

**MALHEUR COUNTY SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**  
**Pursuant to Initiative Measure No. 23-64**  
**January 8, 2024**

The Special Meeting of the County Court was called to order by Judge Dan Joyce at 9:00 a.m. with Commissioner Ron Jacobs and Commissioner Jim Mendiola present. The Special Meeting was held pursuant to Initiative Measure 23-64 to discuss how to promote the interests of Malheur County in any negotiations regarding the relocation of the Oregon-Idaho border. Present in the meeting room were public members Brent Grasty, Jon Beal, and Antonio Sunseri; and County Economic Development and Community Development Coordinator Taylor Rembowski. Present electronically were public members Paul Skeen, David Armstrong, Matt McCaw, Randy Knop, Nyssa City Manager Jim Maret; and County Assessor Dave Ingram and Sheriff Travis Johnson. Notice of the meeting was emailed to the Argus Observer and Malheur Enterprise and posted on the Courthouse bulletin board and County website. The meeting was audio recorded. The agenda is recorded as instrument # 2024-61

Judge Joyce opened the meeting and noted that written comments were submitted by two individuals.

Commissioner Jacobs read the written comments submitted by Blu Fortner: To all those in favor of relocating the Oregon/Idaho border: Please take a second to understand the real agenda of this meeting you petitioned for. We are meeting three times per year at your request for YOU to be able to share the financial benefits of or issues with relocating the Oregon/Idaho border. We are not in agreement with you that the outcome of your petition is that the county wishes to change anything. We voted to talk about it and so far, you have presented no convincing arguments. Please share with us the benefits and/or concerns that are associated with your proposal and, if possible, please stop wasting our collective time and tax payer money.

If we could please meet to discuss any realistic options we are still open to meeting with you. Bob Wheatley has my phone number and we are still waiting to hear a date and time to get together to discuss something more likely to happen and improve our outlook here in Malheur County than your current proposal. Kindest regards, Blu Fortner

Judge Joyce read excerpts of the comments submitted by Gregory Mowe. Mr. Mowe is a retired attorney living in Portland and submitted a guest opinion that was published in the Bend Bulletin for consideration at the Special Meeting. The complete guest opinion is as follows: Guest Column: Just say no to Idaho, by Gregory Mowe, September 20, 2023:

Like many Oregonians, I have been bothered by the supposed grassroots movement to move Oregon's border west. Bothered in part because the corollary of Greater Idaho is Lesser Oregon, and in part because the shape of Greater Idaho looks like a giant middle finger.

In reviewing the Greater Idaho literature and having witnessed the proliferation of signage on a recent trip to Eastern Oregon, it is apparent that the grassroots are being liberally watered by money from somewhere. The message is deceptively simple: Give us our freedom to join a state which shares our values.

States have proprietary rights and obligations. The entire state, not local communities, built and owns Eastern Oregon's highways, bridges, maintenance facilities, gravel and cinder pits, heavy equipment, fish hatcheries, state airports, reservoirs, state parks, state offices, and countless other assets. Are they to be given away? Will Idaho pay for them? The Department of State Lands also owns hundreds of thousands of acres and mineral rights in Eastern Oregon, all held in trust for all citizens of Oregon, not just local residents.

The argument by Greater Idaho appears to be that Oregon state ownership is only about 3% of total land mass in Eastern Oregon, and that any ownership issues can somehow be negotiated between Oregon and Idaho. This argument glosses over the complexity and uniqueness of Oregon's ownership. Two examples immediately come to mind. Oregon owns and operates two institutions of higher learning within the proposed Greater Idaho boundary, Eastern Oregon University and the Oregon Institute of Technology. Both serve local students, but also students from throughout the state. Why would it be in Oregon's interest to give up these institutions or try to operate them in another jurisdiction? Similarly, Oregon operates state prisons and correctional facilities in Madras, Pendleton, Umatilla, Ontario, Baker, and Burns. Why would any Corrections Department choose to voluntarily surrender jurisdiction over its own prisons?

