

Speaker 1:

After rule language was reviewed by Suzanne and there wasn't any feedback given, and so I'm not sure if that's helpful or not.

Chair Sizemore:

It's helpful, thank you. Okay, Senator Conway

Senator Conway:

I have a question more for anyone here depending on what we've had before the legislature in the last four years at least, and has raffle bills, and legislature has taken action on those bills and actually, because we've had rulings on those enhanced raffle bills on the constituted expansion of gambling. My question there is, I just heard you say this, but I'm still wondering why this change why this electronic change doesn't represent something that needs to go to the legislature? I'm concerned here, it says the enhanced raffle came through the legislature, why this one is not... I heard your explanation actually, I'm not trying to put you on the spot here, but electronic raffles seem to be a major change here in how we handle raffles so, maybe I'm wrong on that but.

Tina:

Chair. I would like to add.

Chair Sizemore:

Yeah, go ahead Tina.

Tina:

I would like to answer for Ashley, if I may, thank you. So, enhanced raffles, Senator Conway, you are correct, that is separate legislation that is specifically defined in statute, and is only available for charitable, non-profit organizations which focus on providing services to individuals with intellectual disabilities. So, very defined, in terms of who can operate an enhanced raffle. This activity is a raffle that is defined in ROCW 9 4 6 0 2 7 7, it is just like every other raffle that occurs, so we have the enhanced raffle, that can only be conducted by charitable organizations that provide services to those with intellectual disabilities, and then we have the other definition of raffle, and that is the boundaries of which this will have to operate, and that is why there is an on-site server, that is why it is a closed network, because there is no ability for internet sales. The electronic portion comes into play, there is still a manual draw, which is a requirement under the raffle definition in the ROCW 9 4 6 0 2 7 7, so there is no random number generator. The electronic portion, of this electronic raffle, is really a point of sales system, and a mechanism for which tickets are printed. That's the only electronic component here.

Senator Conway:

I guess I have to follow up, Tina, I mean we had a pretty good conversation about, if I may, Chair.

Chair Sizemore:

Yeah, go ahead Senator.

Senator Conway:

So, it sounds from your discussion here, that any organization could do this, as long as they maintain these rules, and this could be done by almost any kind of organization that wants to do this within the rules. Am I right or wrong on that?

Tina:

That would be correct, but, in this case, we have specifically outlined in this proposed rules package that only, at this time, can the major league sports teams offer this, or allow this electronic raffle that is defined here. We want to keep it very narrow at this point, so that we can make sure that everybody has a handle on things, and then at some point, certainly, we could expand to allow anybody who qualifies under the definition of the ROCW as a charitable non-profit organization.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, thank you for that, Tina. Commissioner Reeves.

Commissioner Reeves:

So this question is for the teams, as the petitioners, would you say that it's a fair assessment that is not you looking to expand gaming, but rather to bring what we currently know as raffles into the digital era by being able to provide an electronic format of what I would normally get, that little blue ticket with my number, and somebody else would get a little blue ticket, and put that in the bucket, that in a 50 thousand person stadium, this is really just an opportunity to make sure that, that little blue ticket that I'm getting is actually just a printed sales receipt with my numbers on it, and the other end of that goes into a bucket in a centralized location, and so this is really the same style of raffles that we know that happen at the senior center or my grandma's backyard party, but now are happening on a much grander scale and with a printed receipt rather than a blue ticket? Is that a fair assessment of what you all are imagining this to be?

Speaker 6:

That is a fair assessment, and the one thing I would add to that, Commissioner Reeves, is the modernization features for some of the other provision in there, such as identifying where those sales can take place, and other clarifications that are just streamlining the current process.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, I see a few other teams, you guys should have had your mascots on. Sorry, Representative Clova.

Representative Clova:

Yes, so following on that question, Mr. Chair, I understand the assertion that this is just a way to modernize the technique that we're using, who is currently doing this in the old fashion way with the two tickets as Commissioner Reeves described, and how many do we know are looking to add this when it's available electronically?

Chair Sizemore:

I believe that would be directed towards staff.

