



April 20th, 2023

Meeting of the Coalition of Local Health Officials

Meeting Began: 12:10pm

Executive Members:

Present: Naomi Biggs, CLHO Chair, Polk; Jocelyn Warren, Past CLHO Chair, Lane; Carrie Brogoitti, Vice-Chair, Center for Human Development Union; Philip Mason-Joyner, Secretary/Treasurer, Clackamas; Dr. Pat Luedtke, Health Officer's Rep; Jackson Baures, Large County Representative, Jackson; Shane Sanderson, Medium County Representative, Linn; Katie Plumb, Small County Representative, Crook; Joseph Fiumara, Coalition of Local Environmental Health Specialists, Umatilla; Lindsey Manfrin, Public Health Administrators of Oregon, Yamhill; Marie Boman-Davis, Legislative Committee Representative, Washington

Absent:

Members Present (x if present)

X	Baker – Meghan Chancey		Hood River - Trish Elliot	X	Multnomah – Jessica Guernsey
X	Benton – Sara Hartstein	X	Jackson - Jackson Baures	X	North Central PHD - Shellie Campbell
X	Clackamas – Kim La Croix	X	Jefferson - Mike Baker	X	Polk – Naomi Biggs
X	Clatsop – Jiancheng Huang	X	Josephine – Janet Fredrickson		Tillamook - Marlene Putnam
X	Columbia – Jamie Aanensen		Klamath - Jennifer Little	X	Umatilla - Joseph Fiumara
X	Coos - Anthony Arton		Lake - Judy Clarke	X	Union - Carrie Brogoitti
X	Crook – Katie Plumb	X	Lane - Jocelyn Warren	X	Washington – Marie Boman-Davis
X	Deschutes – Heather Kaisner	X	Lincoln - Florence Pourtal	X	Wheeler – Shelby Thompson
X	Douglas - Bob Dannenhoffer	X	Linn - Shane Sanderson	X	Yamhill - Lindsey Manfrin
	Gilliam – Hollie Winslow	X	Malheur - Sarah Poe	X	HO Caucus - Pat Luedtke
X	Grant – Jessica Winegar	X	Marion – Wendy Zieker	X	CLEHS Caucus - Joseph Fiumara
X	Harney – Kelly Singhose		Morrow – Robin Canaday	X	PHAO - Lindsey Manfrin

Public Health Division: Danna Drum



Coalition of Local Health Officials: Sarah Lochner, Executive Director; Laura Daily, Program Manager

Other LPHA staff: Jessica Winegar (Grant), Elisabeth Maxwell (Lane County, Legislative Committee Member)

Guests: Ryann Gleason (CFM)

Motion: Meghan Chancey made a motion to approve the March 2023 minutes. Jackson Baures seconded the motion. Unanimous vote, motion past.

Agenda Items

Appointments: None

Legislative Committee Recommendations

HB 2656: Healthy Teens Survey Participation

Elisabeth Maxwell: The CLHO Legislative Committee recommends CLHO Support HB 2656 at Priority 3 (lowest level, provide passive support/logo) – which seeks to require School Districts to participate in the Healthy Teens Survey. The amended version of the bill now specifies that parents must be notified of the survey at least 5 days in advance and that students can opt out of the survey or opt out of individual questions; parents may also decline on behalf of their children. The bill also requires an advisory committee be formed – comprised of the education sector. It was voted out of committee on a bipartisan basis and sent to ways and means. The [Fiscal Impact](#) came in at about \$1.5 million per biennium, with a total of 5 FTE: 2 for DOEd and 3 for OHA. Jennifer Little noted that Klamath schools opted out because of disagreement around the questions on the survey, which means Klamath will be out of a lot of data. Concerns were around gender identity, sexual orientation, access to guns, and the ways the questions were phrased in the affirmative (“how many cigarettes have you smoked?” rather than “have you ever smoked cigarettes?”). List of all the school districts that have opted out here: <https://airtable.com/shryv5OpA7jfkvQbA/tbls8VAFjO1xMCxgZ>. All present at the Legislative Committee voted in favor.

Motion: 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Crook), remaining present in favor, motion passed.



