

Oregon State Bar
Meeting of the Board of Governors
February 18, 2022
Zoom Videoconference
Open Session Minutes

President Kamron Graham called the open session meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on February 18, 2022. The meeting adjourned at 11:59 a.m. Members present by videoconference or teleconference from the Board of Governors Chris Cauble, Gabe Chase, Candace Clarke, Jenny Cooke, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Kamron Graham, Bik-Na Han, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matthew McKean, Rob Milesnick, Apolinar Montero-Sanchez, Curtis Peterson, Joe Piucci, David Rosen, David Wade and Tasha Winkler. Not present was Ryan Hunt. Staff present in person were Cassandra Dyke, Ankur Doshi, Danielle Edwards, Keren Farkas, Susan Grabe, Helen Hirschbiel, Karen Lee, and Mike Williams. Present from the PLF was Megan Livermore. Members of the public present were Anne Morrison, Michelle Pistone, David James Robinson, Benedict Linsenmeyer, Valerie Sasaki, Alex Coven, Evan Burchfield, Amanda Caffall, and Vivien Lyons.

**all exhibits for the minutes are on the Open Agenda [here](#).

[BOG Meeting Rules](#)

Friday, February 18, 2022 9:00 a.m.

1. Call to Order

2. Ad Hoc Awards Committee

Action

Catherine Petrecca presented what the committee does and asked to form an Awards Committee, chaired by OSB President Kamron Graham, to review nominations for the bar's annual awards and develop recommendation for the full board.

Kamron Graham, Chair, Candace Clarke, Kate Denning, Stephanie Engelsman, and Curtis Peterson volunteered to be part of the committee.

3. 2022 Strategic Areas of Focus

Inform

A. Paraprofessional Licensing Implementation [Judge Thompson, PLIC Chair]

Judge Kirsten Thompson discussed her work of the past two years as chair of the Paraprofessional Licensing Implementation Committee (PLIC) and directed attendees to the OSB web site for the PLIC report and additional resources. She reported that efforts to solicit input from the public, the court and OSB membership have garnered approximately 400 comments thus far. Additionally, the OSB enlisted Lara Media to conduct a public survey and focus groups for further input. The PLIC is reviewing the questions and input from the public comment, the Oregon Supreme Court and the Lara Media report. Additionally, the PLIC is drafting Rules for Admission and Rules of Professional Conduct for Licensed Paralegals. Finally, she reported on other states that are considering or implementing similar programs to increase access to justice. She introduced Justice Deno Himonas of the Utah Supreme Court to share information about the Utah program.

1. Utah Licensed Paralegal (LP) Program [Justice Deno Himonas, Utah Supreme Court] Inform

The Hon. Deno Himonas reported that Utah has 18 licensed LP's with another seven in the pipeline. The demand for their services is great. He regrets that the program has not yet attracted more LPs, and believes the barriers are too high. Washington State, the first to implement a program, started with 3000 hours required experience. Utah began with 1500, and recently reduced the requirement to 750 education hours. Justice Himonas believes the barriers remain unnecessarily high, but expects the recent changes to drive more participation. Utah limits the areas of advice to Family Law, Debt Collection, and Landlord Tenant work with the majority currently working in family law. The LPs are not permitted to argue currently, but they are allowed to sit at table. He reported on one unforeseen consequence of the Utah program, where LPs feel that some lawyers are engineering cases to require more proceedings where argument is necessary to disadvantage the LPs. This may result in Utah allowing LPs to make arguments in some cases. Utah is also looking at several similar programs, including allowing trained domestic violence advocates to help fill out protective orders, or allowing licensed social workers to offer legal advice in very discreet circumstances.

Lee Ann Donaldson asked for clarification on whether lawyers are increasing requests for argument to exclude LPs.

Justice Himonas confirmed that this is being reported, although it is anecdotal.

Gabe Chase asked for further detail on educational requirements, as it is a significant concern here.

Judge Himonas reiterated his opinion that the educational components could be reduced, although he supports some additional requirements if Utah allows for some limited arguments.

Apolinar Montero-Sanchez asked if LP's charged similar rates as the lawyers in Utah or if it is meeting a goal of service at a much reduced rate.

Justice Himonas answered that LPs charge between \$100 and \$175 an hour. And that seems to depend on whether they're affiliated with the firm or not. Based on his knowledge of the legal market, this is a significant cost reduction.

Apolinar Montero-Sanchez said another argument in favor of the program is the possibility of increasing services in underserved rural areas. Has this been the experience in Utah?

Justice Himonas reports that he knows of just one LP in rural Utah, but they are hoping to recruit more for these "justice deserts" where the options are zero legal help, or some limited assistance. This reinforces the notion of minimizing the barriers to entry.

Rob Milesnick asked for the Justice's opinion on the target goal for the hours, expressing concern that the 1500 or 3000 hours of preparation would be unpaid and a high barrier. He cited an example of WA allowing applicants to read for the bar, but only two or three applicants per year manage this. What is the right target?

Justice Himonas said we don't have enough of a data set to know the perfect number yet. He believes the requirements will decrease as more jurisdictions implement programs. He also thinks a more targeted approach for specific activities makes sense. Example: the domestic violence advocates in Utah being given a greater role.

Chris Cauble said he was curious about the Justice's mention of allowing a one year master's program? Are any law schools in Utah offering this now?

Yes-the University of Utah. He also mentioned a program in Arizona. This may suggest that we should change name from Licensed Paralegal Practitioner to Licensed Legal Practitioner to show that they are able to do more than just give advice and help with paperwork.

Judge Kirsten Thompson offered further clarity on the PLIC recommendations on experiential hours. It depends a little bit on the prior education and experience of the applicant. The recommendation for

someone with a paralegal associate's degree is 1500 hours, of which 750 would be broken down to 500 in family law 250 in landlord tenant. The requirement would be similar for someone with a bachelor's degree not necessarily in Paralegal Studies. Someone with a JD, 750 hours of experience for someone who is coming out of paralegal practice. It's a 750 hour requirement- essentially five years as a paralegal in inactive practice. Justice Himonas' comments regarding the barriers to entry into practice are well taken, which is we propose that some of those hours could be gained as part of the educational program, for example in a paralegal studies program.

2. Public Comment Report [Victoria Lara, Lara Media]

Inform

Victoria Lara, Antonio Lara, and Jairo Rodriguez presented the research report concluding that many participants believe an LP program could address barriers for low and moderate income Oregonians. Particularly those who have limited English proficiency. Please see the Lara report for further detail.