Oregon state ownership is not limited to the property discussed above. Rather, when Oregon became a state, it acquired title to all meandered lakes and up to the high-water line of all navigable rivers within and abutting the state. Title is held as trustee for all people of Oregon under what is referred to as the Public Trust Doctrine. Thus, not only is Wallowa Lake State Park owned for the use and enjoyment of all Oregon citizens, but so is the lake itself. Similarly beds and banks of all navigable rivers and banks of the Columbia and Snake are held in public trust, as are nearly all natural lakes in the state. Oregon has a fiduciary obligation to preserve and protect public trust rights of all Oregonians. This obligation cannot be met by giving away our rivers and lakes, particularly to a state which has limited the scope of the public trust.

Just as all Oregonians share the state's natural resources, we also share a proud history which should not be lightly discarded. There is a reason they don't call it The Idaho Trail. Political trends are transient; history is not. The Willamette Valley is not a leftist monolith. Indeed, even Portland now has a law-and-order City Council. There are good-hearted people on both sides of the Cascades. Traditional values have an important role in moderating progressive values, and extremism benefits neither state. Rather than continually fanning flames of anger and setting neighbor against neighbor in what is surely a futile attempt at secession, money and energy could be better spent narrowing rather than expanding our differences.

Judge Joyce called on Matt McCaw with Greater Idaho for comments.

Matt McCaw: Thank you Commissioners. We go to all of these meetings all over the state that's happening in all of our eastern Oregon counties and as representatives of Greater Idaho we want to be at these meetings to be able to answer questions and give you guys updates about what's happening and just be a resource for everybody in Malheur county to be able to find out what's going on with the movement. I just wanted to be here, if you would like an update on what's happening with the movement statewide I can provide that, if you guys have specific questions for me I can provide those too.

Judge Joyce: Why don't you go with what's going on statewide for right now and then we'll go.

Mr. McCaw: So statewide, we now have had 12 counties, Wallowa county was the twelfth county that voted on our measures, that passed our measure as of last year. We have 12 counties in eastern Oregon that have passed some sort of a version of the same measure that you guys passed in Malheur county. Their all slightly worded different but the gist of all of them is, do we want our elected leaders to meet and be a proponent for moving the border. We now have 12 counties in eastern Oregon that have passed those measures; Crook county is going to be voting on it in May of this year. So, Crook County is going to be the thirteenth county in eastern Oregon to vote on it. Last year we had a memorial that was introduced and passed in the Idaho House formally inviting the Oregon legislature to begin talks about moving the border. We had legislation that was introduced on the Oregon side but that didn't get moved in the Oregon Senate, didn't go anywhere. Because of this year's short session, so the way the legislature works, last year they had the long session – every representative and senator get multiple bills that they bring. This is a very short session in Oregon so we are not going to be moving forward with the memorial like we did in the long session last year. Our goal, as a movement, for this upcoming session and interim after the session is over is to get an informational hearing at the Oregon State Legislature so that our elected representatives can hear why people in eastern Oregon are seeing this as a solution to this longstanding problem and why they want to move forward with that. That's kind of where we're at. We're looking to get an informational hearing out of our state legislators. We are going to be voting in May in Crook county and just continue to move forward in trying to advocate for what voters are saying they want.

Brent Grasty: I just want to doublecheck. The measures are, as you said, slightly different among the counties. Are there any that ask the electorate whether they want to move as opposed to whether they want to discuss?

