

AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**3:00 P.M.**  
**Room EW41**  
**Thursday, January 27, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
---------	-------------	-----------

---

Review of House Rule 45

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Thursday, January 27, 2022

**TIME:** 3:00 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW41

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representative(s) Crane and Gannon

**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the session the sign-in sheet will be filed with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

**MOTION:** **Rep. McCrostie** made a motion to approve the minutes of the Monday, December 6, 2021 and Tuesday, December 7, 2021 meetings.

**SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION:** **Rep. Chew** mentioned in the minutes from December 7, 2021, her discussion on Page 3, paragraph 2 was more to the effect that the process for a witness exiting a hearing be more secure and planned out and made a motion for more explicit language to be added to the minutes regarding the process of a witness exiting a hearing and it be more secure for witnesses as they exit a public hearing. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**MOTION:** **Rep. McCrostie** made a motion to approve the minutes of the Monday, December 6, 2021 meeting as written. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Chairman Dixon** asked **Kristen Ford**, Legislative Services Office (LSO) to explain the three drafts she has compiled. He said **Rep. Young** also has some changes she has had drafted and **Rep. Chew** has some possible additions to review.

**Kristen Ford**, LSO, explained the first draft (089) was taken from discussions during the Committee meetings held in December 2021 and have been incorporated it into a new rule. She reviewed the changes in the draft she added from the committee's discussion. The second draft (090) are variations of the first draft that adds more language regarding the involvement of attorneys and having an attorney available for all parties. This draft also includes more language regarding specifics on financial assistance in case of an extreme financial burden which could be voted on by the Committee.

**Ms. Ford** said the alternate draft (091), adds language providing for contact information of the respondent be given to the Committee so service will be easier in getting information to the respondent.

The Committee discussed the striking out of language regarding expulsion that runs counter to what is in the Idaho Constitution and **Ms. Ford** mentioned it would be a good suggestion to reference the Constitution in this case. Committee members questioned the value of having the complaint being signed under oath which was a part of discussion in December and may deter frivolous complaints.

**Rep. Barbieri** mentioned his concerns with having both parties use the Attorney General's Office and he believed it would be a conflict. He said he did not think there was a need to involve the AG's office or the Executive Branch at all.

**Rep. Chew** reviewed the suggestions she had brought to the Committee, suggesting language be added regarding the redaction of the name and any identifying information of the person who may have brought or initiated a complaint. She said especially if the person is a third party.

**Rep. Young** reviewed her draft and the changes already made in the drafts from **Ms. Ford**. She said the language in the House Rule has been rearranged, and the investigative portion is made more clear and remains confidential. A new lists has been added with reasons why a complaint would be dismissed. She said some steps in the process run together, so those have been broken out for clarity. Rep. Young said redacting names in documents prior to their release has been added and she tried to redraft the rule to follow the process sequentially. She said language is added regarding using council for some things such as questions, but not for other things, but the committee and not council will conduct the hearing. Rep. Young said the rest of the sections deal with recommendations and committee reports, etc.

**Rep. Barbieri** mentioned he has substantial concerns with the rule, but would bring those up a later time. **Chairman Dixon** said he hoped this discussion would give the Committee some ideas and something to discuss at the next meeting.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**3:00 P.M.**  
**Room EW41**  
**Thursday, February 03, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
----------------	--------------------	------------------

---

	Review of House Rules 45	
--	--------------------------	--

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Thursday, February 03, 2022

**TIME:** 3:00 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW41

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** Leslie Hayes, Deputy Attorney General

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

**MOTION:** **Rep. McCrostie** made a motion to approve the minutes of Thursday, January 27, 2022. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Chairman Dixon** reviewed the three drafts brought by **Kristin Ford**, LSO, Research and Legislation, and explained how the red-lines and highlights are changes from the original rule. He said these were brought to facilitate continued discussion on the rule.

**Rep. Chew** said she would like to focus on third party involvement, and a review of language to make it clear, a third party has the ability to leave a hearing with protection and have their identity kept private. **Leslie Hayes**, Deputy Attorney General responded saying the language of the proposed changes are appropriate when challenged with trying to protect a victim. She said when the committee goes through the process laid out by the rule, the full house needs to be able to hear the evidence while still protecting the identity of the victim. **Rep. Crane** responded by saying if the committee is trying to manage the "safety" of a person some language could imply the committee provide a body guard or protect a victim at their home. Ms. Hayes mentioned "safety" could entail a spectrum of definitions and the language could be problematic.

**Rep. Horman** stated keeping the identity of a victim confidential and protecting the safety of a victim are different things. **Ms. Hayes** said protecting the identity of a victim would also protect future **Jane and John Does**. **Rep. McCrostie** asked Ms. Hayes to explain the difference in identity and privacy. Ms. Hayes said identity would specifically refer to a name and face, privacy gives the committee more leverage in disseminating information about the case. Rep. McCrostie expanded the question to the Committee for discussion regarding the term safety and if there is a way to limit the scope of what safety means to in and out of the hearing in the Capitol Building.

**Rep. Chew** asked for guidance from **Ms. Hayes** on suggested wording for the rule. Ms. Hayes said guidance was provided through out the process of the case in guarding the identity of **Jane Doe** and was handled at the hearing with the comments of the Chairman at the beginning, and through out the hearing to protect her identity. She said she was not sure any written rule or standard of care could have prevented anything different from happening because Ms. Doe had an emotional response when leaving the hearing. **Chairman Dixon** clarified there was discussion and negotiation with Ms. Doe's attorneys during the preliminary portion of the case on how to keep Ms. Doe's identity private during the hearing. Ms. Hayes said the Committee did have a safe exit plan that Ms. Doe chose not to

utilized, she reiterated that any written rule would not have changed the outcome of that situation.