David Rosen thanked Ms. Lara for the report, and expressed a need for the BOG to consider this data carefully, whether with the PLIC or our other work. He asked for explanation of the statistical analysis that arrived at a survey population of 262 to arrive at a confidence interval of 90 percent.

Antonio Lara answered we came to this number of as you mentioned by looking at population in Oregon, using numbers from the census. We then increased the number after speaking with OSB staff. And we then focused on populations targeted by the PLIC in their study: specifically targeting people from identified communities and income levels.

David Rosen asked for confirmation that the methodology cited on page 13 of the Lara Media report (262 surveys targeting identified populations) can reliably be extrapolated to the population of the State of Oregon.

Victoria Lara said yes.

Gabe Chase thanked Lara Media for its work, which he found extremely helpful. He asked about two different definitions for Licensed Paralegals that emerged from the focus groups. He asked to clarify that those definitions were developed by the focus groups themselves as opposed to being provided by the program. He asked if those definitions had an impact on the perceptions that the groups had of whether this program would meet the concerns that they had.

Victoria Lara confirmed that the focus group participants created the definitions, and that many were confused by the name "licensed paralegals." Citing the current existence of paralegals, they struggled to understand what the difference would be.

Kamron Graham asked if they were told that the licensed paralegals could represent them in family and landlord tenant law?

Yes – the participants were told of these two focus areas for the program. Participants expressed an interest in adding immigration law and criminal law.

Kamron Graham appreciated the content around the barriers to access and information; there is a continuum of services that would be helpful to individuals in accessing the justice system. Some need lawyers. Some may need paraprofessionals. Some may need better information on websites. The portal project seems relevant to the results of this survey also. It affirms that a multi-tiered approach is an appropriate approach.

Stephanie Engelsman sought clarification on whether program envisions LPs helping clients from beginning through end of case. The presenter mentioned a question about how likely the client

would be to seek the assistance of an attorney after talking to the paraprofessional. Is the idea that they would then seek other legal advice after working with the paraprofessional?

Victoria Lara said participants were told LPs would help resolve their cases, beginning to end. But they also sought to understand if it might increase their belief in lawyers and the justice system generally. Participants shared negative experiences with lawyers, and that they feel outside of the system, and that the system is not there for them. African Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, or low income white Americans in particular reported feeling excluded. They feel like the legal system works for them in a very different way than people with money. So the focus groups asked if this program would increase their trust level. They believed it would, and would give them the courage to trust or to call an attorney for another issue.

Kamron Graham said it seems like that question was more about the confidence in the legal system after their experience with the paralegal versus like severity of the case. The plan expects that if at some point that the issue is outside the range of the paraprofessional, then it would be referred to an attorney.

Gabe Chase said that from his reading of the report, most folks would prefer to have an attorney if they could afford one, and if they could find one who understood them/their culture etc. Is that accurate?

Victoria Lara answered that this was not her conclusion. She shared the strong conclusion that these participants had much distrust in lawyers. Some expressed interest in the LP program themselves, to help their communities. She said it went deeper than affordability and focused on the dignity of people being seen and treated with respect. Many had worked with attorneys and feel they didn't get any service even though they paid them.

Judge Thompson discussed the PLIC's work on the scope of services for Licensed Paralegals. We want to keep the focus on landlord tenant and family law, because they are such high need areas. And to focus on routine legal matters middle and lower income Oregonians face frequently with no resources. We want to keep the scope of what they are able to do at an acceptable risk in terms of consumer protection. Listening to the Lara Media report, a positive interface with a licensed legal paraprofessional might help for a more effective referral to an attorney, when warranted. This could increase trust with the system in general, if the system was responsive, but the scope of practice is extremely important from a consumer protection point of view. Licensing, education, insurance, but being there in a culturally responsive and affordable manner is what the program would try to do. Finally, it also seems we may explore a different name, like licensed legal paraprofessionals to make it understandable and accessible to communities.

Victoria Lara shared that most participants did not know about Oregon State Bar. Even those who have lived here all their lives. She also recommended increased outreach to communities.

3. Lessons Learned from WSBA LLLT Program [Jason Solomon, Executive Director, Center on the Legal Profession, Stanford Law School]

Judge Thompson introduced Jason Solomon.

Jason Solomon offered an overview of the the Center on Legal Profession, which focuses on legal services, regulation, and access to justice. Solomon has spent the last few years working with states around the country on possible changes to who can provide legal services, in order to increase access

to justice. He shared that existing regulations are much more restrictive in the U.S than many other countries including the UK, contributing to the justice gaps here. He summarized a paper that examined the pros and cons of Washington State Bar Associations LLLT's program.

Apolinar Montero Sanchez asked if there was a projection of how many LLLTs there would be prior to implementation of their program, and then how many there were when it was discontinued.

Jason Solomon said they did not start with any solid projections, but there were mismatched expectations. They also had little money designated to market new program.

Judge Thompson asked Washington State is considering reinstating the program.

Jason Solomon has not heard anything about that recently.

Gabe Chase asked to confirm that the program cost \$7 per attorney based on the number of Washington State attorneys?

Jason Solomon confirmed.

Gabe Chase asked if there were any complaints or negative experiences reported by the public.

Jason Solomon: Very few. We lack good data on the number of clients served. There were 46 licensees as of last year, for the 46 licensees, each report serving hundreds of clients a year, and we had two complaints over the seven years.

Gabe Chase were the complaints valid or not.

Jason Solomon said he did not know the outcome, but he would follow up.

Kyle Sciuchetti, Immediate Past President of the Washington State Bar discussed opportunities for the states to collaborate on issues confronting our bars, including our triple LT program and these licensed paralegal programs. The LLLT program still has a court appointed board, it still operates because we still have many LLLT practitioners. There has been no formal discussion of restarting the program. However, if Utah and Oregon managed to create a successful model, WA may reconsider.

Sciuchetti discussed a variety of differing opinions about the program in the bar and on the Washington Supreme Court. Some also felt that it launched as one type of program and evolved into something else. A clear priority of some was to ensure that the program was self-sufficient. He shared that Oregon should carefully consider how and when the program should reach self-sufficiency. Or whether self-sufficiency is not an absolute necessity, as this is an access to justice issue. That self-funding expectation was one of the key mistakes of the WA plan.

