

## WORK SESSION MINUTES

Audio record of these proceedings available at [http://akleg.gov/audio/2015/CACFA\\_1-14-2015.mp3](http://akleg.gov/audio/2015/CACFA_1-14-2015.mp3)

### 9:01a.m. – Call to Order

**Roll Call** – Rod Arno, Chad Hutchison (by phone for Senator Coghill), Mark Fish, Teresa Hanson (by phone), Charlie Lean, Kathleen Liska, Mike Meekin, Warren Olson, Susan Smith, Frank Woods, Representative Keller

### Meeting Objectives – Sara Taylor

One of our major objectives for today is going to be come to some consensus as we move forward as a Commission, first reviewing our statute, what our bylaws constitute, which is more procedural, check in with staff position descriptions and how they have changed somewhat from what is on the books and a brief check in with the budget, which is in very good shape. The second major objective of the day is to figure out the needs for using our appropriation which we received July 1 of last year. We will be introducing those in the morning and discussing those in the afternoon.

### Approval of Agenda

**Ron Somerville** – Motion to accept the agenda as written.

**Frank Woods** – Second.

### Commissioner Opening Comments

**Kathleen Liska** – Thank you to the Commission approving Susan, Teresa, Wes and myself to attend the Alaska Lands Council last October in Salt Lake. I'm looking forward to some exciting conversation this afternoon.

**Mark Fish** – Reviewing some of the papers that we have in front of us today, I notice there are a lot of things that are coming and I remember that we were going to categorize and put together a lot of stuff. What I'm seeing is that is impossible to deal with these people, the Federal Government, I'm anxious to start to take authority as a state and the rights of the citizens back and hopefully we can get the right council and the people involved to get our sovereign rights back.

**Ron Somerville** – Welcome Sara. The only this I want to say is about the direction the Commission is going. There are some important positions being written out of the budget and I think that doesn't bode well for the Commission. I have already said to some of the other Commissioners, we have to be aggressive with the biggest issue being federal overreach and where we see the recommendations going and our role.

**Warren Olson** – We have done a tremendous amount of work from the Summit and received substantial results from it. I would make the suggestion that we do an inventory of the memberships in Alaska, make contacts with these groups and distribute our information.

**Mike Meekin** – I guess I don't have any recommendations but this board has the ability to make a big impact, looking and budgeting and things and how we go about that.

**Charlie Lean** – A lot of things have been said that I agree with. I have had a lot of conversations with federal employees and they even the federal employees in Alaska don't necessarily agree with changes in the Department of Interior. It's very frustrating that the local technicians don't even know. It's disingenuous and being more and more disillusioning.

**Frank Woods** – We've covered so much, in our area in Bristol Bay we work really hard and really appreciate the first report from CACFA outreach. Now that we have a change in administration, I think we need a change in outlook on how we deal things politically. You look at budget, 35% of the income coming in is federal dollars. Roughly 20% is state contribution and the remaining is Native Corporation lands. I'm talking lands because I think that is what this group does and how they are managed. When I hear federal overreach it puts up a wall for me because the feds have a big impact on this research and we want to really create relationships, it may not be to our best advantage sometimes but its 20 years arguing about the regulations. So we work really hard changing regulation on the state side. Looking at the big picture, this brain storming has been a long time coming.

**Rod Arno** – The fears that those of us that were pursuing the life in the outdoors in the 70's, fear of what ANILCA would bring, are being realized. We're being violated by the Department of the interior, the State needs to take action and outreach is important and if the public had any idea of the infringement being taken place by the Department of the Interior, they would rally along with CACFA.

**Susan Smith** – I agree 100%. I think that with the change in administration and budget cuts it's important that CACFA remain operating. We need to try and get our budgets on track and busy.

**Representative Keller** – Remember we said, Sara's got to figure out how to work with her, and we meet with her every week and, I didn't expect it to happen over a couple weeks, but its been great to see you step up to the plate. Woody you are an absolute critical part of this group because if we can't reach consensus and make good decisions here, we can't take it out to the people it affects. About the new administration, we need to take the positives. Politics can be terrible things because sometimes they aren't open the issue. If we can keep them away from that, stay enthusiastic and stay together and compassionate. Be aggressive, talk to the new administration, we are looking to build relationships and in my mind so are they.

**Teresa Hanson** – I am very interested in how this new administration is going to work with us as far as what the sub-committee is thinking about and what direction the sub-committee can take. That's what I'm interested in today.