Tina:

So, I can't answer how many teams, bear with me Representative Clova, is the question how many teams are running the paper based raffle right now? I can't answer that, I would look to the teams to say, I believe Drew indicated, Mr. Johnson, indicated that the Sounders tried, I think is what my notes... He's nodding yes, it looks like the Sounders tried, I'm not aware of the Mariners or of, Kraken isn't open yet, so I'm not aware of any other teams that have tried this, but I can go back and pull licensed organizations and find out if you would like me to do that outside of the major league teams.

Representative Clova:

I'm interested in the major league teams who are petitioning, and [crosstalk 00:08:39]

Tina:

I will let them answer that question, thank you.

Speaker 8:

Representative Clova, and Mr. Chair, we do have a representative from the Sounders who has raised his hand if you want to hear from him.

Chair Sizemore:

Oh, okay, Diego, if you could identify yourself for the record.

Diego:

Thank you, my name is Diego Puetez, I am with the Seattle Kraken, currently, none of the national sports teams are offering a raffle, I believe the only team that recently offered a raffle is the Seattle Storm, but they did have to pause those due to Covid, and so currently, Representative Clova, none of the professional sports teams are offering a raffle at their sports venues. There are some smaller teams in the state that are offering raffles, or more recently offering raffles, like the Seattle Thunderbirds, and we've been in contact with them just to gain a better understanding of what the operation looks like from a raffle perspective, I hope that answers your question.

Chair Sizemore:

All right. So I want to thank the team representatives for coming before us today, and we'll let you stand down, I'll check with, Commissioners up, Vice Chair Patterson,

Vice Chair Patterson:

Yeah, just a quick question, something I should have asked staff for a long time ago, and that is could you give me a description of what would constitute and expansion of gambling, what criteria would have to be met in order for an activity to fall into that category? I'm curious to see what legal staff will be analyzing.

Chair Sizemore:

Hi Matt.

Matt:

Hi. Vice Chair Patterson, we can provide that, Suzanne and I will provide that next week, as soon as possible, not a problem.

Vice Chair Patterson:

I assume Representative Clova and Conway and Holier are aware what that is, I just should have asked a long time ago, thank you.

Matt:

Yes, no problem

Chair Sizemore:

All right, thank you.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Thank you.

Chair Sizemore:

So I believe that, let me go back to my packet here... the staff has recommended, sorry I'm still going, staff recommends filing draft language for further discussion.

Tina:

Chair, were you going to ask for public comment on this?

Chair Sizemore:

I certainly was, I'm sure. All right, thank you for that reminder. So, at this time, prior to any motions, I will open the floor for public comment. I'm not seeing any raised hands, so once again, if there's anyone that would like to make a public comment, I'd ask that you use the functionality of the Teams app here and raise your hand or, if that's not working for you, you could unmute yourself and gain my attention. I think I talked long enough to see if there was anyone, and I'm not seeing any hands for public comments, so we'll go ahead and close public comment. Commissioner Reeves.

Commissioner Reeves:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. If it's appropriate at this time, I'd like to move to initiate rule making proceedings by filing that 102, that 102 rule is proposed for further discussion.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, is there a second?

Commissioner Leeve:

Commissioner Leeve seconds.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, it's been moved and seconded to follow staffs recommendation of filing draft language for further discussion, so would you like to speak to your motion?

Commissioner Reeves:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I heard the discussion today, but I think this is something that the commission's going to wrestle with, as we move into the 21st century, as we think about how we update automated systems to ensure that we can continue to conduct the activities that benefit our communities, particularly from a charitable perspective, and I think I've heard that word probably 15 or 20 times today in their presentation, I think this is a great opportunity for us to make sure that that work is continuing, it's continuing in a safe, effective, efficient, and transparent way, and so appreciate the petitioners bringing this before us, I appreciate the staff's good work to make sure that they're thinking through some of these new questions that we need to answer as we update and modernize systems, I look forward for the opportunity to continue.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, is there any further comments? Okay, hearing none, I will go ahead to ask for a verbal vote, so all those in favor of the motion, please say aye

Commissioner Leeve:

Aye

Tina:

Aye

Commissioner Reeves:

Aye

Chair Sizemore:

Aye. Any opposed? Motion carries four to zero. I want to thank the teams and, again, the staff, work on this has been outstanding. With that we will say goodbye to our friends from the teams, next time send the mascots.