4. Arizona Legal Paraprofessional Program [Suzanne Porter, LP Program Manager]

Helen Hirschbiel reported on behalf of Arizona, which was unable to send a representative. Helen reported on her discussion with with AZ State Court Administrator Dave Buyers who reported much opposition among lawyers in development phase, but that this largely disappeared once the program was launched in January 2021. Several lawyers who were vocal in opposition changed their opinion since its launch. They have 12 LPs in the new program. He expects that increase rapidly over the next couple of years, as two new programs are under way with the schools and are anticipating graduates

soon. Their educational pathways allows for Associate Degree in Paralegal Studies, a Bachelor's Degree in Law, a Master of legal studies, a JD from an ABA law school, a certification in legal paraprofessionals, or have been a foreign trained lawyer with an LLM. That's a future option. And then the areas that they have Licensed Paralegals in are Family Law Limited Jurisdictions, Civil and Criminal Law, and Administrative Law.

They do not have an experiential requirement. It is solely an educational requirement, although there can be some adjustment to the educational component based on experiential factors (i.e. years of service as a paralegal). They do have two tests: one that is general on scope of practice and ethics, and one that tests on subject-matter certification. This is about a half-day exam, offered on a rolling basis which is how they have been able to license people relatively quickly.

5. Oral Testimony on PLIC Report

Kamron Graham invited nine people to offer oral testimony, all of whom had reserved time in advance. She offered a three-minute time limit for comments, asked that speakers share their name, practice area, the company or organization that they are with, with, and what part of the state the live and work in. This portion of the minutes is taken directly from a transcript of the meeting, edited lightly for clarity.

Anne Morrison, retired attorney, La Grande, OR

In my career, I started out after law school working at Lane County Legal Aid. I was there for several years before I moved into criminal work instead. And I spent the rest of my career working as a public defender. So essentially, I spent most of my career dealing with low income clients. I know that our state has countless residents who have valid legal claims and defenses, but have been unable and are unable to hire lawyers for their cases. I guess I would say I live in Eastern Oregon, but I watched the Portland news every night. Clearly Portland has huge problems related to homelessness. And on a smaller scale. My town of La Grande does as well. I frequently wonder how much of that issue, how much of that homelessness is exacerbated by people's lack of access to affordable legal services. And in what way our profession contributes to that issue. I've reviewed the proposals. And I really think that this issue of whether to set up a paralegal program is not a "can we do it," but it's really more of a "will we do it." I know that other professions such as the medical profession have developed credentialed trained positions to deal with the need for services. They have requirements that people who are not physicians go through training, they have to meet competency requirements. They're held to ethical standards. They have to go undergo ongoing training, and they may be required to practice under the supervision of physicians. The medical profession has found a way to accommodate this issue to provide essential medical care while protecting patients. And I can't think of any reason why the bar and the legal profession can't do the same. I have seen so many Oregonians lives, detrimentally affected by their inability to access legal representation in regard to the very essential matters. If attorneys can't fill that need or if attorneys won't fill that need. I think really that we really are compelled as a profession to find a way that those needs can still be met. So this is my long way of saying that. I strongly support the idea of setting up a paralegal program. I really hope that the bar will go through with it. So thank you.

Michele Pistone, Director of CARES and Law Professor at Villanova University in Pennsylvania:

I've been a professor there for close to 25 years. My specialty is immigration. And I'm here because I wanted to talk about a similar paraprofessional model that exists in immigration law. And I actually

started an educational program, which launched in August of 2020. To train paraprofessionals, to do immigration representation, I designed an online certificate program. And my students come from 32 states, and they range in age from 21 to 86. They are providing legal representation to immigrants in various capacities. My purpose in being here is to let the Oregon bar know about this model that exists in immigration, and the educational program that I created, which is very practical, and oriented toward getting people out there and hitting the job and being able to do the work on the ground. And so basically, there are decades old regulations that allow for what are called accredited representatives to provide legal representation and immigration proceedings, both before the immigration courts, and before USCIS. But that regulation is totally underutilized. So as an immigration lawyer, I saw a need and I jumped in and created an online scalable educational model to get students educated. And we've already issued 300 certificates. And we have students working in all parts of the country, like I said, 32 states, because it's online, the scalable tuition is only \$4,000 for an entire year of training. So I know that there are concerns about self-sufficiency and how to make this go. And I feel like what I've been working on is at least a model that I'd be happy to share with the bar I submitted comments. I am available if you have any questions about ways to create an online scalable model for training. Because to me, one of the biggest issues in creating a professional model is to make sure that we have an educational program that's practical, that helps students to hit the ground running and still protect the public. And so being able to create a model that is practical and get students to apply the law that they're learning, while they're in the educational program, I found has been really successful. And my students are working as paralegals and law firms, but they're also doing amazing work on the border. They're working with Afghan refugee. *Time was called on speaker.*

David James Robinson, Portland and Toledo Oregon Attorney, SSSF member:

I have a solo practice in Multnomah County-civil practice. And I'm four years into a buyout of a general practice in Lincoln County. First, I ask that the Board of Governors make the Lara Report's raw data available to the public because I challenge the statistic confidence in the assumptions that I've read from their report. First, how the population was selected. That it focused on underrepresented communities and persons of color, the small size of the focus groups and that all the groups were paid. And so I think what we're reading, the results only reflect the opinion of certain people who want to be paid for their opinion, and we can't extrapolate that to the general public. Here's the thing though. The Lara Media report results match what we've gotten from just about every other report available for around 85% underrepresentation rate. This is one of the three key findings from the American Bar Association's justice gap report from 2017 One of the other key findings from that report is that the legal needs weren't being met because of limited funding for legal aid. Legal Aid Services is where access to justice really happens. They capture all those folks that get priced out from the legal aid program and have to go into the clinics. The data we get before we make the decisions is important. The California Bar justice gap report asked an important follow up question of the folks that were unrepresented. They asked, Did you try to find a lawyer? Two thirds said they made no attempt. They didn't call they didn't go to the internet. They didn't even ask a legal aid group. They refer to that as the knowledge gap within the justice gap. And I think we have the same knowledge gap here in Oregon. I want to end with the economics of it. And apparently the licensing, it cannot expand access to justice based on current law firm economics. Oregon family lawyers are averaging \$236 an hour. Anecdotally in Lincoln County plus lawyers are at 200 an hour. The Oregon judicial department paralegals are at \$110 an hour and Northwest legal paralegal salaries range 45 to \$85 an hour. Now apply those numbers to the Oregon State bar's PLF guide to billing the rule of threes. It's a guide on how you price your legal staff. And the results you get is that your unlicensed paralegal right now has got a bill out \$1,500 a year to get up to a rate of around \$100 an hour. And

that's anecdotally what the law firms are billing out for the paralegals. So it looks like to me that a licensed paralegal is going to have to charge somewhere around \$150 an hour just to make it work. And that's before you factor in the attorneys time to supervise that licensed paralegal. I'd like to conclude by saying that this is a good idea. And I would like to encourage a dual track as we go forward, that the Oregon State Bar really pay attention to aggressive and public outreach to fund legal aid clinics, places like St. Andrews and the Commons and the legal aid clinics to catch the overflow for people that are priced out like the Low Income Taxpayer Clinics.