HB 2420: Vital Records

Sarah Lochner: The Legislative Committee voted to support HB 2420 at a Priority 2 (submit testimony when heard in the second chamber). The original bill was brought by a funeral home in Burns that was frustrated by how long it takes to obtain death certificates, but it would have shifted fees away from the state office to locals (along with responsibilities) and that would have left the state office unable to function. An amendment turned it into a taskforce bill instead, and it considered a non-controversial bill and passed out of committee with bipartisan support. It names county vital records offices as one of the participants on the taskforce, so one of you will likely be called to serve on this taskforce. All present at the Legislative Committee voted in favor.

Joe Fiumara: Would the taskforce be considering allowing local vital records offices to issue death certificates after the six month mark?

Sarah Lochner: That is one of the things they would be considering, yes. Another idea was that the counties could issue death certificates while the state could issue the birth certificates – there may be ways to split the duties. Right now, if there needs to be a toxicology report, that often takes longer than six months, and then the death certificate must go through the state, which delays it even more.

Sarah Poe: I just learned that not every county oversees the vital records. We have very few birth certificates that we need to issue, yet we have to keep a full-time person for this. Are there counties that have given these duties entirely to the state? And is the idea that the county would be able to issue them up to a year? Because we would love to do that.

Sarah Lochner: Right now, these certificates can be issued by the local up to six months after death, but any time past that must go through the state. The complaint that started this taskforce was that locals should be able to issue them past six months, and this would potentially generate more fees for the locals to support their programs. So now, it is about making it be more convenient and allowing more things to go through the locals while not having the state lose out on all fees – it will be a balancing act.



Jiancheng Huang: If the state could not sustain themselves, is there a way to just split the fees that would go to the state among the locals to support their vital records programs? I am in support of the locals taking this work on.

Marie Boman-Davis: I want to flag something for everyone – the State Medical Examiner's Office will not be doing medical examinations or issuing death certificates starting in July for 14 counties. Because of this, there will be a delay for these 14 counties in certifying

Sarah Lochner: Thank you, Marie, and I think it would be good to have a representative from one of these 14 counties on the taskforce.

Marie Boman-Davis: Yes, and it might be good to have multiple spots for representation because it will impact these counties very differently. Also, the Health Officer's Caucus is involved because if a county does not have the right person to sign off on death certificates, it falls to the health officer.

Pat Luedtke (via chat): An FYI to Marie's comment on the ME changes: The HO caucus has been meeting regularly with Dr. Hurst (State ME) on this issue.....and the HO retreat this weekend has it as an agenda item yet again. As you can tell, there is some fear in this space.....as well as lack of clarity.

Jessica Winegar (via chat): Just wondering what the other counties are doing? Our HO will resign if he is required to be the ME as well.

Robert Dannenhoffer (via chat): The medical examiner issue has been discussed extensively at the health officer's caucus. It is not clear that there will be any changes in Southern Oregon- we have heard differing things.

Motion: 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

HB 2397: Harm Reduction Warehouse

Sarah Lochner: The Legislative Committee voted to support HB 2397 at a Priority 2 (submit testimony when heard in the second chamber). This adds funds and supplies to the harm reduction warehouse, and it adds LPHAs as potential recipients of the warehouse. The bill is now in Ways & Means with an indeterminant fiscal because the Legislature can decide the



amount that can go into it. It was voted out of committee with bipartisan support. All present at the Legislative Committee voted in favor.

Motion: 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

HB 643: Home Kitchens

Sarah Lochner: The Legislative Committee has voted to change SB 643A (regarding home kitchens) from “oppose without amendments” to “neutral” since we got our amendments added, including what foods are allowed to be prepared in home kitchens and requiring a clear label and identifier as an item prepared in a home kitchen (for tracing back if there are problems). As the law stands right now, it allows coffee shops to use food prepared in home kitchens. Our Environmental Health folks tell me that coffee shops technically fall under the definitions of restaurants, so this would be a departure, but that could be addressed in rulemaking. It could also be a problem for larger counties with many coffee shops - I have heard that Clackamas County intends to oppose it, but because CLHO is a statewide entity and is trying to build relationships with Republicans (who are sponsoring this bill), it is probably wise to remain neutral, especially when it moved out of Committee with bipartisan support.