**Chad Hutchison for Senator Coghill** – I know from our perspective CACFA has been very, very helpful and the information that we receive here is shared with leadership and there is overwhelming support of the issues. We are cognizant of the mission, their support of the mission and what is of great concern to us is the expansion of critical habit and the EPA efforts on the waters of the United States. That is a pretty concerning issue from our perspective. In order for CACFA to be effective there has to be outreach, which we should talk about today, like little small informational videos that shows that CACFA is interested in these issues. You can post them on YouTube. The challenge is to read these EIS's and the Federal Register. Even people who have been doing this for a long time are challenged and I think what we can do is to produce some of these videos so the general population will have a better understanding of these issues. I have some suggestions that maybe we can talk about later but this seems like step one in helping people understand these issues and the ramifications.

**Executive Directors Reports** – Sara Taylor, Stan Leaphart  
Time stamp on the recording at 0:34:04

## **Bylaws Discussion and Authorizing Statute Discussion – Sara Taylor**

Time stamp on the recording at 0:44:42

## **Current Staff Duties and Obligations –Sara Taylor**

Time stamp on the recording at 1:02:43

## **Budget Update – Sara Taylor**

Time stamp on the recording at 1:06:45

## **Historical and Current CACFA Mission, Priorities and Objectives – Stan Leaphart**

Time stamp on the recording at 1:12:20

## **BREAK**

Time stamp on the recording at 1:43:02

## **Project (Federal Overreach Funds) Budget Implementation – Sara Taylor**

Time stamp on the recording at 1:55:22

## **Proposals**

- Digitization and creating a searchable database of the CACFA Library – Sara Taylor;
- Digitizing of the ANILCA library – Sara Taylor;
- Explore the costs for professional help and distribution of a DVD for educating the public – Representative Wes Keller;
- Creating a professionally produced plan to provide to the new administration educating on Alaska specific issues and join forces with other western states – Scott Ogan;
- Resolution creating a similar action group to the to the Alaska Lands Use Council – Outreach Sub-committee
- Set up social media sites and other digital media items – Outreach Sub-committee
- Printing costs – Outreach Subcommittee
- Attending conferences annually regarding transfer of public lands (attending summit in Salt Lake City was vastly helpful) – Outreach Sub-committee
- Bring transfer of public lands experts to Alaska for presentations – Outreach Sub-committee
- Contracting with a public relations firm – Outreach Sub-committee
- Contracting with Stan Leaphart – Ron Somerville

Discussion on concerns to allocate our funds,tie up our funding so we don't lose our funds.

## **11:30a.m. Public Comments**

Time stamp on the recording at 2:38:20

**Mark Wayson** – What I heard today is a lot of what I have heard before. This is one of the only ways to communicate to the public and public servants should serve the public. There is a lot of law that says you have the right to speak but it says nothing that they have the right to answer. The idea of public outreach but what I have heard from Commissioner Fish is to try and get the Governor to act. Back to this action thing is that they are going to put these people in jail, they're not going to put the Governor in jail. The federal government has the protection of the Department of Justice. This seems like a public safety issue. CACFA represents the people. The State of Alaska is doing exactly what the feds what us to do. They violate the law.

**Frank Woods** – The Native Corporation, what they have done and gone directly to the government, gone to the Representatives, gone to the Senators, the AG’s office. I don’t have that here and I don’t want that here. The layers of bureaucracy, they have teams in every department.

**Mark Fish** – We need to give our elected officials the courage to act. This Commission has to provide the conduit to get the people behind these projects like the Izembek road.

**Scott Ogan** – We have a real reality show about the federal government, what better story do we have than Mr. Wayson, who has private property and he has been locked out of, or Jim Wilde. We have a real opportunity for a reality show and I think CACFA should produce it.

**John Sturgeon** – I filed a lawsuit in District Court for using a hovercraft within a conservation unit. His decision was against me but it actually made it worse for all the inholdings within federal lands. We appealed to the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit, my lawyer said it doesn’t look very good. The suit was joined by the state, a private citizen, 7 Native Corporations and several Village Corporations. Unfortunately we did not win and they still didn’t answer my question, it was more of trepidation around the regulation. Our question was ANILCA says your regulations don’t apply on navigable waters in the parks. Probably the most frustrating thing was that, after reading the Native Corporations’ amicus brief, they focused a lot on Congressional intent. The bottom line is I lost. It was framed again as a regulation issue not an ANILCA issue so we got a different answer. The next step is the Supreme Court. I asked my lawyer and he said, “You have a 1% chance of being chosen to be heard.”

