:54  
Same.  
Okay, um...  
Given that.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 51:01

And I invited Frank to come today, but he's busy, so he might be able to come to the July meeting if we had more questions about it, but just wanted to flag it.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 51:09

Yeah, maybe that's something we can all just make sure to read this and come with questions at the next meeting if Frank can make it. Are we ready to move on to public comment?

Okay, moving on to the public comment period. It looks like we've got Joe Barker. Joe, go ahead.

Are you speaking because I'm not I'm not hearing any is anybody hearing Joe? Um...

Joe, are you present and are you speaking? Oh, there you are. Okay, great. I'm going to, since we're getting slow or we're getting short on time, I'm going to set a timer here for two minutes and then, yeah, and

**JB** **Jo Barker** 51:51

Yeah, I'm here.

Well.

Oh.

Well, my question basically deals with Shasta, to Shasta's comment with the records request being flipped right now and taking so long if the records are disorganized. Would there possibly be consideration for if a journalist comes in and says, look, we're going to clean up your record for you. Can you give us a cost break type of thing?

thing. Is there room for that type of negotiation or consideration within the programming of records request? That was just something that popped into my mind, that's all.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 52:40

Well, there is the public interest fee waiver. So theoretically, you know, they should already be getting a discount because they're in the public interest. But this would kind of go a step further and actually like reversing the flow back to the person who's creating a public good.

**JB** **Jo Barker** 52:44

Okay.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 53:01

Great. Thanks for that, Joe. Anybody else who would like to speak?

All right, seeing none, move on to figuring out when we're going to meet next and what we're going to discuss next. Shasta, did you? Okay. Okay, good. Because I don't know what's going on. But go ahead.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 53:16

Thankfully, we know when we're meeting next.

Okay.

Why? Too many doodle polls or something? July 10th, 1pm.

is the next meeting date that's been approved, locked in on your calendars, don't forget. And then after that, it's August.

11th at 11 A.m. These are subcommittee meetings. I still have a handful of holdouts for the PRAC's own meeting in late August, early September. So I just sent a reminder to them. I don't believe there was anyone on the subcommittee. So hopefully they'll answer me soon or we'll just have to set another meeting date without them.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 54:03

Okay. And and what are we? Oh, go ahead.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 54:03

And sorry, I guess if it no, April, go ahead. No, go ahead. Sorry.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 54:07

I was going to move on and kind of go over what we're going to do at the next meeting so I can take some notes and be prepared next time. But go ahead.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 54:13

Yeah, if it helps as a reminder, so we're all good to go on the three like actually worded communication recommendations we came up previously. So those are

good and ready to go. And I mean, disagree with me everyone, but I think we're still developing these concepts to submit as well. And that's what I have.

**AE** April Ehrlich 54:32

Yeah, I mean, it sounded like we're all pretty good with what Shasta has drafted here, but we maybe want to talk about what we want to prioritize and what we want to do for next steps. Shasta?

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 54:43

I guess I have a question, you know, so would we, are these three separate concepts or do we want to put them together as a package?

**AE** April Ehrlich 54:55

I think last time we talked about doing separate ones.

**ML** Mark Landauer 54:56

I would, yeah, I would highly recommend them being separate with very, very narrow relating to clauses, simply because if you don't, that invites all kinds of shenanigans.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 55:14

Yes, I remember that advice from last time. So, well, I don't know that we have the power to do that, right? Because that's a legislative attorney thing.

**ML** Mark Landauer 55:24

No, you can request, you can request a very specific relating to clause. Whether the council who's drafting it will accept that remains another question, but generally speaking, you can request narrow relating to clauses.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 55:24

But.

**SS** Scott Stauffer 55:29

Ohh.

**SM** Shasta Kearns Moore 55:36

Okay.