Joe Fiumara: To clarify, the definition of coffee shops as restaurants is in statute, so it could not be addressed in rulemaking. This would essentially create opposing statutes, and we don’t know how they will figure out the legality of determining what is a coffee shop and what is a restaurant. The coffee shop amendment was added after we provided our first set of comments, so CLEHS does not support a neutral stance and would still like to oppose.

Pat Luedtke: I share some of Joe’s concerns, and in my experience with certifying laboratories, there is a grace period where labs have six months before they needed to be certified. We’ve found that when we go out to certify, the address is to a dry-cleaning shop or some other place and that this lab took the money and provided lab results without ever doing any testing. As the acting state laboratory director, I’m concerned that something similar could happen here where we don’t have visibility into where this food is being produced and who is producing it.

Marie Boman-Davis: As a procedural question, could we provide an amendment before the vote?

Sarah Lochner: Yes, or they could provide a new motion.



Pat Luedtke: Sarah, you mentioned earlier the political value of remaining neutral – I worry that if we don't get involved, there will be a domino effect where we don't get involved in the next one either.

Sarah Lochner: This bill originated by Senator Knopp, the Senate Republican Leader, who we are trying to build a relationship with as we make public health a bipartisan issue. However, we met with him during National Public Health Week, and he didn't seem excited about public health, so I don't know that opposing this bill would break a vital relationship. If someone wants to make a new motion, I will follow what you all want.

Florence Pourtal: I understand the point of being a good partner and building relationships, but I also want to support our Environmental Health folks, and I don't want to remain neutral on a bill that has a big impact on public health. Is it possible to oppose this unless the coffee shop piece is taken out?

Bob Dannenhoffer: An amendment would be in order. You can only make a new motion if the previous motion is defeated or withdrawn

Ryann Gleason: SB 643 has been referred to the House Economic Development and Small Business committee. Rep Janelle Bynum chairs this committee. Rep Bynum is a small business owner and owns a few McDonald's restaurants, so she might understand some of the complexities.

Joe Fiumara: I will add that CLEHS is only looking at this from an EH perspective, not a political perspective. Many of our concerns were taken into account, and with the addition of coffee shops, our concern is that many places will say "I serve coffee" as a way to get around the definitions. The things that Sarah brings up are not things CLEHS considered, and I just want to be clear on that with everyone here.

Motion/vote: The Legislative Committee has put forward a motion to move from "oppose without amendments" to "neutral" on SB 643A. 20 nay votes (Umatilla, CLEHS, Clackamas, Lincoln, Washington, NCHPD, Josephine, Lane, Linn, Douglas, Jefferson, Yamhill, Baker, Jackson, Clatsop, Grant, Multnomah, Columbia, Benton, Polk). Motion defeated.



Joe Fiumara: Prior to a new motion, I want to note that CLEHS will probably never like this bill, but they could probably live with it if the coffee shop part is removed because then the restrictions are in place for the licensed facilities, and they won't be receiving these products. Julie in Clackamas emailed today and referenced that there's confusion among CLEHS about why this bill even needs to exist when there is already a process for both licensed and unlicensed facilities in Oregon. So, if we were to remove the coffee shop portion, there would still be this

Florence Pourtal: I feel like there may be an opportunity to educate the committee it's going to as to why we are saying no. So if CLEHS recommends to oppose while we also want to build relationships, could we approach the committee with "we are opposing without this dropping the coffee shops and here's why" and then remain neutral on the rest of this?

Sarah Lochner: We could "oppose unless amendments to remove coffee shops" so that the licensed facilities are not receiving these products.

Pat Luedtke: Looking at past experience, we had BM 91 to pass recreational cannabis a number of years ago, and the sky did not fall down. However, there have been the predictable downstream health impacts we expected – stubbornly high STI rates from people not making good decisions under the influence, stubbornly high hospital visits due to high levels of THC, and such. So, there could be an opportunity for education here to talk about how this decision will impact local public health further down the road. Sarah, I don't know if you think that time has passed or not, but I would support that.

Sarah Lochner: I think there are opportunities for education, but I would need more support from the EH folks to articulate this.

Joe Fiumara: If we make a new motion, are we really changing our position? Right now, we are "oppose unless amended," so do we need to be specific about how we want it amended?

Naomi Biggs: Right, we would want to specify what we want amended.