Discussion continues at time stamp 3:04:23

### **Summit Development and Planning**

Time stamp on the recording at 3:44:42

### **Noon-1:45p.m. LUNCH**

Time stamp on the recording at 4:13:03

### **Reconvene**

Time stamp on the recording at 4:49:48

**Mark Fish** – I make a motion to convene an Executive Session pursuant to A.S. 44.62.310 (c)(2), (3) and (4) to respectfully discuss contractor proposals and staff issues, convene with the Department of Law on litigation, and discuss deliberative documents required to keep confidential. A majority vote is required.

### **Vote Unanimous**

### **1:50-3:15p.m. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Time stamp on the recording at 4:55:16

### **Reconvene**

Time stamp on the recording at 4:55:40

**Mark Fish** – Motion to establish the Alaska State Lands Council based on the resolution from the Outreach Subcommittee as written.

**Rod Arno** – Second.

## Discussion

Time stamp on the recording at 4:56:34

**Rod Arno** – Do we want to call it an “advisory group” as opposed to a “council” to be consistent with the statutory authorization?

**Stan Leaphart** – Duties of the commission authorizes it to form advisory groups, I would recommend it be the Alaska State Lands Advisory Group. This allows the commission to manage it, provide staff support and fund whatever travel and other expenses are necessary. Make sure to mention the statutory authorization (AS 41.37.230).

**Mark Fish** – Would the Outreach Subcommittee see that as a friendly amendment, to change to advisory group?

**Susan Smith** – Yes.

**Frank Woods** – Revise language to be more inclusive than just mentioning the Tongass. Under ANILCA, we can co-manage the lands, all lands, would like other options than just straight up saying we’d like to take over the lands.

**Representative Keller** – Strike some language in the third whereas, make it broader?

**Susan Smith** – Only one provision mentions the Tongass but the next provision is much broader, the fourth resolve from the bottom.

**Frank Woods** – Is there a reason we’re going after a national forest? I think it’s too much to take on.

**Ron Somerville** – I don’t like identifying just a few things, I think it should be broad enough to cover examples given to us in our summit. I don’t want to name people in the resolution. I’d like to see what we are talking about in terms of expenditure for the subcommittee and who will decide the membership.

**Sara Taylor** – The names are people who have indicated a willingness to help. We would have to invite nominations for this group. If you want to consider the bylaws, under number 9, if an “advisory group” is a “special committee” then one may be formed by the commission or the chairman.

**Frank Woods** – I’d like to concur with Commissioner Somerville that we keep it broad enough to come up with alternatives for land management and without naming areas. Amendment to recall the motion, would not feel comfortable passing as written. We have some time to consider this resolution until our meeting in Juneau, what to charge the advisory group with. I like the new name.

**Charlie Lean** – I was reluctant to name names, these are all fine people, but may not all be available.

**Rod Arno** – It does need some work and the confusion is this a committee or an advisory group? Our authority says advisory group and our bylaws say committee. Will this take a change in the bylaws at a later date, we should keep this resolution consistent with the legislation that says “advisory group.” Take out references to special committees and rename.

**Susan Smith** – The reason the Tongass is included is, in Utah, we had an opportunity to caucus as a state group, eleven members from Alaska, “Mead Treadwell Plan” offered suggestions and that was one

of them. Law passed already by Alaska State Legislature that recommended taking federal land back from the Tongass, this was meant to support that bill. The second resolve after that includes other areas.

**Warren Olson** – Cautious about establishing another permanent committee. We have strength in our bylaws and I do not see the purpose of passing anything prior to going to Juneau.

**Sara Taylor** – We will need to change the first resolve to provide that nominations will have to be invited pursuant to AS 41.37.230(b) and the acronym will need to be changed throughout to reflect a new name using “advisory group.” If we do want to consider it more fully, can pass this in Juneau.

**Representative Keller** – What if we just created the group with a less specific mandate and ask them to come back with a recommendation? They could come back with the recommendation of the Tongass. We can change the motion completely and say something like “The Commission is taking nominations to serve on an advisory committee that will be formed later.” Leave it at that until we get to Juneau. People we ask will have different ideas. For instance, I would pick a GMU as a pilot project for transfer of public lands. We should pass the responsibility for choosing to the advisory group.