Benedict Linsenmeyer Vancouver, Washington:

I graduated from the University of Oregon School of Law in 2020. And I have practiced landlord tenant law for a little more than a year at McPherson getting Diaz out in Newport, Oregon, which is in Lincoln County. I'm here to give my perspective on practicing landlord tenant lawyer in a small and impoverished community. And I'm wearing what my clients would wear when they came to see me which is just a t shirt. I think that it's important that this conversation has a proper context and that everyone understands the people who this proposal will help aren't currently being represented. First, the majority of landlord tenant issues I saw probably about 60% could have been dealt with by members of this new program. There are a few cases which had complex questions of law. But most of the calls I got related to specific provisions within the laws that were not incredibly complicated, and involve only basic concepts which continue to impact a growing number of people. We all know there are people who suffer today because they did not have access to courts yesterday. People who are trying to help stop the downward spiral of poverty, they simply don't have the luxury of spending \$175 an hour to get a lawyer. And I believe that access to justice cannot be a luxury. As the profession which are gatekeepers to the courts, we should be doing everything we can to open those gates and expand access, especially if that means addressing the issue of homelessness. If you live in Oregon, you're going to see people experiencing homelessness every day. Portland, Newport, rural, urban doesn't matter. There's people living on the streets, literally. How many of these people were prospective clients who couldn't afford help? How many of these people are sleeping in doorways because they had a valid legal claim which they couldn't get through the court on their own? And what can we be doing to prevent this from happening to anyone else? To everyone who opposes this measure? I would say do not let perfect be the enemy of good. If this proposal can prevent one more family from living in a minivan in a Walmart parking lot. We owe it to that family to get this done in the most effective way possible. Second, paralegals, as we all know, are a cornerstone of this profession. Anyone who's worked with a paralegal knows they're invaluable members of the community which we need to function. This proposal would allow individuals to expand their careers while expanding access to justice. And that's a way there should be no concerns about an LP or whatever we choose to call them. Their ability to represent individuals in these matters, especially concerning the rigorous training requirements imposed. In fact, I think that the experiential requirements should be the primary means of training these people. In making these determinations, I encourage you to think back on your first year practicing and how unprepared you were for the realities of practice. Let's not pretend that law school or any amount of formal education, regardless of the quality could prepare someone to practice law. That's just not how it works. You learn on the job, and if the classroom hours and the bills associated with them can be traded for practical experience, I believe they should. We need to expand access to courts. The homelessness epidemic shows that what we're doing now as a profession and as a state is not enough. Will allowing LPs to do landlord tenant cases fix the problem of homelessness? No, not even close. But it will allow more people to get their day in court.

Valerie Sasaki, Portland, OR Samuels Yoelin Kantor:

I'm a practicing tax attorney with the firm of Samuels Yoelin Kantor in Portland, Oregon. Although currently I'm working from my home in Washington County. Today I'm here to testify solely on my own behalf in favor of the proposed paraprofessional licensing program. I thought it was important to highlight the fact that we have paraprofessionals in Oregon that operate independently in our spheres already. In the tax practitioner community. There are several different types of paraprofessionals that are licensed to represent taxpayers and operate independently. At the federal level, we have had enrolled agents since 1884. These are individuals who are neither CPAs nor attorneys but who are authorized to practice before the Internal Revenue Service. This means they can represent taxpayers in disputes, help with tax planning, and represent taxpayers and tax court. In addition to Enrolled Agents, the state of Oregon Board of Tax Practitioners also licenses and regulates tax consultants who can prepare personal income taxes in return. Well, there's some overlap between the type of services that these paraprofessionals perform and those that we in the tax lawyers perform. As a matter of practice, it is my experience that they handle matters where it would not be cost effective to retain counsel. Everyone does or should pay taxes. There is a tremendous need for representation in this area that these professionals help address. It's not a perfect system. But absent their work, these taxpayers wouldn't have professional help. Thus, their work leads to better taxpayer outcomes for low and moderate income taxpayers, especially outside of the metro areas, and reduces strain on the tax administrative systems. It's my understanding that the post licensure requirements that we're discussing today are as strict or stricter than those required of either enrolled agents or licensed tax consultants. I have spoken with several of my colleagues in the family law and real estate bar and I was struck by the fact that these are two areas of law that the proposal seeks to address are encountering similar challenges, those that the tax community would encounter, but for the hard work of enrolled agents and licensed tax consultants. Many people who need help with landlord family law and landlord tenant matters can't find cost effective legal counsel to represent them. Therefore, they often try to navigate these complex systems without professional help, which can lead to bad outcomes for the individuals in court systems. I believe that the proposal will help Oregon and Oregonians achieve the systemic and individual advantages in these areas that we are familiar with in the Tax Practice. Therefore I encourage the Board of Governors to adopt the proposed paraprofessional licensing program. Thank you for your time today.