Speaker 14:

Noted, Mr. Chair. Definitely will do.

Chair Sizemore:

All right

Speaker 14:

Thank you.

Chair Sizemore:

Thank you. So we went a long time on that topic, so I'm going to ask that we take another eight minute break, we have two more issues that we'll work on today, but let's return at 12:25, and we'll get those last couple of items on the public meeting. Thank you all, see you at 12:25.

Chair Sizemore:

All right, it looks like I have quorum again, so we will go ahead and, if staff is ready, move on to tab four in our agenda, which is default for Lina Thau, CR 2020 - 0 1 5 8 8, and as folks are aware this is held over from our last meeting, and it will be for action and possible close session, and we have Adam Teal, our acting legal manager for presentation.

Adam:

Good afternoon Chair, commissioners, again, for the record, Adam Teal, I'm the acting legal manager, we are back on the record on case CR 2020 - 0 1 5 8 8, Lina Thau, class three certification holder number 6 9 - 1 9 4 3 9, as you're aware, this matter is continued from the August 12th, 2021 meeting, at that hearing staff had presented and order for default, the record provided the only argument that you had in front of you included both the factual background, it was established through our special agents investigation, as well as the legal basis for replication, the information that was provided to you remains true and correct at this time with no exceptions per special agents supervisor of licensing at 9:15 this A.M. We were able to confirm that there has been no renewable files on Ms. Thau's class three certification thus expired two days ago.

Adam:

The record in front of you has established that Ms. Thau failed to appear not at a pre hearing conference, which she had previously attended, but at the actual hearing that she had requested, after that, she failed to file a petition to reinstate with the Office of Administrative Hearings, and failed to file a petition for review. For those reasons, Ms. Thau has forfeited her right to challenge the information presented to you, that is the only record in front of you, through which commission has established on the order the proper factual, legal basis to act. Accordingly, staff, again, recommends you sign the order revoking Ms. Thau's class three certification.

Chair Sizemore:

Thank you for that, Adam. Any questions for Adam? Okay, not seeing any. I am going to ask if Ms. Lina Thau is present on this meeting, and wish to address the commission at all? I see your hand, Vice Chair Patterson, let me check one more time to see if Ms. Thau is on this meeting, or a representative. All right, seeing no one raise their hand, go ahead Vice Chair Patterson.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Thanks, Mr. Chair. I was just curious if staff reached out to Ms. Thau to let them know that this meeting was going to occur, to let her know what happened at the last meeting, and that she would have an opportunity to address us today? Staff, did that?

Speaker 16:

I did not, no.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay

Vice Chair Patterson:

So we had a difficult, or maybe that's not the right word, we had a conversation last time, and, for me, this wasn't clear cut, and that was how long ago, several weeks ago

Speaker 16:

Two weeks.

Chair Sizemore:

Two weeks.

Vice Chair Patterson:

It would have been really helpful to have made a concerned effort to call her, or her daughter, or someone, to let them know that there still was an opportunity for her to come in and talk to us, because there are questions that we couldn't answer. I, personally, am disappointed that that didn't happen, just have to say that.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, thank you. Commissioner Reeves.

Commissioner Reeves:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to start by saying thank you to Mr. Teal and to staff, I know that the conversation that we had at the last commission meeting, I won't say difficult, but was stretched, I think, or stretched us all a little bit, both in our technical understanding of the process and in our personal perspectives and values on the process. I'll start by saying that while the process is incredibly clear, and Mr. Teal I really appreciate you following up to make sure that I understood the process, that I understood what our options as commissioners were, I do want to thank you all for your flexibility, and appreciating, both to you and to Commissioner Patterson and the Chair, that I really struggled at the last meeting with how we apply the process in a variety of different instances. And as I've said before this commission multiple times, I am constantly thinking about how, just because this is the process or the way that we've always done things, doesn't mean that we shouldn't be asking is this the right way to be doing things. And so I really wanted to thank you guys for giving me the space and the grace to continue asking that question, I'm going to continue asking that question.