**Susan Smith** – No objections to generalizing it.

**Mark Fish** – Friendly amendments: “advisory group” incorporated in; first whereas – end with a period after “commission”; first resolve – end at “State of Alaska”; remove third resolve (too specific).  
Time stamp on the recording at 5:13:11

**Rod Arno** – Second.

No Objections

**Ron Somerville** – Still looking for potential expenditure.

**Mark Fish** – I am also interested but difficult to discuss without passing resolution itself.

**Ron Somerville** – I cannot vote for it in the shape it is in, you allow the group to set its own meeting schedule.

**Rod Arno** – Suggest removing the ability for the group to set its own meeting schedule.  
Time stamp on the recording at 5:16:36

**Mark Fish** – Second.

**Ron Somerville** – Adding to that, would it be appropriate to say we are appropriating from our project funds a certain amount to start this process, add to it later.  
Time stamp on the recording at 5:17:00

**Representative Keller** – Yes, pick a low number with the realization commission can add to it.

**Kathleen Liska** – Suggest putting a cap on it. And removing the date in the third resolve (by removing the language where the group can set its own meeting schedule) may be complicated.  
Time stamp on the recording at 5:17:32

**Mark Fish** – Point of order: we have a motion on the table to strike the first sentence in the third resolve (for group to set its own meeting schedule).

Time stamp on the recording at 5:18:13

**Mark Fish** – Second.

No Objections

**Charlie Lean** – We should add Forest Service next to Bureau of Land Management to the fourth from the bottom resolve.

**Ron Somerville** – If we're following the lead of other states, how about we just say "options they may identify" and end it there? Why do we need to name? Move to delete the middle sentence.

Time stamp on the recording at 5:20:05

**Mark Fish** – Second.

No Objections

**Representative Keller** – Do we want to vote on this?

**Susan Smith** – Thinking about caps for funding, the commission, for 12 members, for the three main meetings, costs about \$49,000. So if we appoint no more than eight people to this group and can figure that's \$35,000 for three meetings per year, that might give us an idea, but it might be hard to say not knowing who the people are and where they are coming from. Add a line indicating where the funding is coming from.

**Stan Leaphart** – The commission's first (and only other) advisory group, all members were in southeast, only lasted three years, always met in Juneau. Did not cost that much.

**Ron Somerville** – Move to appropriate up to \$20,000.

Time stamp on the recording at 5:22:52

**Representative Keller** – Move that it be \$10,000 to cover the first meeting. Friendly amendment.

Time stamp on the recording at 5:23:09

**Mark Fish** – Second.

Discussion

**Mark Fish** – Wise to issue \$10,000 and see where it goes from there. May extend it beyond January 30, 2016, gives them a year with that \$10,000, can always request more from the commission. I was ready to go to \$50,000 because this will really mean something to the public, attract people. Wise to proceed with caution for the \$10,000.

**Sara Taylor** – I would go higher so I can say we've expended it.

**Kathleen Liska** – Are we going to attract the people we need if we're only putting \$10,000 out to accomplish what we want to accomplish. We can assert control in there.

**Representative Keller** – If we tell them we have an open-ended approval with \$10,000 for your first meeting, and come back to us with a proposal, we can't make it a blank check.

**Sara Taylor** – To note, it is not open-ended, I have to approve expenditures.

**Ron Somerville** – I question we resolve just saying we appropriate this much or that much, the governor can still say we cannot spend that money. Finance people will say it's not a contract.

**Sara Taylor** – An encumbrance for an advisory group will be compelling. The money will not be "removed" from the balance, but I can tell someone coming for our general fund moneys that \$50,000 has been put towards the group. I think that will go a long ways.

**Ron Somerville** – The other side to that story is that we are being wasteful with our money because we've dedicated funds without knowing what it will go towards. I can support \$10,000 or \$20,000 on the understanding the group will come up with a plan.

**Sara Taylor** – I would wholeheartedly agree if we did not have a budget crisis.

**Susan Smith** – Can we do both, say we are setting aside \$50,000 from our project funds for this and allocating \$10,000 for the first meeting?

**Charlie Lean** – Trying to figure out how to spend our \$200,000, we want to be realistic how much this will cost us, but we have an unknown – an advisory group we may not even decide we like – I think there should be meetings.

**Representative Keller** – Is our concern over the perceived threat to our money real, because of the price of oil, but I'm puzzled over, beyond political action, how the money could be frozen easily.