Mr. McCaw: That's a great question. The way that the ballot measure system in Oregon works is that anything that's citizen led has to be legislative and not administrative. That gets fairly complicated. When we first started with this we wanted to put this question in front of voters in every eastern Oregon county and we wanted to put the most direct question in front of them that we could – Do you want your elected leaders to pursue making your county part of Idaho? Because that is the clearest way to know what voters want is to ask the question in the most direct way. When we started out in this process and we sent out these questions to get ballot measures that people could vote on, the different counties all had different legal interpretations about what that

language should look like, what was legislative versus what was administrative, so we ended up getting this smattering of things that are all similar but kind of different. But to answer your question, yes, we have had counties that have voted directly – Do you want your county to become part of Idaho? Wheeler county voted on a measure like that; I believe Sherman county voted on a measure like that. Crook county's measure that we're going to be voting on is a direct question to the voters – Do you want your county to pursue becoming part of Idaho? And the reason we're able to do those advisory questions in those counties is that state law does allow an advisory question, a direct question like that, if it's proposed by the county commissioners. So, the county commissioners can put something like that on the ballot but we couldn't go ask that question as a citizen led initiative. In the few select counties we were able to ask that question directly and what we found is in those counties we got about the same percentage of votes as we got in the other counties. People understand that what they're voting on here is to say, yes, we like this idea, we want our elected leaders to pursue making this happen.

Mr. Grasty: So, Matt, do you list the different questions on your website for each of the counties?

Mr. McCaw: That's a good question. I'm not sure. I couldn't answer that because I don't know everything that's on the website. I know that we would love to have that and we're redoing our website with the hopes that we can show, it's easier to find directly what exactly did Malheur vote on, what percentage of people voted yes, but I don't know that we have that information in a handy spot.

Mr. Grasty: Would it be possible to share those different questions? That's a great addition – percent that voted for and against by county to the Malheur County Court?

Mr. McCaw: Absolutely, like I said we're working on adding that. We're redoing our website and we're working to add that and absolutely we could get that information. That information also, if it's not on our website currently that's all on the secretary of state's website, you can look at every single ballot measure, what it says, what it was asking voters and what percentage of voters voted yes.

Mr. Grasty: It's easy to look it up Matt, but it's time consuming. Maybe you could compile it and send it out to the Malheur County Court.

Mr. McCaw: Yep, I can definitely work on that, absolutely.

Mr. Grasty: Thanks.

Paul Skeen: Folks, appreciate you having the meeting and I wish I felt better or I'd be there. Matt, there was some talk about doing some phases, last call, phase 1, 2, and three, which I was extremely excited about. Most people probably don't pay that much attention to Google Earth and see where Idaho and Oregon is. You might explain that to them. I think it's a great start that would make

people realize. I happen to be one of those guys that's got 2 ½ miles of river frontage where I'm only 800 feet away from a free state. Did you like that (inaudible)?

Mr. McCaw: Yeah, so to answer your question, our proposal, when we started this 3 ½ years ago we had originally included eastern Washington, northern California because those are places that vote similarly to eastern Oregon, they vote similarly to Idaho, we had presumed that those places would probably rather get their state level government from a state like Idaho than the ones they currently were. As we've moved forward we've narrowed that scope. We have a big enough challenge just to get the folks in eastern Oregon governance that makes sense for them. We foresee that down the road; our idea is all about self-determination. People should have the kind of government that they want, that they vote for, and that makes sense for their communities. We foresee moving down the road, once this happens and once we're able to get eastern Oregonians state government from the state of Idaho, that that will open up this, kind of flood gates for other areas to relook at, does it make sense for us to be getting our state level government from the state we're getting or would it make more sense to get it from people that more closely match our values and match what we want for our communities.

Mr. Skeen: Let me do another follow-up then. There is an area after you cross the bridge in Adrian that is still, it's called Big Bend, and it's still in the state of Oregon, great trivia question nobody realizes that. And then there are some spots, two other spots, where just a portion of the state of Oregon is on the other side of the river. And it was proposed to me at one point, and I don't remember who brought it up to me, I think it was Chris, but that we try something where that's actually on the other side of the river, east of the Snake River, and see if those people even want to change, which anybody in their right mind would, I mean, if the state of Oregon would do three or four things to make it to where we can compete against our agricultural counterparts on the other side of the river would be a great heaven sent from the state of Oregon. Whether we could get that done or not. We compete every day with that same problem that they don't have to compete with and I'm 50 minutes out of Boise and 6 ½ of 7 hours from Salem – just doesn't happen.