Alex Coven, Portland, OR Oregon Justice Resource Center:

I'm a practicing tax attorney with the firm of Samuels Yoelin Kantor in Portland, Oregon. Although currently I'm working for my home in Washington County. Today I'm here to testify solely on my own behalf in favor of the proposed paraprofessional licensing program. I thought it was important to highlight the fact that we have paraprofessionals in Oregon that operate independently in our spheres already. In the tax practitioner community. There are several different types of paraprofessionals that are licensed to represent taxpayers and operate independently. At the federal level, we have had enrolled agents since 1884. These are individuals who are neither CPAs nor attorneys but who are authorized to practice before the Internal Revenue Service. This means they can represent taxpayers in disputes, help with tax planning, and represent taxpayers and tax court. In addition to Enrolled Agents, the state of Oregon board of tax practitioners also licensed and regulates licensed tax consultants who can prepare personal income taxes in return. Well, there's some overlap between the type of services that these paraprofessionals perform and those that we in the taxpayer perform. As a matter of practice, it is my experience that they handle matters where it would not be cost effective to retain counsel. Everyone does or should pay taxes. There is a tremendous need for representation in this area that these professionals help address. It's not a perfect system. But absent their work, these taxpayers wouldn't have professional help. Thus, their work leads to better taxpayer incomes for low and moderate income taxpayers, especially outside of the metro areas, and reduces

strain on the tax administrative systems. It's my understanding that the post licensure requirements that we're discussing today are as strict or stricter than those required of either enrolled agents or licensed tax consultants. I have spoken with several of my colleagues in the family law and real estate bar and I was struck by the fact that these are two areas of law that the proposal seeks to address are encountering similar challenges, those that the tax community would encounter, but for the hard work of enrolled agents and licensed tax consultants. Many people who need help with landlord family law and landlord tenant matters can't find cost effective legal counsel to represent them. Therefore, they often try to navigate these complex systems without professional help, which can lead to bad outcomes for the individuals in stream court systems. I believe that the proposal will help Oregon and Oregonians achieve the systemic and individual advantages in these areas that we are familiar with in the Tax Practice. Therefore encourage the board of governors to adopt the proposed paraprofessional licensing program. Thank you for your time today.

Evan Burchfield Portland, OR:

I am not a lawyer. I am the coordinator of the Eviction Representation For All campaign and I'm speaking in favor of the proposed paralegal licensing program. Eviction Representation For All, which is a campaign that we call ERA is a right to counsel a campaign that is preparing a ballot measure that would provide legal representation for all tenants facing eviction in Multnomah County. Landlords in Multnomah County are 10 to 15 times more likely than their tenants to be represented by counsel in eviction proceedings. Other jurisdictions in the United States that have enacted similar right to counsel programs have demonstrated that providing legal representation to tenants effectively lowers the number of eviction filings, tenant defaults, lopsided stipulated agreements and judgments of eviction, including those by default. legal representation in eviction court has proven to increase the number of tenants who remain housed, thus decreasing the number of new individuals and families facing houselessness. Allowing Licensed Paralegals to appear in landlord tenant proceedings would increase the number of legal tenant legal advocates for tenants. Greater number of advocates would help to accomplish the goal of ERA, which is to make sure that every tenant has representation leading up to and during the eviction process. Should our ballot measure pass, Multnomah County would be tasked with arranging representation for every tenant that faces eviction in the county, and if such matters could be handled by Licensed Paralegals, the county and its partners would have a wider pool of advocates to work with allowing for effective representation to all tenants in housing court. So these proposed licensing requirements by the Oregon State Bar will ensure that Licensed Paralegals will be able to provide effective assistance similar to that currently provided by attorneys and we are very much in support. Thank you for your time.

Amanda Caffall: Portland, OR Commons Law Center:

And I do feel lucky to be here. Thank you. I run a little nonprofit called the Common Law Center. We deliver legal services on a sliding scale, including in family law, landlord tenant estate planning and probate. We serve primarily the Tri County area but also some other counties. Our firm provides practical training to emerging legal professionals since we welcomed our first client in January of 2017. We've hosted 50 Student clerks, those are from law schools, paralegals and undergraduate institutions. A third of them have found their training with us so useful that they've stayed for a second or even a third semester. Our practical training program also includes a three-year fellowship for new lawyers. We've hired half a dozen of these since we started. Two are out working in the community already. One was recruited by a private firm last summer, and a third is preparing to launch her own solo practice focusing on historically underserved communities in East Multnomah

County. Paying equitable salaries is a priority for us. Gains in the labor market plus the cost of hiring lawyers has made it hard to compete with the private market. Our goal is for our legal services programs to be self-sustaining based on legal fees paid by clients, even though those fees are well below market rates. Raising our fees doesn't go very far because it quickly puts services out of reach of target communities. So we want to increase our use of paralegals. A dozen paralegal students have already joined us last year we hired our first paralegal. It's going swimmingly. We're posting a job for a second paralegal shortly. We have a goal of building a paralegal fellowship program similar to our attorney fellowship program. We are big fans of an active Brainstormers with the team at Portland Community College's paralegal program. Elena Tapper and her team have created multiple clinics to train paralegals, all of which provide valuable and needed legal services to communities in Oregon that attorneys are not providing, by the way. All that's to say I'm here to strongly encourage your support for licensed paralegal program. I heard one person today the size of the problem as a reason why not to move forward with this program.. There is absolutely no way that the comments last 100 can resolve Oregon's access to justice problem alone. We need so many more ideas, teams, organizations, institutions on board. The licensed paralegal program is a great opportunity to put more tools in the toolbox. When four out of five people can't get basic legal help. And the lawyer marketplace has not found a way to close that gap. Despite decades of trying, we have got to do something else. I recently learned 75% of lawyers practice business law rather than people law, the kind that these Licensed Paralegals would do. So here's another proposal. What if half the lawyers 50% of lawyers working at firms quit and helped low income people modify their contentious divorce agreements? Nobody? No takers. Okay, what's another option? We have to do something to close this access gap. And these paralegals can share help, please do this for Oregon. Please, please do this for Oregon.

Vivien Lyons Portland, OR Lyons Legal Services LLC:

President Graham and other members of the Board of Governors. My name is Vivian Lyon, I practice tenant defense. So my remarks only go to the landlord tenant side of this not to family law. At the end of 2015, I opened a solo practice designed to address the access to justice gap and have been representing tenants since early 2016. Tenant representation and defense and evictions comprises roughly half of my practice. I've been on the rental services commission in Portland since September 2020. I've recently accepted the managing attorney position at PCC Clear Clinic, the Portland Community College's new eviction defense program. And I'm there right now. Portland housing Bureau is awarded ARPA funds to Oregon law center for a limited right to counsel program and also recently to PCC. Even so the number of attorneys practicing tenant defense in the metro area is still too low to provide legal representation or advice to all the tenants who need it. I'm very much in favor of this program and of licensing paralegals and others to confront this persistent structural gap in access to justice. I want to echo a previous speaker in addressing the real the how realistic the requirements are. Early in my career, I helped the International Union of Operating Engineers 701 Create an apprenticeship program for their stationary engineers to people who do the HVAC and facility maintenance. The hours currently proposed seem potentially unreasonable to me based on that experience. It's no surprise that programs that require 1000 or more hours of experience are having a difficult time getting participants through the program successfully. The limited maintenance electrician license apprenticeship program from the union that I just mentioned, had enormous difficulty retaining apprentices because of the hour requirements. I believe that the hour requirements for this program need to be carefully scrutinized to ensure they don't constitute a prohibitive barrier to people achieving this limited license, thereby condemning this program to the same issues that the Washington Supreme Court used to justify sunseting that program. Regarding the landlord tenant realm, Licensed Paralegals or whatever they end up being called should be allowed to argue before the court especially given the fact that landlords are allowed to be represented by their agents, who by long familiarity with residential tenancy laws become able to