**Mike Meekin** – Say we're using this \$200,000 figure, we might be scrutinized how we spend the money, and spending 1/4th of the budget to initiate a *new* advisory group. Not sure we've gotten our point across yet, and we're adding to what we already have. The \$10,000 seems like a good amount of money to get started, and if we need more, and it's there, and it's a good idea, we could do it then.

**Frank Woods** – I think we should form a committee for each recommendation from the Federal Overreach Summit, \$10,000 for each advisory committee we convene to come up with a solution. It's more work but it leads to something to work with. Let's appropriate it as provided under our bylaws.

**Mark Fish** – Call the roll.

**Ron Somerville** [restating the motion] – Motion to appropriate \$20,000, friendly amendment to appropriate \$10,000.

Time stamp on the recording at 5:33:56

Olson (N); Meekin (Y); Somerville (Y); Fish (Y); Liska (Y); Smith (Y); Arno (Y); Woods (Y); Lean (Y); Hanson (Y); Chairman (Y)

**Mark Fish** – Move to pass resolution, as amended.

Time stamp on the recording at 5:35:30

**Ron Somerville** – Second.

**Frank Woods** – Objection in the sense it did not address comments.

**Ron Somerville** – Clarification to adopt with the idea that the agenda in Juneau is to see this written and it can be taken up again.

**Warren Olson** – Objection because we have not had sufficient time to consider operations in advance.

**Representative Keller** – Can revisit by simple vote at any time.

Roll Call

Somerville (Y); Fish (Y); Liska (Y); Smith (Y); Arno (Y); Woods (Y); Lean (Y); Hanson (Y); Chairman (Y)

Advisory Group Resolution Passes

Time stamp on the recording at 5:38:46

**Ron Somerville** – Move to approve expenditure on digitizing archives, estimate of \$12,000-15,000.  
Time stamp on the recording at 5:40:13

**Mark Fish** – Second.

No Objections

**Ron Somerville** – Media relations firm hiring.

**Charlie Lean** – It's a very good idea. Digitizing enables that very action. Got the ball rolling, OK with putting this off until we get a proposal.

**Representative Keller** – Media relations firm coming to January meeting, have been listening in today and can capture something for us in a presentation.

**Mark Fish** – Can we add resolutions to authorize Revolution Media to agenda at Juneau meeting?

**Sara Taylor** – There is time on the Juneau meeting agenda to reflect on this work session.

**Ron Somerville** – Putting Stan Leaphart on contract with so much per hour, per diem, etc.

**Sara Taylor** – Stan is here as a vendor, that is taken care of. To make it grow, it could be approved.

**Mark Fish** – Resolution from the subcommittee on overreach project funding. Summary from Commissioner Smith?

**Susan Smith** – We have weekly subcommittee meetings, throughout all of this change in administration we've been worried about our \$200,000 federal overreach money and would like to allocate the whole amount at some point in time. We have a blank on the back to describe what remains. I would like to see this amended to actually say "so much for our advisory group" and "so much for a PR firm to help with outreach" and "so much for the media firm to do videos" and "so much for digitizing the library" so we could show that we have a use for it, even if we have not "spent" it.

**Kathleen Liska** – Add “so much for other summits.” Would like to hear from Access Subcommittee on other summits and how much they might cost.

**Teresa Hanson** – Looking at doing another summit, and we need to get moving on it. If we wait too long, we need to keep things flowing.

**Frank Woods** – Do we have a budgetary plan? I would like to see this tabled until Juneau. It would be good to have a full budget analysis, including my idea of different advisory groups.

**Representative Keller** – [to Director] do you see a product forthcoming that details that?

**Sara Taylor** – A comprehensive list would be very tentative. Caution shown today is good and we have spent some of it (10%), but not enough progress made today for the whole. As soon as a significant amount of it gets spent, we can say “this is how we spent it” and reserve the remainder to expenses like printing, conferences, website maintenance, etc. This is a good meaningful start.

**Mark Fish** – Have subcommittee keep this resolution as a draft, work with Director, time launch of it.

**Rod Arno** – Lost of things described in here are still balls in the air. Planning for another summit, it might be better to have these other things set up first. Access as a summit topic will draw more attention than wetlands and such, but a lot of that stuff is not over. Things were promised in the federal law that we could be achieving, is this money going towards overreach or is access another project altogether? Should complete things we’ve been working on, get new staff, before planning something new.