Mr. McCaw: I would just say to that, there have been border changes, again, part of the reason why our solution makes sense is because there actually is a political pathway and a political precedence for it. State lines have moved multiple times throughout the history of the United States because there do become these situations like what you're talking about; rivers change course, you end up with land on one side or the other or even you just have counties that no longer identify with the government that they've got and they want it from a neighboring county. There is a process, we can make this happen, it has happened multiple times; it's just a matter of getting elected leaders to come to the table and make it happen.

Judge Joyce asked if there were comments in opposition.

Antonio Sunseri: I'm Antonio Sunseri, I'm the Treasurer of the Greater Oregon PAC (Political Action Committee). I personally think that we should have an advisory question on the ballot, because there is a lot of confusion about what our measure actually did. And the only people who

can put an advisory question on the ballot is the County Court. I would also think that possibly there would be a way, maybe the legal counsel can chime in on this, if there's a way to attach a repeal to the section of the County Code that creates these meetings as an administrative thing that's required and that could be changed to where the County Court could decide when to have that, because that chapter of the County Code in the long term, as it was said in the last meeting, these meetings aren't necessarily always productive and we are just going to have these meetings at the county level until that part of our County Code goes away, regardless of how far this continues to move in the state legislature.

Mr. Grasty: Would you put that in the context of the effort to gather petitions?

Mr. Sunseri: We are collecting petitions right now to get a repeal of the part of the County Code that requires us to have meetings. And we are actively trying to get that repealed. However, I think that it would make more sense to people if the question was just asked. Because there seems to be a lot of confusion among people about what was actually passed and what the purpose of the ballot measure that passed in the Special District Election in 2021 was. Because what was passed was that we would have these meetings and it would really clear things up if there was just an advisory question put out there.

Mr. Grasty: What would that question be? Should we continue

Mr. Sunseri: The question would be like they put in, I think Wheeler county was the one that said, does this county want to become part of Idaho? And the question was directly asked. Rather than saying should we create this law that requires us to meet on these specific days to discuss it, with a penalty for the county commissioners, which was the part that was required to get, I was told, to get this original measure on the ballot. The forepart Chapter 12 I think it is in the County Code.

Mr. Grasty: And the purpose would be to inform county residents of the overall perspective by voters on whether we want to move or not?

Mr. Sunseri: Yes. Then there wouldn't be any question about it. Because right now there are people who would question what the results of that election was because of that. And I also think in my personal opinion that a question as important as that should go up in the General Election, not in the Special District Election which normally has much lower voter turnout.

Mr. Grasty: And that would be separate but still continue the PAC petition gathering and a potential measure on the November ballot?

Mr. Sunseri: Yes. Our group is working to put that measure on the November ballot to repeal the part of the County Code; as Matt said, we don't as voters have the ability to put an advisory question on; it can only be done when the elected officials themselves decide to put forth that resolution towards the ballot. I believe that's kind of similar to what was done the year before last with the psilocybin ballot that was advisory, or, I guess that created a, never mind, I was wrong.

Commissioner Jacobs: I think that was a little different than what we're doing here.

Mr. Sunseri: Yeah, because that created an ordinance.

Mr. Grasty: So, I'm just curious, would the Court entertain asking that question more directly, to, you know, I agree with Antonio, that the General's going to get the turnout, the maximum turnout, we can anticipate a higher turnout since the last General Election probably. Is that a question that's fair for the Court to consider? And how would that work if you three, do you get more input from the public, from your constituents, how does that work?

Judge Joyce: Good question. I'm sure that we'd have to go back to the author and the state for direction on part of it, the challenges, so I would think the best thing that you could do Antonio is put that in writing, get the right verbiage.

Mr. Sunseri: The right verbiage?

Judge Joyce: Yeah.