Okay, so I can commit to drafting these as three separate concepts with a specific relating to clause and maybe Todd with his law degree can help edit it. Okay.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 56:01

Sure. I feel like these are almost like policy statements or something like that. And so I feel like as a subcommittee, we should really agree on like a true sort of like, like a single sentence and maybe an elevator pitch related to each, because when we submit it, we're not giving them much more than that anyway. So maybe that's where our remaining work should focus for each, for each, you know, for all three.

**SS** **Scott Stauffer** 56:22

Can, can I, can I, and the committee council can overruled me, but can we switch two and three? I just think the flow of 1, three, two, in my mind, anyway, that that's.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 56:28

Yep, yeah, I think.

That's been clear, yeah.

Yep.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 56:36

Should we like, like, no, I was going to say, should we like each be assigned a different thing to work on? But maybe I'm thinking too much of like a journalist that needs assignments. I don't know. Maybe we'll just come back next time and talk about what we want to actually propose in September or whenever it is we need to get something to lawmakers.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 56:58

Well, I'm happy if anybody wants to, like, take on one of these three concepts and, you know, draft it.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 57:07

Draft it in legal. Legal. Oh, you're gonna draft it. Okay.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 57:07

Perfect.

I mean, it's going to be like a legislative concept. So it'll be, this is what we want to accomplish.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 57:16

Okay, I could maybe take something on to take something off your plate, Shasta. So I don't know, maybe I'll do the mutual aid one, even though we're probably not going to do anything with that. I think it'll be worthy of just putting something together so we have something to discuss and can work on it in the future.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 57:34

Awesome.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 57:34

Well, if I can ask maybe Mark or whomever else, Andrew or anyone else who might know, when we're committing, when we're submitting A legislative concept that isn't sort of like drafted statutory language or rather this sort of more amorphous like, hey, we should all think about this officially together, what form must that take for a submission?

**ML** **Mark Landauer** 57:53

I typically just do a memo to legislative council outlining what we're trying to accomplish. You don't necessarily have to have legal language to legislative council. The council will

I mean, you can request very specific language, but the likelihood of it coming back exactly the same is close to 0. So I've found that the more detail that you can provide,

the better. But typically you can do it in a memo fashion, just, you know, identifying the problem, seeking the solution, and any additional details that you can provide will give legislative council an opportunity to put something

on paper. What I'd also share with you is that for pre-session filed bills, which are required to be submitted to Legislative Council by September 11th, you will receive a copy of what Legislative Council drafts

**SM Shasta Kearns Moore** 58:55

I.

**ML Mark Landauer** 59:09

and you have one opportunity to make changes or request changes to that concept. And those changes will be embedded in the final version that you receive. So you get one additional bite at the apple.

after you submit your concept in whatever form you do it. And I'm sure Andrew has more to add.

**SA Smith Andrew** 59:38

Thank you, Mark. I concur with all that background with the exception, Mark, that legislators, we get a couple bites, just the way it goes. Sorry. But the sooner you submit it, yeah, yeah, the sooner you submit it, the more you have time to massage it up front. So just and establish a good relationship with the drafter. So

**ML Mark Landauer** 59:46

Yeah, I might, I might, yeah, go ahead.

**SM Shasta Kearns Moore** 59:47

Mhm.

**SA Smith Andrew** 59:57

And it, and just so you know, it is kind of, or it is privileged to the degree, if you didn't want a draft, you know, you just wanted to wait, you wanted to massage it before you publish the version, you have that so people don't get confused, not because it's you're hiding something, but you can work on your draft and then... polish it up before sessions. So the sooner you do it, the better, because we could start working on behalf of LC this summer or fall, you know, before the deadline.

**AE April Ehrlich** 1:00:24

I have to get going as the chairperson. Is it okay if I leave or should we just end it now?

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:00:27

Okay.

I think we can adjourn.

**AE** **April Ehrlich** 1:00:31

Okay. All right, everybody. Thank you so much for the discussion. And yeah, see you next month. Bye.

**SM** **Shasta Kearns Moore** 1:00:38

Please.

**AP** **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** 1:00:38

Take care.

● **ALBERT Todd \* PRA** stopped transcription