advocate for their employers without having a law license. And regarding self-sufficiency in the cost of the program. I frankly, I don't care about the cost. I urge any attorney that finds subsidizing these programs with our dues problematic take a long look within. Attorneys can practice tenant defense at any time, no one is stopping them. There's a wealth of opportunity go down to the courthouse on any given day, there are potential clients desperate for representation, not to mention plenty of opportunity to get trial experience, given how fast the statutory timeline to trial is. But there are not enough tenant defense attorneys practicing

6. Feedback received on PLIC Report

Inform

The exhibit is a collaboration of comments from the public.

7. Next steps [Judge Thompson, PLIC Chair]

Judge Thompson reiterated her invitation that all those interested look at the report that has been submitted, and submit comments and feedback. The PLIC will continue to meet through March to revise recommendations for make to the Board of Governors and the Supreme Court in an upcoming meeting. We do not yet have a date for completion of our next revised report. We appreciate the information shared by Lara Media which reinforce need for representation. This also provided insights about messaging. Judge Thompson shared her conviction that the program is needed, but that getting the details correct is essential.

4. BOG Committees

A. Policy and Governance Committee [Lee Ann Donaldson]

1. 2022 PGC Work Plan

Inform

Lee Ann Donaldson shared the Policy and Governance Committee work plan.

2. Amend OSB Bylaw Section 18.9

Action

Lee Ann Donaldson presented the recommendation to amend OSB Bylaw 18.9 regarding the PLF and OSB annual meeting.

Motion: to waive the one meeting notice requirement and amend OSB Bylaw Section 18.9 to allow annual meeting of the OSB and the PLF to occur before July 1 of each year. Policy and Governance Committee motion no second needed. Those in favor were Chris Cauble, Gabe Chase, Jenny Cooke, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Bik-Na Han, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matt McKean, Rob Milesnick, Apolinar Montero-Sanchez, Curtis Peterson, Joe Piucci, and David Rosen. There were none opposed and no abstentions.

3. COVID Vaccine Verification Policy for In-Person Events

Action

Lee Ann Donaldson presented a recommendation for to implement a COVID-19 Vaccination Policy In-Person Meeting and Events. She said that a lot of sections are asking for our policy, so it is important to move on this.

Kate Denning said she loved the sun-setting provision and the other amendments they made. I'm concerned about having a booster as part of the requirement as opposed to a just standard vaccine card, which is more in line with what is being requested in other organizations. In my community, there's a lot of people who have two shots and do not have the boosters. I think they will interpret this as a way to prevent them from utilizing the bars resources. I think it is controversial include the booster and that's just a summary of discussion.

Apolinar Montero-Sanchez asked how it would be extended by the BOG if it were to be extended.

Ankur Doshi, General Counsel, said that in January it would go back to the Policy and Governance Committee to either sunset or amend.

Gabe Chase had two question. One how did you guys come up with the 45 days? And then to Kate's point, is if you've gotten COVID, they don't let you get a booster for a certain amount of time. I don't know if that's right. Is there any has that been addressed? Because that could seems like it could throw things off for people?

Kamron Graham goes back to the Policy and Governance Committee to answer.

Stephanie Engelsman stated that they didn't actually talk about that yesterday. But I do wonder whether that would be wrapped up in the 45 days. If somebody is ineligible for the booster, by doctor's orders or CDC recommendation to not get one because of a recent COVID infection that that may be wrapped up in that, but that would just be my thought.

Curtis Peterson said that the 45 it was a just kind of number we picked. Giving people a reasonable amount of time to have access to the booster without getting too far out of the "zone of safety" for lack of a better word, for those in person events.

Apolinar Montero Sanchez asked if all the events will be available for zoom as well.

Kamron Graham said that the decision is up to individual sections. I don't think that's addressed in the policy. So this is just for live events right now.

Chris Cauble we are going to be asking patrons to sign a certification that they've met with the vaccination policy. We're not going to be putting our staff in a position where they're going to be going more into it, or pushing the issue of somebody. We don't want to put our staff in the position or getting in a situation where they're physically removing people from the event and things like that. The other thing is that there's an ethical element here, if you falsely certify that you're properly vaccinated, then we were saying that potentially could be a disciplinary violation

Helen Hirschbiel stating that staff has mostly heard from sections around whether or not they can institute a vaccination policy. I don't have a sense of whether there is a huge contingent who is among lawyers who is not in favor, so I just I'm kind of looking for some sense of how controversial or not this policy might be. I had a brief conversation with Ankur Doshi before this meeting, in terms of the accommodations, the likely accommodation we would be providing is attendance remotely, even when we start going back in to in person events. Sections are finding that providing that remote participation for CLE events can be quite expensive. It's easy enough to do for meetings, but it's not quite as easy to do for events. I just wanted you to be aware of these things.

Bik-Na Han said I understand the logic behind the vaccination policy. I guess one of my concerns is that out in the community, it seems that whether or not you're vaccinated or not, the likelihood of catching COVID has been quite common, because of the omicron variants. So I've seen people who have been fully vaccinated, who've been super careful who still get COVID. So I guess I'm a little concerned that the policy might be a little bit outdated by the time it is implemented for an entire year. I'm really uncomfortable with the requirement that there be a vaccination, but that there would be no alternative for people to attend an in person event, whether it be being tested or being isolated for a period of time prior to attending a live event.

Stephanie Engelsman said I was part of the conversation yesterday. And I have this question. Under the caveat that I fully support this measure. But it came to my attention after the meeting yesterday that the Washington Governor has planned to remove the mask mandate, and also decided to no longer require vaccinations for events, meetings, those things as of March 1. I suspect that Oregon will follow suit with something similar. And I wonder whether that changes our discussion of whether the bar wants to be requiring something that may be going away by the government. And maybe it's completely separate.