Commissioner Reeves:

I think this point, and I said this in the last meeting, for me Ms. Thau's lack of application to renew her license tells me, I think I can infer some personal motivation on her part that this is not a path that she is going to pursue for whatever reason, and so, despite whether or not I agree with how the process got executed, whether or not I think there were challenges for her, I think at this point I would share with my fellow commissioners that I am prepared to move forward with the redaction of Ms. Thau's license based on the findings of fact, I'm not making a motion, Mr. Chairman, simply sharing a perspective. But I do think it is important for us to think about how the processes that we execute impact real people's lives, so I just appreciate the opportunity to have thought that through, and I'll end with that.

Chair Sizemore:

All right, thank you. I will make mention to the commission that we do have the opportunity for a close session if we feel that it is necessary or I certainly could accept a motion at this time. Commissioner Reeves

Commissioner Levee:

[inaudible 00:30:36]

Commissioner Reeves:

Go ahead

Commissioner Leeve:

I was going to make a motion, so if you're going to do something else...

Commissioner Reeves:

Nope, I was going to make a motion as well, so feel free.

Chair Sizemore:

Commissioner Leeve, seniority.

Commissioner Leeve:

I move to revoke Lina Thau's class three certification for the reasons presented by staff.

Chair Sizemore:

Is there a second?

Commissioner Reeves:

Second.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, it's been moved and seconded to revoke as presented by staff. Any discussion? Okay, hearing non, we'll try a voice vote, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

Commissioner Leeve:

Aye.

Commissioner Reeves:

Aye.

Chair Sizemore:

Aye. Any opposed? Commissioner Patterson, I think I saw your mouth, but you are muted, sorry.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Aye.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay. Motion carries forward three to zero. Adam, thank you very much for your presentations.

Adam:

Thank you everybody.

Chair Sizemore:

With that, that finished the matter on tab four, and we will now move to tab five, which is our agency request legislation, and I believe that Tommy Oaks will be making the presentation, Tommy, you with us? Hi there

Tommy:

Yes, I'm here, how're you doing?

Chair Sizemore:

Good.

Tommy:

Good. All right, good afternoon Chair, Commissioners, and ex-officios. For the record, my name is Tommy Oaks, I am a professional standards and training supervisor, and interim legislative liaison with [inaudible 00:32:25]. I am bringing before you today our final proposal for [inaudible 00:32:28] legislation for 2022. We share the same packet that is in front of you. Before I go into our agency request legislation, I want to try to explain the why, how did we get here. In the last three years, we've responded to a number of complaints regarding senior recreational video games could be played. While we don't actively regulate these unlicensed gambling activities such as this, we do respond to complaints that brings us in, and we get [inaudible 00:33:02] cause issues. We've also had inquiries from legislatures on how to address this problem as proposed by their constitutes. This agency request legislation before you today was actually brought last year by departed [inaudible 00:33:18] manager, Brian Consadine, and he had stated then that Senator Kaiser had worked on a bill in 2019 that Brian had helped out with, and it was at that time they decided our agency was going to take the lead on this, to try and get this problem resolved.

Tommy:

It didn't move forward last year, I think due to Covid being the main priority of the legislation here, is why it didn't move forward, to my understanding. So section one of this amendment, per our request will add the bonafide charitable or non-profit qualifications to include a specific exemption for non-profit senior housing organizations and community centers offering senior BINGO, under ROCW 9 4 6 0 3 2 1.

Tommy:

In section two, the amendment increases the twice per year limit for unlicensed BINGO, raffle, and amusement activities to 12 per year. This would allow once a month for each type of activity, but still keeps the max number of these activities at 5 thousand dollars, with no change.