### **Commissioner Closing Comments**

Time stamp on the recording at 5:56:25

**Teresa Hanson** – Never want to attend a meeting by telephone ever again. Subcommittee seems stalled until hearing about the direction we’re going in, no discussion on attendance in Utah, glad to see the advisory group is agreeable to all, very excited about seeing where it goes.

### **Out-of-Order Discussion**

Time stamp on the recording at 5:57:46

Process for inviting nominations to advisory group

- No stepwise process is required, just that nominations shall be invited
- Notice will be published, two weeks to submit (before or at Juneau meeting)
- Membership affected by federal land management/establishment, per AS 41.37.230(c)
- Group should have a diversity of experiences, but it is not required
- Can recruit people directly; can submit nominations without notifying nominees

### **Commissioner Closing Comments (continued)**

Time stamp on the recording at 6:01:39

**Charlie Lean** – Problems with federal overreach is lack of consultation with the affected users, as so often their actions are based on perceived problems by people who have never been there or done that. Important for us to focus on particular issues and problems and crafting solutions for that particular thing rather than address all things at once.

**Frank Woods** – AS 41.37.220 says we shall hold hearings; is every meeting a hearing? Going off that protocol is that our internal process, we have to develop how to internalize information and resolve issues, be it legislatively, administratively or by policy, how do we do that? I would like to address that at the next meeting. The advisory group sets a precedent. If we're only going to meet three times as a group, provide hearings, we should explore internal process. Land into trust has divided Alaskans, two sides, have to look at all issues and that is a big one.

**Rod Arno** – Impressed with how much time commissioners spend on this commission. Executive Commission, Outreach Subcommittee, that is what is making this commission way more functional than it has been before. Would like to know what five comment deadlines are coming up next month. Have the Director let commissioners know what s/he is working on in case we can contribute.

**Susan Smith** – Thanks to Sara and Karrie, working hard, keeping busy. Sara stepped into Stan's seat and hit ground running, really appreciate that. Thank commissioners for considering subcommittee resolutions, worked very hard on them, wanted everyone on the same page, appreciate consideration.

**Kathleen Liska** – Very impressed with Outreach Subcommittee and Executive Committee. Thank you for getting these resolutions approved, get working on things. So many of these pieces and expenditures can go under public relations aspects. Excited to meet PR firm in Juneau.

**Mark Fish** – Looked at resolutions today and seen an incredible amount of work went into it. Appreciate that work and thought it was imperative to move on some of those issues today and respect that work. Reviewing bylaws, caught my eye, that each commissioner needs a copy of Robert's Rules. I would like my copy so I can be better at these meetings, so we all have them, meetings move smoother and achieve more, build efficiencies. Advisory group should attract a lot of attention.

**Ron Somerville** – Raise a couple things. Interpretation of the statute in terms of assignments from the legislature, has always bothered me that we're allowed hearings but not meetings, summits, are we stretching things. Outreach Subcommittee might be reaching out further than authorized, commission should expand their charge. Subcommittee was about reaching the public, brochures, materials, etc. I did not have time to look at these, not very aware of what was going on until it was before us. Admire the people on the commission, one of the few groups that actually discusses these problems, work hard.

**Mike Meekin** – Agree with what other said, admiration for commissioners. Bylaws need to be introduced from the get-go.

**Warren Olson** – Two housekeeping subjects: (1) would like Director to transmit material in advance of meetings, nothing the morning of the meeting or similar, want to go through it several times, minimum amount of time before meetings and (2) would like heads up on reappointment of term, how to resubmit, what is needed to be done to re-up.

Response

**Stan Leaphart** – Vacancies, term expirations posted on Boards and Commissions website.

**Representative Keller** – Deep appreciation for commission. The issues are huge. Appreciate willingness in this group to take risks, to act, to press on, that is not always easy to find in a group of public servants. This group sees the problem and does something about it. Mark Wayson's comments today and public testimony hit home.

**Stan Leaphart** – Thank you for inviting me and asking to participate. About last year's summit, a whole list of recommendations was put out. Take a number of those recommendations, prioritize them,

and ask an advisory group how to implement them. Summit identified the problems, next step is how to fix. Might be more efficient than developing multiple advisory groups.

**Representative Keller** – If commissioners do not have iPads, or similar, let us know.

**Sara Taylor** – Thank you, Stan, for coming. Feeling optimistic. Thank you everyone, this day went a lot better than it did in my head. Everyone stayed on task, articulate comments, very impressed with how things went.

**Adjourn**

Time stamp on the recording at 6:23:15