Motion: Joe Fiumara made a motion to oppose SB 643A unless amended to remove coffee shops. Pat Luedtke seconded. 0 nay votes, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

Alcohol Awareness Hearing



Sarah Lochner: The Legislative Committee approved me to participate in an informational hearing about the health impacts of alcohol consumption. I've been participating in the Oregon Alcohol Policy Alliance which had introduced an alcohol tax increase bill. This bill died due to the April 4th deadline, but they still wish to have an informational hearing on this general topic before the end of the session. This would be a good way to introduce a public health perspective on this issue.

Jessica Guernsey: I'm generally supportive, but I would like to talk through the specifics. The context and backdrop with the vitriol around public health opposes all fun makes this tricky.

Sarah Lochner: I would be very careful about how I phrase this and would focus on excessive consumption. This hearing would also be after the policy committees have stopped their work this session (sometime in June).

Jessica Guernsey: I've been working on bringing in our Health Officer to help with these tense issues, because then we have a doctor just talking about the facts. Our hands are sort of tied with alcohol because the industry is large in this state, but I'm supportive of this because we have to start somewhere just like with tobacco. I would just like to think of ways to insulate ourselves from the backlash. And I'm sure you would present this well, Sarah, but I had to be careful locally when navigating this.

Katie Crook: I also support this work 110%, and in Central Oregon where brewing is big, I've seen health care providers take on this messaging by talking about how it is showing up in our hospitals, and it seems to carry more weight than public health saying it. I say it all the time, and I'm dismissed as the fun police. I wonder who would be in the room – would we be there, and would we be saying this in tandem with health care providers?

Pat Luedtke: I have seen real benefit from a collaborative approach if more than two people are allowed. Doctors do receive a certain amount of respect, but there are some things we can't say. For example, we can't say "if you get vaccinated, you won't get whopping cough" because the vaccine is only 75% effective, but Public Information Officers have a way of saying it that resonates more. I think an approach that uses medical, population health, and political/communication expertise is the way to go.

Shane Sanderson: Agree with Pat. This is a spot where position statements are a lot less impactful than data, particularly forecasting data. For example, we presented data on traffic deaths to policy makers in Wisconsin, and we showed them that



it was their call – not to be dramatic, but how many deaths are they willing to see? This puts us in the spot of data/information provider rather than political communicators, which is a good approach for these types of tense cultural issues.

Jocelyn Warren: Regular use has been implicated in dementia - defined as use of as little as one drink weekly.

Naomi Biggs: Sarah, do you know if there is only one spot for this hearing, or could multiple people participate?

Sarah Lochner: I'm sure we could have multiple people, but we also don't even know if we will get a hearing or not. Given how often we have Board meetings, I wanted to get permission now in case I need to act before the next one.

Naomi Biggs: I would feel comfortable with supporting this knowing that you will come back and get more folks involved if needed.

Multnomah County left the call.

Motion: The Legislative Committee has made a motion to support Sarah participating in a potential informational hearing on alcohol consumption and taxes. 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

Rural Health Providers Tax Credit Bills

Sarah Lochner: The Board had previously given general support for pursuing adding public health nurses added into rural health tax credit bill. Our best shot at this does not seem as though it will work, so the Legislative Committee has recommended we put these efforts to the side for this session and consider bringing our own tax credit bill in a later session. There are unlikely to be many tax credit bills passing this session because of the limited funds available.

Motion: The Legislative Committee has made a motion to hold off on pursuing a tax credit bill for public health nurses this session. 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

HB 3610: Taskforce



Sarah Lochner: The taskforce created by this bill would look at alcohol pricing and alcohol treatment in the state of Oregon. This was brought by Reps Sanchez and Nosse (Rep Sanchez sponsored the alcohol tax bill that died). It currently does not have public health named as a seat, and we would like to add public health to this taskforce. The Legislative Committee did not have quorum to vote on this, but all those present agreed that it should come to the Board for approval. I would recommend this at a Priority 1 so I can actively lobby to have a public health seat added (there is a public hearing this afternoon on this). I talked to Rep. Nosse about this, and he believes that it is necessary to get all these folks at the table. It is not considered a controversial bill since it is simply convening a taskforce to discuss this issue.

Motion: Pat Luedtke made a motion to support adding a public health seat to HB 3610 at a Priority 1. Bob Dannenhoffer seconded. 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

Health Officer Rep left the call.