Tommy:

So, why do we do this? These changes will allow the Gambling Commission to be more effective and efficient with this licensing of these resources, and better meet its core mission of protection the public by ensuring the gambling is legal and honest in Washington State. Additionally, increasing the unlicensed activity limit to 12 per year provides additional opportunity for the senior BINGO activities, it

does not create any significant regulatory concerns, on the staffs board. Also, this legislation kind of compares with what was done in the 2019 to 202 legislative season[inaudible 00:35:06]ROCW 9 4 6 0 2 0 9 to include two additional organizational purposes, of religious and scientific, as a true purpose for an organization to be considered a bonafide charitable or non-profit organization. Once again, the reason why we tried to do that before was to allow the Gambling Commission to become more effective and efficient with its licensing and allocation of resources, and better meet its core mission.

Tommy:

Overall, making these changes is in the best interest of the State and the Gambling Commission. These changes will allow for senior recreational BINGO in housing community centers, and provide lower earning charities and non-profits the ability to raise the money for projects and services that help Washingtonians, while still keeping the maximum gross of these activities at 5 thousand dollars. More important than for an agency, these changes will follow the legislative purpose and direction of the Gambling Act, while allowing the Gambling Commission to be more effective and efficient in the use of agency resources when regulating charitable and non-profit organizations engaged in gambling activities. With that, I would like to open it up to questions.

Chair Sizemore:

Any questions for Tommy? I don't know, I think you covered it pretty well, there's probably no room for questions, but Commissioner Reeves does have one.

Commissioner Reeves:

Leave it to Reeves to ask a question. Mr Oaks, can you, or would you find it a fair articulation that this is not considered an expansion of gaming given, I guess I'm not asking the question correctly. Could you share your thoughts on whether or not this constitutes an expansion of gaming?

Tommy:

I cannot share my thoughts because I am not qualified to answer that question, but maybe...

Commissioner Reeves:

So, Mr. Chair, maybe you could ask other members of our staff or, I don't know if Matt is still here, I know I our packet there's an AG letter that we received, but for the public's benefit it would just be helpful to have that confirmed, please.

Chair Sizemore:

Yeah, so I think our AAG did provide us, and I'll just read it. So it says, thank you for providing me with the opportunity to review this proposed legislation, I understand the purpose of proposed language, solidify ROCW 9 4 6 0 2 0 9, and 9 4 6 0 3 2 1, to amend the types of non-profit organizations qualified to engage in certain BINGO gambling activities, and make changes to the number of occurrences permitted for unlicensed activities. I did not identify any legal prohibitions with this proposed legislation. So, we do have that. Okay. Any further questions or comments for staff?

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, seeing none, as is our normal process, I will open it up for public comments, I think that we did receive a little bit of comment back, which is in our packet, is there any member of the public at this

meeting that would like to address the commission and make public comment? Again, I'll ask that you utilize the functionality, raise your hand, or if that's not working, if you can at least unmute yourself and gain my attention. And I am not seeing any public comment, so with that, we'll close public comments and ask if there is a motion. Commissioner Reeves.

Commissioner Reeves:

Sorry, Mr. Chair, I actually do have one more question. I thought this was answered in the last meeting, but my brain is forgoing me today. To be clear, this legislation is agency request, but not at the request of the senior centers or the non-profits that would be benefiting from that, is that accurate? This is something that we are instituting in response to, if I heard you correctly, Mr. Oaks, in response to reactive engagement with the community based on calls that the agency has receive on this issue, is that correct?

Tommy:

That is my understanding, that is correct, yes.

Commissioner Reeves:

Okay, so we don't currently have, from your understanding, stakeholders who are proactively asking the agency to engage in this legislation, is that correct?

Tommy:

I have been contacted by, I can't remember the name, but non-profits saying they support this legislation, one was sent out for stakeholder feedback, so as far as asking to push it forward, to help out or whatever, I've gotten around four, does that answer your question?

Commissioner Reeves:

Yeah, the way we would refer to it, or folks refer to it in the legislature is, right now the agency would be the champion of this legislation, not a particular non-profit or stakeholder group to the agency, correct.

Tommy:

Yes, that's correct, I'm sorry, thank you for clarifying

Commissioner Reeves:

No, that's great. Thank you very much.

Tommy:

Lord knows I could go off on this so I apologize.

Commissioner Reeves:

You're doing great.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, is there a motion?