Mr. Sunseri: Okay, because I know that an advisory question I think could be put forth by the Court, for me the complication would be how do we also get, maybe get rid of that chapter at the same time. So, saying, hypothetically saying that the advisory passes that people do want to be a part of Idaho and they also might be able to wrap the two ideas into one. Because this trying to explain to people what a yes or a no vote is, you're twisting pretzels with people, it doesn't make any sense to anybody. Because you're asking people to vote yes to remove a chapter from the County Code about going to Idaho so they think yes is no and no is yes, but really the question that's at hand is still not the actual question, because the question can only be asked when it's put forth by an advisory ballot, and we can't do that for an initiative petition.

Judge Joyce: Serious questions.

Mr. Grasty: (inaudible) feel incumbered by the vote that we're currently here meeting on that would cause the Court to be reluctant to move forward on a question like Antonio's suggesting? I mean you get 54 to 46% in an off season – in a Special District Election, and 35% of the voters turnout. Now you put it out to maybe 50% of the ballot voters, maybe we'll go higher than that this year. Do you feel reluctant in any way to issue independently a question like that? I guess I'm thinking politically, is there challenges there that I'm not thinking of?

Judge Joyce: I guess it could go either way.

Mr. Grasty: It could, yeah, that's fair.

Judge Joyce: Seems that would be the biggest question. Thoughts anybody, any thoughts?

Commissioner Jacobs: I think we just have to take it under advisement, partly because we don't want to, we want to make sure that everything's done correctly for one thing. We don't want to change how it was initially done because of how it was voted on initially, however it doesn't mean that if we felt like that it would be prudent to change it and legally everything done legally. I wouldn't really have an objection of changing the verbiage on the voting to make it more clear, partly because I think a lot of those bills that are put up and stuff and those things that we vote on are always, or not always, but a lot of times unclear of how they're written and you don't know whether you are voting yes or no because; I would want it to be clear so that people do understand it and make it easier to understand, I'd be in favor of something like that.

Judge Joyce: The way it's currently written, we're just here to listen. That's it.

Mr. Sunseri: Exactly.

Mr. Grasty: It's one of the things that causes confusion I think, you know, repeatedly Matt and Greater Idaho suggest that the results of those votes were an indication that members of eastern Oregon want to move to as opposed to what the text of this question was, to meet and look at the potential advantages, whatever the quote was on the measure. Everybody we all probably have talked with are uncertain about, it's not clear, it's certainly not as clear as Greater Idaho has suggested at times that we want to as opposed as we want to talk about it.

Commissioner Jacobs: I think we made that clear from the beginning, that was not the vote, that we didn't vote to move, our vote was to have it brought up before the legislatures and let them discuss it.

Mr. Grasty: Right. On the flip side I really do appreciate that Greater Idaho's always said, we want the conversation. That's about where we have conflict.

Commissioner Mendiola: I've said this before, I think we're closer than people think, we just need to get some things hashed out. There's some changes we could make in Salem. There's some stuff we could change in Salem but it's going to take some work. And when I heard eastern Oregon I wasn't thinking Wheeler county was going to be in eastern Oregon. I mean it's not; neither is Deschutes in my opinion. If you figure in thirds, there's only a handful of counties that are in the third in the eastern side. I think there's a lot of disgruntled people but I don't know for sure; it's going to be a long process to get anything done. Like pushing a rope up a hill.

Mr. McCaw: I just wanted to reiterate what, talking about what people voting on and where we're at as far as that goes. You are correct, everybody's correct, what people voted on in Malheur county was to create this committee to promote the county's interest when the border discussions take place. I think it's important to understand, people voted affirmatively, yes, when these border negotiations start, we want to have a say in what happens with us. People understand, and maybe people don't understand, but counties cannot make this happen. What their voters can do is say,



yes, we think this is a good idea, or we support this, or we want our elected leaders at the local level to promote our interests when this happens. It's the state legislature that's going to have to make this happen. And we foresee that once border negotiations start, there's so many unknowns right now, and I couldn't tell who it was, but you referenced this, what we're proposing is getting this conversation started between the two states. We believe that most people in eastern Oregon would prefer to get their state level governance from the state of Idaho, but before that border move happens there's going to have to be a whole lot of conversation, a whole lot of studies, and a whole lot of details fleshed out before something like that were to happen. We have always said that we support and we foresee that after negotiations happen, after an interstate compact happens, that it would go back to a vote of the people once they have all the information, all the details in hand. I just wanted to kind of put that out there. I wish we could have asked voters directly; do you want to be part of Idaho? That would have been the easiest way to gauge voter sentiment. We asked as close of a question that we could and what we found is that for the most part people in eastern Oregon support this idea, they at least support having the conversation and having their elected leaders having the conversation. I just wanted to clarify on that.