HB 3247: Zoonotic Disease Lab Funding

Sarah Lochner: This would provide \$3.73 million to Oregon State University to upgrade their zoonotic disease lab to level 1 (most secure). They currently do all testing for zoonotic diseases in Oregon, and they do not turn anyone away, but their lack of capacity/staff/equipment puts their staff and the public at risk. This would go through the Education Subcommittee, so this budget request would not interfere or take away from our other public health priorities. Again, the Legislative Committee did not have quorum to vote on this, but all those present agreed that it should come to the Board for approval. I would recommend supporting this at a Priority 2 so I could draft and submit testimony in support of it.

Motion: Jackson Baures made a motion to support HB 3247 at a Priority 2. Anthony Arton seconded. 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

HB 2925: Racism as a Public Health Crisis Companion Bill

This is a repeat from last Board meeting. OPHA has repeatedly asked for CLHO's support on this bill. This is the companion bill to HB 2918 and would extend the deadline for this work, the reports back to the Legislature, and would extend funding of \$785,000 for support staff at the Oregon Advocacy Commission through OHA. I would recommend CLHO support this at a



Priority 2 (provide written testimony or letter of support). At our last meeting, we got hung up on the RFP that came out for this mobile health unit funding. This is separate from that RFP process (though this bill would support the staff who are overseeing the RFP process).

Naomi Biggs: When we voted in support of this before, we voted to support the concept but not the moved deadline, right?

Sarah Lochner: There are two separate bills – one that add \$4 million to the mobile health units program (which we have supported), and this one which extends the deadline for some of the existing funding to support the program.

Motion: Marie Boman-Davis made a motion to support HB 2925 at a Priority 2. Jiancheng Huang seconded. 0 opposed, 0 abstained, remaining present in favor, motion passed.

Human Services Coalition of Oregon Letter to the Co-Chairs

Sarah Lochner: This Coalition is issuing a letter to the co-chairs for the Ways and Means Committee about their budget framework. The budget framework did not issue any cuts to Public Health Modernization, but it also did not offer any additional funding. This letter would urge the co-chairs to put additional funding towards Modernization given how vital public health is.

Florence Pourtal: Who is writing this letter?

Sarah Lochner: The Human Services Coalition of Oregon, which is a group of advocates that I sit on – members are from government, CBOs, CCOs, and many other advocacy organizations.

Motion: Mike Baker made a motion to sign onto this letter to the Ways and Means co-chairs. Jackson Baures seconded. 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Washington), remaining present in favor, motion passed.

Healthy Oregon Workforce Training Opportunity (HOWTO) Grant:



Laura Daily: There is a draft proposal in the meeting materials of CLHO's idea to apply for the HOWTO Grant. We learned about this grant and attended an information session last week, so all this information is still very new and the ideas are not fully formed, but we are bringing this to the Board today to get approval to put time and effort into this. The HOWTO Grant is:

- Administered by the Oregon Health Policy Board in partnership with OHA and OHSU
- Expands health professional training to address health care workforce shortages in:
 - Culturally, linguistically, and historical marginalized communities
 - Rural communities
 - Communities experiencing inequities throughout Oregon
- Purpose: Support innovative, transformative, community-based training initiatives that will address identified local health care workforce shortages and expand the diversity of the health professional workforce.
- Core values are to:
 - Support greater trauma-informed, ethnic, racial, cultural, and linguistic diversity and inclusion in Oregon's health care workforce
 - Address health inequities and social determinants of health
 - Expand current and/or develop new health professional training in a local area
- Still getting clarification on whether CLHO can apply as a 501(c)(6)

Our proposal today is to apply for this grant to address training needs among new local public health staff. We heard through the Workforce Report that there were gaps in public health practice in existing degree programs, and many LPHAs felt the need to "home-grow" their workforce even if the workforce has less formal education or a background in public health. We discussed this idea with the NWCPHP in October 2022 when we were pursuing a small grant through NACCHO, and NWCPHP had this type of work on their radar for a while and quoted us one year of a graduate research assistant working on this at \$30,000/year. This grant can be up-to three years if we choose.