Kate Denning said I just wanted to point out that the definition by the CDC is that fully vaccinated just means the two shots, they actually have not changed it to include the booster shot, and that's from their website. So if we just said, fully vaccinated, and they change that definition, the policy would go along with it. Whereas right now, we are defining fully vaccinated in this policy as something different than the CDC.

Curtis Peterson said Karen Lee had made a point yesterday that this policy is creating a sense of safety for staff who attended these events. I do think we should keep that in our mind with this policy.

Matt McKean said I don't have the site for this, but I believe that people who get COVID after being vaccinated are less contagious, they're less likely to spread the germs because they can't have a less of a load

Motion: to adopt the COVID Vaccine Verification Policy for In-Person Events and meetings as written. Policy and Governance Committee motion no second needed. Those in favor were Gabe Chase, Jenny Cooke, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matt McKean, Curtis Peterson, and Joe Piucci. Those opposed Chris Cauble, Kate Denning, Bik-Na Han, and Apolinar Montero-Sanchez. Those abstained are Rob Milesnick and David Rosen. Motion passed

B. Board Development Committee [Curtis Peterson]

- 1. 2022 BDC Work Plan** Inform

Curtis Peterson shared the Board Development Committee work plan.

- 2. BOG and HOD Election Recruitment** Inform

Curtis Peterson presented information regarding BOG and HOD Election Recruitment.

- 3. Comments on BBX Co-Grader Candidate Pool** Action

Curtis Peterson presented information on the BBX Co-Grader Candidate Pool

Motion: to approve the slate of BBX Co-Graders to go to the Supreme Court for appointment. Board Development Committee motion no second needed. Those in favor were. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed

- C. Budget & Finance Committee [Kate Denning]
 - 1. 2022 BFC Work Plan Inform

Kate Denning shared the Budget and Finance Committee work plan.

- 2. Financial Update Inform

Kate Denning presented a financial update of bar finances.

- 3. Investment Bylaws revisions Action

Kate Denning presented the Investment Bylaw revisions.

Motion: to waive the one meeting notice requirement and approve the proposed amendments to OSB Bylaw 2.23 to clean up the “Investment Policy” in the Bylaws. Budget and Finance Committee motion no second needed. Those in favor were. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed

- D. Public Affairs Committee [Joe Piucci]
 - 1. 2022 PAC Work Plan Inform

Joe Piucci shared the Public Affairs work plan.

- 2. 2022 Legislative Session Update Inform

Joe Piucci presented a 2022 Legislative Update.

- 3. Approval of Positions on Tracking Sheet Action

Joe Piucci presented the position on bills in eh 2021 legislative session.

Motion: to ratify previously taken positions taken by the Public Affairs Committee on 2022 legislative proposals. Public Affairs Committee motion no second needed. Those in favor were Joseph Hesbrook, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Curtis Peterson, Colin Andries, Chris Cauble, Kamron Graham, Dave Rosen, Gabe Chase, Matt McKean, Bik-Na Han, John Grant, Joe Piucci, and Jenny Cooke. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed

5. Professional Liability Fund [Megan Livermore]

- A. 2021-December-31 Draft Financial Statement Inform

Megan Livermore presented the PLF Financial Statement.

- B. 2021-December-31 Rudd and Wisdom Actuarial Analysis Inform

Megan Livermore presented the Rudd and Wisdom Actuarial Analysis.

- C. Q4 2021 RVK Quarterly Performance Report Inform

Megan Livermore presented the Quarterly Performance Report.

- D. Memo from PLF CEO to BOG re prior year Claims Attorney and Defense Counsel Evaluations and Claims Statistics Inform

Megan Livermore presented the 2021 Claims Attorney and Defense Counsel Evaluations

- E. Memo to BOG re temporary admission and PLF coverage (PLF Bylaw 1.1 and Policy 3.150) Action

Megan Livermore presented the recommendations to proposed bylaws and policy revisions. We were asked last year by the bar to provide coverage for attorneys who are temporarily admitted to the bar. The PLF BOD approved the changes and approved providing this coverage at our December meeting. We're eager to go ahead and get started with that to support the bars efforts.

Motion: to approve the revisions to the bylaws and policies to provide PLF coverage for those who are temporarily admitted to the bar. Chris Cauble moved and Curtis Peterson seconded. Those in favor were Chris Cauble, Gabe Chase, Jenny Cooke, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Bik-Na Han, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matt McKean, Rob Milesnick, Apolinar Montero-Sanchez, Curtis Peterson, Joe Piucci, and David Rosen. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed.

6. OSB Committees, Sections, Councils and Divisions

- A. ONLD Report [Yvana Mols] Inform

Yvana Mols presented an update on what the Oregon New Law Division's activities. Our committees are hard at work trying to develop plans for this year to address the ongoing challenges of our remote connection with members, providing supports for students and access to high quality CLE's that our members have come to rely on. The Student Outreach Committee have a really ambitious plan to provide some deep engagement for students at Oregon Law Schools, making them aware of the work of the ONLD in the Oregon State Bar.

7. President's Report [Kamron Graham] Inform

We're six weeks into the year. And it's been very busy, very productive. It's been really wonderful and I have been able to participate on a Workgroup for the Wellness Summit Planning Committee, which was one of the HOD resolutions from last year. I was able to attend the Bench and Bar Professionalism Committee. It was their first committee meeting of the year. It was incredibly interesting, it is really pushed myself, JB Kim from D&I, and the committee to look at professionalism issues through a D&I lens. I have been to the PLF meeting and also have a seat on the Board of the CEJ. Kate talks a little bit about that concern about the plateau of firm members will definitely be a discussion that we're going to have to have with the PLF moving forward in the future. And I believe it was also at the PLF meeting, that the issue of outside National Firms coming into Oregon and setting up satellite offices. It both creates an unusual competition, but also poaching of lawyers from other firms. I think that's sort of something we just need to keep on our radar.

It's been a really great six weeks. I really appreciate all the support of the OSB staff. I can assure you none of us can get done without all the work of Helen, Susan, Kateri, and Cassandra. It's just been phenomenal.

8. Closed Sessions – CLOSED Agenda

A. Executive Session (pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f) and (h))

Kamron Graham: At 12:32 p.m. announced an **Executive Session**, as follows:

The Board of Governors will now meet in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h), to consult with its outside counsel, Amy Robinson, and general counsel, Ankur Doshi, concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

The Board of Governors will also meet in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f), which allows the Board to meet in executive session to consider information or records that are exempted by law from public inspection. The Board of Governors will consider a written attorney-client communication that is exempted from public inspection by ORS 192.355(9)(a).