David Armstrong: I just wanted to say I appreciate you saying that coming back to the local voters after things are kind of fleshed out because one of my big concerns, and I'm actually one of the chief petitioners of the Greater Oregon - the repeal of that measure here. My concern was always that we had Brexit and it was a lot of we negotiate, we negotiate, and we negotiate, and then we don't find out what it is until after the fact what the impacts are. I'm a little bit hesitant to say let's move the border because we don't know what we don't know. Thank you, Matt, for at least talking about that and dealing with that concern.

Commissioner Mendiola asked Mr. Beal what his thoughts were. Mr. Beal said he had no comments at this time, that he didn't know enough about it, overall was not in favor of it and was interested in keeping up with the matter.

Judge Joyce: I think there's a lot of comments online if I'm correct Matt that people if they want to look at them they're there. I'm not sure exactly what the website says.

Mr. McCaw: We have a pretty extensive FAQ (frequently asked questions) section so a lot of the questions that people have we have the best answers we can give. Unfortunately, again, there's going to be a lot of details that have to be hammered out between the two state legislatures. When you propose to move a border there's going to be things that you have to figure out what's happening, what's going to happen with minimum wage, what's going to happen with these areas like legalized marijuana that isn't the case in Idaho, there's some things we can't answer, there's a lot of questions we can't answer, but we answer everything we can and try to address people's concerns to the extent that we can on our website at [GreaterIdaho.org](http://GreaterIdaho.org). Thank you, commissioners, for mentioning that.

Judge Joyce: And I believe that this attorney from Portland that put his article in the Bend Bulletin has got two or three pages of questions that people can look at.

Commissioner Mendiola: Very good questions too.

Judge Joyce: For those that are listening or concerned or want more information.

Commissioner Jacobs: That's part of my problem with the whole thing is there are so many questions that need to be answered and really, we as the public or even county commissioners can't answer those questions. They have to be answered through the legislators negotiating, Oregon and Idaho, and I think if more people knew all those different questions and specific, trying to think of the right word, like PERS (Public Employees Retirement System) and like the hospitals, and like the state parks and the prisons and all those things that have to be hashed out. We can't do anything about it Matt and so that's where my problems come, so I do think it would be better if these counties voted on whether or not they wanted to move versus just wanted to have the legislators talk about it and try to hash all this stuff out. Because the way it was put on our ballot, I think a lot of people initially would have liked to have seen the legislators meet and hash all this stuff out, but a lot of people didn't understand how many issues there is that has to be addressed and so one thing I'd like to see the Greater Idaho movement do is address some of those things, recognizing that you can't really do anything about it but at least let people know what has to be addressed really to make this all happen.

Mr. McCaw: And I would just say to that commissioner, if people would check out our FAQ's; like I said, we have a pretty thorough list of questions that people have about this process and about what's going to happen to X Y Z and we try to answer those in the best way that we can, knowing that we're not able to, we don't have a crystal ball and we can't see what the Idaho and Oregon state legislatures would do. I also just wanted to add, you are correct in that there's only so much at the county commissioners' level you can do, but one thing that I think that all of our commissioners can do in eastern Oregon is, the people of eastern Oregon are voting and saying at a bare minimum we want our elected leaders to have this conversation and we want to explore this idea. Right now, our elected leaders at the state level that represent the folks in Malheur county are not advocating for having this conversation or having informational hearings or any of that sort of thing, they've just kind of taken a stance of we are not going to touch this or deal with this at all. So as commissioners of your counties I think that you do have a role, or you could have a role, in advocating to Representative Owens, to Senator Findley, about advocating for what voters are saying they want, which is we want to have this conversation, we want to explore this idea.