This transcript was exported on Sep 07, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Vice Chair Patterson:

I can do that, Mr. Chairman. I move to approve the 2021 agency request legislation, as just presented by staff.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, is there a second?

Commissioner Leeve:

I'll second.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, it's been moved by Vice Chair Patterson, seconded by Commissioner Leeve, that we approve the presented 2021 agency request legislation, any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll try a voice vote. All those in favor, please say aye.

Commissioner Leeve:

Aye.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Aye.

Chair Sizemore:

Aye. Any opposed? Motion appears to carry three to zero, with one abstention. Thank you, Tommy, do good work.

Tommy:

Thank you very much.

Chair Sizemore:

All right. I believe that brings us to the last tab, tab six, we have a director hire update, and I believe Lisa Benevidas will be making that presentation, Lisa are you with us?

Lisa:

I am.

Chair Sizemore:

Welcome

Lisa:

Thank you.

Chair Sizemore:

Vice Chair Patterson.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Mr. Chair, I'd like to request that, or I'd like to suggest that you turn the gavel over to me now. I suggest you give me your power.

Chair Sizemore:

I will relinquish the gavel, and you are now in charge.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Thank you. Go ahead Lisa.

Lisa:

Thank you, Vice Chair Patterson. Good afternoon, I don't know why I'm pausing, Chair Sizemore, Vice Chair Patterson, Commissioners, ex-officios, and staff, for the record, I'm Lisa Benevidas, I'm the HR director for the state Gambling Commission, here to provide an update on the status of our director hire. We received quite a good response to our published job posting, we did a lot of outreach, and we were able to move forward 43 applications for commissioner review. Those applications were reviewed by commissioners at executive session on the 25th of August to discuss candidate qualifications and application materials that we had received. Because I feel like the candidate pool was sufficient, I went ahead and asked my staff to close the job posting as of yesterday afternoon, so we will not be accepting any more applications for this position, once a decision is made by commissioners on which candidates they would like to move forward, then human resources staff will begin contacting candidates to let them know of their status in the process.

Lisa:

I see a hand.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Okay, I'm not, let's see. I'm sorry, I don't have that information here, so is it Representative Reeves, is that your question?

Commissioner Reeves:

Your hand is up, Ms. Patterson.

Lisa:

It's yours, Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Patterson:

I didn't know that was new or not.

Commissioner Reeves:

If your suggesting that now would be the time, you're on mute, Commissioner.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Well, I'm doing a great job chairing this meeting, now aren't I? Go ahead, Lisa, that was a mistake on my part.

Lisa:

No worries. So, if there is some further discussion or a motion that commissioners would like to make regarding which candidates to move forward, I believe now would be the time to do that.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Thank you, Lisa. I, at this time, would entertain a motion, if there is one to be made.

Commissioner Reeves:

Lisa, do you want to do it or do you want me to?

Lisa:

Go for it.

Commissioner Reeves:

Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair, at this time I would like to move that the following, I don't have a specific language so bear with me, that the following candidates from the qualification review period that was conducted on the 25th of August be selected for forward motion in the process, or the next step in the process, and are listed as follows: Candidate A2, Candidate A5, Candidate A7, Candidate A9, Candidate A11, Candidate A13, Candidate A48, and Candidate A50.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Okay, there is a motion on the floor by Commissioner Reeves. Commissioner, did you wish to speak to your motion?

Commissioner Reeves:

I don't think I can speak to it until it's seconded, Madam Chair.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Is there a second?

Commissioner Leeve:

Yeah, I'll second it.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Thank you. Commissioner Reeves?

Commissioner Reeves:

Thank you, Madam Chair. One, I just want to start first and foremost by commending staff, the packet of information that we got was incredibly thorough, and was very, very helpful, I think, in doing the work of evaluation candidate qualifications, and making sure that, as somebody who is constantly up here preaching about the need for equitable systems and processes and inclusive opportunity, I really do just

want to commend our HR team for the work they have done to try to minimize bias, minimize barriers, et cetera, in this process. With that said, I want to say thanks to my fellow commissioners, because I know we had a very robust conversation about candidate qualifications, and I feel that the candidates that are included in this motion all meet or exceed qualifications for this roll, and I look forward to the opportunity to move them to the next step in the process, to hopefully get to meet them and talk about why they may be a good fit for this agency.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Okay, thank you, Commissioner Reeves. Any further discussion?