Representatives of the news media may attend this executive session. All other members of the audience, including all bar staff, are asked to leave the room. Representatives of the news media are specifically directed not to report on or otherwise disclose any of the deliberations or anything said about these subjects during the executive session, except to state the general subject of the session as previously announced. At the end of the executive session, we will return to open session and welcome the audience back into the room.

Kamron Graham: At 1:18 p.m. announced return to **Open Session**.

Motion: that the BOG issue clear instruction and directive to the CEOs of both the Oregon State Bar and the PLF to work together to modernize and institutionalize the 1993 memo regarding OSB PLF salary classification, and to create a plan with a clear timeline for a formal joint Pay Equity Analysis. Matt Mckean moved and Curtis Peterson seconded. Chris Cauble, Gabe Chase, Jenny Cooke, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Bik-Na Han, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matt McKean, Rob Milesnick, Apolinar Montero-Sanchez, Curtis Peterson, Joe Piucci, and David Rosen. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed.

Motion: to refer the options regarding the adoption of a Bylaw for Supreme Court approval amending the House of Delegates Bylaw 5.6 and amend bylaws, articles 10 and 11, from the policy and governance committee work plan to the General Counsel for review. Lee Ann Donaldson moved and Rob Milesnick seconded. Chris Cauble, Gabe Chase, Jenny Cooke, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Bik-Na Han, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matt McKean, Rob Milesnick, Apolinar Montero-Sanchez, Curtis Peterson, Joe Piucci, and David Rosen. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed.

9. Consent Agenda

A. CEO Director Update

Inform

We had started returning to the office on October 18. And by the end of the year, most of the staff were in the office at least two days a week, then Omicron hit. And we all went back to remote work. With the Omicron surge abating, we hope to be returning to the office soon, and implementing our new hybrid work model, which will allow most people to be working at least part time at home.

We also are excited about allowing bar groups back into the office sometime this spring. And I just want to say thank you to the board for adopting a vaccination policy, I think that will definitely help assuage staff concerns, and help us make sure that we can get bar groups start meeting and having events back at the bar center sooner rather than later.

I think I've mentioned before our new email marketing platform, we did launch that last month. The key benefit for members will be more relevant and fewer emails from the bar. The key benefit for us operationally is really twofold. One, it will give us more modern data metrics so that we can evaluate what's working and what's not in terms of marketing and communications with members. And secondly, it's just more efficient than Group Mail and easier to use. The downside that I mentioned is only supports one email address. And some bar members, including Bog members, have been relying on being able to have two email addresses.

We just finished compliance season, which is a big time for us. We field a lot of phone calls, and folks are busy with fees, status changes, and compliance reporting.

We hope to have all the program evaluations to the board at its April meeting.

We also hope to have the three reports that we provide to the Supreme Court, from Disciplinary Counsel's Office, the Client Assistance Office, and the Disciplinary Board. Hopefully those will be ready in time for the April meeting as well.

I just want to mention on the Portal Project, you heard about what's happening in the legislature, big huge shout out to Karen Farkas she did a great job testifying before the legislature also to Valerie Colas from the court. It was really, really well received. That was in part, because of all the work that Susan's team has been doing behind the scenes and also the court and our Access to Justice Team. We signed the MOU with the stakeholders. Thank you for approving that in January. We'll be meeting with stakeholders on February 28 to sort of bring everybody up to speed and develop a plan for next

steps. So I'll report on that again in April. One more thing on the Portal Project Think Shout, which was the company that we have contracted with to develop the wireframe for the website for Oregon Law Connect, they are will have their final recommendations to us by next week, which is great because we can then use that to create an RFP for development of the actual website. And just as a reminder LASSO, Legal Aid Services of Oregon, received a technology grant for development.

The BBX taskforce on Alternatives to the Bar Exam. At it's January meeting, the Supreme Court approved moving forward with the development of the two proposals recommended by the task force there. The court said we should do it in the way that we did it with the Paraprofessional Licensing Implementation Committee. So that was a nice affirmation of the process. So we'll be putting together an Implementation Committee. Jo Perini will be the chair and she'll be sending out an email inviting participation on that committee soon. Alternatives to the Bar Exam Task Force's final report, the recommendation was two alternatives. One, the Oregon Experiential Pathway, which is basically a two year curriculum with, a large portion of it being experiential, through the law schools, and would culminate in a capstone portfolio that would be assessed by the BBX. The second is the Supervised Practice Pathway, which would require 1000 to 1500 hours of supervised legal practice, with some sort of capstone portfolio assessed by the BBX. Those are moving forward. We're getting a lot of national attention about those two proposals.

The bar exam is happening next week, on Tuesday and Wednesday, we've got 142 people sitting for the bar exam, which is 10 more than last year. That is actually the fourth year in a row that it's been less than 200. I think this is because we lowered our pass score not too long ago, and more people are passing the July exam and not having to retake it in February.

Legal Publications is almost done with implementing the new platform for bar books, Query. I give a huge shout out to the PLF. Thank you for your contribution to that. It literally would not have been possible without you. And everybody is super excited about it.

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Programming had a big event in January, OLIO Employment Retreat. And we had over 70 law students participating this year, which is great participation considering, especially considering it was remote. That's exciting.

Last thing, and I think Curtis, you might have mentioned this already, but the deadline to submit candidate statements for the House of Delegates is March 4, and the deadline for candidate statements for the Board of Governors is May 10. The board there will be openings in regions 4,5,6, and 7, so start lobbying folks now to run for the BOG and HOD.

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--------|
| B. | Appointment of various Committees, Councils, and Boards | Action |
| C. | DCO Status Report | Inform |
| D. | CSF Claim # 2021-9 Deveny (Betts) | Action |
| E. | CSF Claim # 2021-10 Fargey (Dyer) | Action |
| F. | Approval of Meeting Minutes | |
| | 1. November 20, 2021 open and Closed minutes | |

2. January 7, 2022 open minutes

Motion: to approve the consent agenda. Curtis Peterson moved and Joe Piucci seconded. Those in favor were Chris Cauble, Gabe Chase, Jenny Cooke, Kate Denning, Lee Ann Donaldson, Stephanie Engelsman, Bik-Na Han, Joseph Hesbrook, Myah Kehoe, Matt McKean, Rob Milesnick, Apolinar Montero-Sanchez, Curtis Peterson, Joe Piucci, and David Rosen. There were none opposed and no abstentions. Motion passed.