Jim Maret: The only comment I had is the reason I think that we all kind of went this way is because we really don't have a voice in Salem and so it's very frustrating as far as administrative people on this side of the state not having any kind of voice on what comes down the pike. With that said, there's going to have to be a lot of research done and trying to figure out what are the right decisions to move forward. And I agree with Matt wholeheartedly, there's got to be a lot of different questions answered, which is PERS and the prisons and hospitals, those things have to be answered. I think at least maybe were moving somewhat in a direction that will at least make

Salem understand that we're tired of being pushed down and not listened too. So hopefully maybe something at least will come out of this that will help us move forward. Thank you.

Mr. Grasty: I do have a question - Ron, you were quoted in the paper on attending a meeting and you found it interesting. Could you summarize that meeting? What was that?

Commissioner Jacobs: There was just some legislators from Idaho there and they discussed the possibility of Idaho accepting Oregon and they did discuss some of the things that had to be addressed for this to even happen but those specific legislators were in favor, but there was only two or three of them there from Idaho, so that was a minority. And we just discussed some of these things that we've discussed today, what it would take to do this and they were in favor of meeting with the Oregon legislators. But by the same token, I agree with Jim, I think our biggest issue is that we don't feel like our voice is really heard in western Oregon, and most of the laws that are passed are passed by the northwest part of Oregon. I think this is why this has all come forward is because we want to be able to have our voice heard and actually be able to receive more consideration from the west side. But really, there was not a lot accomplished at that meeting, they just discussed a lot of some of the things that we're discussing today.

Mr. Grasty: It was just interstate coordination?

Commissioner Jacobs: Basically. I don't recall, there wasn't any legislators from Oregon there, as I recall.

Mr. McCaw: Actually, there was, Representative Breese Iverson was at that meeting and she helped organize that meeting. Essentially it was chance to get some folks from the Idaho legislature together and the Oregon legislature and any local commissioners and talk about what might need to happen to make this move forward; advocate for what people are asking elected leaders to do and look at what next steps might be for that.

Commissioner Jacobs: Thanks Matt. I'm sorry, she was, Representative Iverson.

Mr. McCaw: That's okay.

Judge Joyce asked for any further comments from the meeting participants.

Commissioner Jacobs: I would just say that we'll take into consideration what's been discussed here and see what we'll do here in the future.

Judge Joyce: It's sure easier to see it in writing.

Randy Knop inquired if GoTo Meeting had closed captioning that could be activated; it does not. Mr. Knop inquired if participants could be allowed to record the meeting; GoTo Meeting allows organizers to record.

Mr. Grasty: Forgive me for adding one more thing, (inaudible) Antonio and the group put together some verbiage for your review. Our next meeting's not until May. How can we follow-up on that? Attend a regularly scheduled commission meeting? To nudge this along, support you all, if you have complication, or if Stephanie suggest modifications or clarification, how do we go forward?

Commissioner Mendiola: You mean to review what they're going to put on the ballot in May?

Mr. Grasty: No, to, I forget the wording

Mr. Sunseri: What was discussed today about the advisory, the idea of putting an advisory ballot

Judge Joyce: And you're going to put it in writing, so it's visible, okay.

Mr. Grasty: How does it follow-up if we wait until the next meeting, I don't know, does that run

Judge Joyce: That's September

Mr. Grasty: us on not being on the November ballot if that was an option?

Mr. Sunseri: There's plenty of time.

Mr. Grasty: Is there? Okay.

Commissioner Mendiola: Maybe we can look at it in May, the verbiage.

Mr. Sunseri: I think (inaudible) get something on the ballot, for the November ballot, is August.

Judge Joyce: And it'd be real easy to clarify that down the hall.

Mr. Sunseri: (inaudible) I think it's August 30th or something like that.

There were no further comments; Judge Joyce adjourned the meeting.