Commissioner Leeve:

I just wanted to say, so that everybody knows, we had an executive session on August 25th, where we had a very robust, maybe four to five hour conversation about each of the candidates. I just went through my notes and, I know I seconded that motion but, since those were Christine's names, I wanted to make sure that I had the same ones, actually, and I did so I think we're good there. So Commissioner Patterson, I don't know if you had a chance to double check through your notes to make sure that those were also the same people that you had down, based on our discussion on that day. But, I appreciate all the candidates, we had some really, really great people that came forward, really good discussion going through all the materials and everything like that the other day. I will stick with my second of that motion.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Okay, great, thank you. I just want to ask, Lisa, you've seen the list that's been put forward for vote, is there any glaring omission that you might want to tell us about, do you see there's any omission or anything here that, from your point of view, we should talk about before we take a vote?

Lisa:

Are you asking about the candidates that are in the motion to move forward?

Vice Chair Patterson:

Yes.

Lisa:

I believe that, based on the conversation that I was privy to at the executive session on the 25th, I don't believe that you are excluding any candidates from this process that were overwhelmingly supported by any one commissioner, that is not included in this list, so I believe that this list accurately reflects the conversation that I was a part of on Wednesday.

Vice Chair Patterson:

All right. Was there any further discussion? All right. All those in favor of Commissioner Reeves motion to move A2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 48, and 50 forward in the process, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioner Leeve:

Aye.

Vice Chair Patterson:

And there's an aye from you, Reeves.

Commissioner Reeves:

Yeah, sorry, I'm solo parenting, so was dealing with children and lunch. Yeah, that is correct.

Vice Chair Patterson:

Okay, and I'm voting aye. So that motion does pass. Thank you. I'll send the gavel back your way
Commissioner Sizemore.

Chair Sizemore:

All right, and I'll just ask, Lisa, do you have any final words on this before we move to the next topic?

Lisa:

I just want to confirm and clarify that the next step in this process is for human resources to have to contact the candidates that are going to be offered to participate in the next step, and the next step in this process is an interviewed with commissioners. Those interviews will occur in executive session, as that is allowed, in order to continue the conversation regarding candidate qualifications. Those interviews will likely happen in October as calendars are quite full for the month of September.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, and I am seeing both Commissioner Reeves and Vice Chair Patterson shake their head yes, so it appears you are on track. And, Alicia, do you still have anything, I don't want to clear your hand if you still had something.

Commissioner Reeves:

Oh, no, sorry.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, no problem.

Commissioner Reeves:

Oh, now I raised it again.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay. All right, thank you, Lisa, for that. So that completes tab six, which leaves us opportunity for public comment, so if there is any public comment, general words of encouragement or otherwise from the public, now would be the time. Again, we'll use the functionality of the Teams app. All right, I am not seeing any hands raised. Commissioners, ex-officios, any good of the order items before we go to executive session? All right, I'm not seeing any. Can we do a 20 minute break for folks to get lunch. Okay, with that, the Commission is going to take a 20 minute break, which would be 1:15, we'll return at 1:15 for an executive session for possible litigation for the last two hours, and we will reconvene for the soul purpose of adjournment, so prior to that, Commissioner Reeves?

Commissioner Reeves:

I'm so sorry, Mr. Chair, just so I'm clear, because last time you took roll after a break, do you want us to come back to this room, take roll, and then go to executive session, or can we go directly to executive session?

Chair Sizemore:

We can go directly to executive session.

Commissioner Reeves:

And what time did you say you'd like us to reconvene in executive session?

Chair Sizemore:

1:15.

Commissioner Reeves:

1:15, all right, thank you sir.

Chair Sizemore:

Okay, so with that, we are recessed to a quick break, the executive session with the soul purpose of returning to public meeting for adjournment only, in approximately two hours and 20 minutes. All right, thank you, we'll see everyone, commissioners, ex-officios, over at the executive session. Thank you