Our ask of the Board today is approval of CLHO staff pursuing this. If the Board is supportive, there would be a few areas of work that I would put on the back-burner since this would be my primary focus of the next 30ish days. And I will pause there to see if there are questions or feedback.

Marie Boman-Davis: I am generally supportive, but I'm wondering if there would be an opportunity to brainstorm the title rather than using "Intro to Public Health."



Jiancheng Huang: I hope that the state would give us some guidelines or standards around workforce training. I have worked in rural public health for 30 years, and home-growing the workforce is not enough. When I went to work as a director of public health in New York, I was told that I had to become an Environmental Health Specialists, and I was able to go to the university and get that certification through a state program. This should be a state-level thing, not something for this group to pursue.

Naomi Biggs: I will ask that we keep comments limited to whether we support this initiative because we are over time and have many people having to leave the call.

Laura Daily: I will add that not pursuing this round of funding is 100% on the table. We have several upcoming initiatives, such as the statewide Workforce Development Plan as a priority of Modernization and CLHO's strategic planning in September, to decide if this sort of this is a priority. We saw this opportunity and wanted to bring it to the Board, but there is no rush to apply for this right now if the time is not right.

Joe Fiumara: I think this will be useful in general regardless of education level or background. Public health education programs look different based on where you go to school, and people moving to Oregon have a lot to learn as they figure out how things work here. The one thing I would caution against is using the idea in the proposal of lowering requirements. I don't think we want to frame it as lowering requirements and do want to frame it more as a way to broaden who we are looking for.

Laura Daily: That makes sense. That would not go into the application – that was more of a question to you all of, would this idea help with that issue of feeling as though you all needed to lower minimum requirements. But I understand your point about framing it as a way to broaden who we can get.

Naomi Biggs: And I understand that you would pull together a workgroup to discuss some of these things?

Laura Daily: Because of the right turnaround, we wouldn't actually schedule workgroups, but we would ask for a couple of folks willing to provide feedback to look over our work via email.

Katie Plumb: Can you speak to what you would need to put off or delay working on to complete this application?



Laura Daily: Yes, our monthly newsletters would be delayed/shortened, my email responses would be delayed, I wouldn't participate/support as many Conference committees, and meeting minutes would be delayed. Nothing vitally important, but I want to be transparent about what would get put off.

Kim La Croix: I'll just add that Clackamas has developed our own PH and Modernization 101 training for onboarding. It could be strengthened. I'd be happy to participate in a workgroup.

Jocelyn Warren: Thanks for sharing this Kim - it is so great to have examples from other agencies! I am working on revising ours now.

Yamhill County and PHAO Rep left the call.

Marion County left the call.

Jackson County left the call.

Motion: Joe Fiumara made a motion to support CLHO staff applying for the HOWTO Grant. Jocelyn Warren seconded. 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Clatsop), remaining present in favor, motion passed.

Budget Check-in

Baker County left the call.

Washington County left the call.

Sarah Lochner: I can make this quick since we are overtime. I met with Carrie and Jocelyn and then the Executive Committee to go over the proposed budget, and there were no concerns. The dues increase has already been approved, and the increased funds would go to a few increased areas of spending (though we would still be in the black/adding to reserves):

- Provide Laura with a substantial raise
- Bring in an intern @ \$15/hour to help sustain the communications work we have begun with the Stuart Collective (this will be a bit of an experiment since we don't know if this will be enough money)
- Strategic Planning session: about \$12,000 for the facilitator, room, and food for the day
- Adding a couple thousand dollars to the retreat budget since we are trying out a new venue
- Keep the state travel budget healthy so Naomi and I can finish visiting all the health departments around the state.



Anthony Arton: Very supportive, and Laura totally has earned the raise! And the stronger CLHO is the stronger all of us are.

Website Updates and National Conferences:

Laura Daily: Because of time, I won't review the website updates. For National Conferences, some administrators indicated that they wanted to know which of their colleagues were attending conferences around the state and country so they could arrange meet-ups. I've created a survey that I will send out with the follow-up email where you can indicate which events you are going to. At any point during the year, you can resubmit it, and I will get an alert. I will use this to connect people who are attending the same events so they can arrange a meet-up.

Due to time, Ryann Gleason will send out a written Legislative Update with Sarah's Friday email.

Meeting adjourned at 1:32pm.