In Committee discussion regarding the possible changes to the rule outlined in the drafts, **Rep. Gannon**, had thought language specific from committee discussion on the ability to consult with a deputy attorney general, gives equal access to the member and to the committee.

**Rep. Horman** reflected on one draft which had language that did not create a conflict. She felt more comfortable with that type of language regarding attorneys. **Rep. Barbieri** said he felt any involvement of the Attorney General's Office is a mistake and is inviting the Executive Branch into legislative business.

**Rep. Young** said the discussion should revolve around two topics, is support provided but there is also the question of what role attorneys will play in the process. She thought having attorneys present for legal questions and advisory roles would be appropriate. **Rep. Barbieri** said if attorney's are allowed and the Committee is following a legal process, there should be a provision to include the legal rules of evidence. He said this is not a legal process, attorneys should be removed. Because it is an internal matter there is no purpose for attorneys.

**Rep. Gannon** mentioned how often times rules of evidence are relaxed and attorneys make adjustments to what they think will work for the situation. The draft refers to Committee members making inquires of the AG's Office and not having the AG Office be the lead during a hearing. He said Committee members should be like the jury or judges in a hearing, providing the evidence and conducting the hearing would be more bias and unfair.

**Rep. Green** questioned other members regarding the two recent hearings and if there was value in having the attorneys present and participating. **Rep. Horman** said during the first hearing which was during session it was difficult to find the time to review the evidence in detail so having people help organize the materials was helpful. She said when there are cases with possible legal implications or fines it was valuable to have an attorney present. **Chairman Dixon** mentioned he also saw value in having an attorney, in the first hearing there were leanings toward a criminal case and in the second hearing the Committee tried to create a separation.

The Committee discussed the topic of sanctions and the term good cause shown. They also reviewed thoughts on expulsion and not using a recommendation that had the effect of expulsion. Language was reviewed for adding more provisions for expulsion if it is justified.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**3:00 P.M.**  
**Room EW41**  
**Tuesday, February 22, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
----------------	--------------------	------------------

---

Review of House Rule 45

NOTE: Time and Location are subject to change.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Tuesday, February 22, 2022

**TIME:** 3:00 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW41

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of session the sign-in sheet will be filed with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 3:11 p.m.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Gannon** made a motion to approve the minutes of Thursday, February 3, 2022. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Chairman Dixon** explained the committee has a copy of the current House Rule 45 and a draft copy of color coded suggestions of changes to the rule in one document. The plan is to continue to refine this today and get a clear direction for something to present to the House Judiciary, Rules and Administration Committee. The draft is fully rearranged to how the committee works through the process.

**Rep. Young** requested to work sequentially through the draft, and **Chairman Dixon** reviewed the changes in the draft. **Rep. McCrostie** said he would agree with 12 days instead of the 14 days after session begins to organize the committee and the next change is determining alternates. **Rep. Young** said the changes were to be consistent and not have leadership determine the order of alternates.

**MOTION;** **Rep. Gannon** made a motion to accept paragraph one and subparagraphs 1a, 1b and 1c. with the change from 14 to 12 days. **Rep. Crane** said he could not support the motion and would like to go through the entire rule before making motions.

**MOTION  
WITHDRAWN:** **Rep. Gannon** withdrew his motion.

**Rep. Crane** reviewed on page 2, electing a chairman, saying he would like to add "of the majority party". **Rep. McCrostie** said the 4/5 vote would provide for a majority party chairman. **Rep. Gannon** said the minority members of the committee have no objections to this.

**Rep. McCrostie** expressed concern for identifying any third parties as a complaint is being put together. He said they would not want to exclude a third party and appreciated the intent and would support inclusion at some point.

**Rep. Horman** explained in subsection b, three of the five previous allegations have been removed. **Rep. Young** explained her intent for removing the other allegation causes and said the current draft may have some of the language compressed. **Rep. Young** said the committee and House is not a judicial body and she did not want to bring attention to anything criminal. She wanted to get away from that language and emphasize conduct unbecoming so the rule would capture those behaviors. **Rep. McCrostie** said he would feel more comfortable with the current rule language and some of the allegations should be spelled out.



**Rep. Barbieri** said the discretion of the committee must be maintained and this covers it without delineating that discretion. **Rep. Crane** said he would not support the language as written in the draft. He said these are rules for Representative's conduct on what will be allowed or not. **Rep. Green** said she would agree with spelling it out more than having it compressed. **Rep. Horman** said she would agree with the delineation of the five and feels there is value in stating up front what potentially is an ethics violation.

**Rep. Barbieri** said on page 2, line 32, he is concerned with basing allegations solely on news reports and how the use of new reports could be utilized in the process. He explained he would not want an investigation triggered by an article. He explained further a complaint could be filed on the "evidence" the reporter based the article on and gave an example.

**Rep. Crane** said he is concerned with not being able to use the investigation phase and **Rep. Gannon** said it would be up to the committee to evaluate a news story, but if the committee can't even look at it, it would be difficult to investigate. Discussion was held on a complainant bringing supporting evidence and whether the burden should be on the complainant or the committee to investigate and find the evidence during the investigation. **Rep. Horman** pointed out a media only complaint may not pass muster in the current rule.

**Rep. McCrostie** pointed out concerns on page 2, line 32, subsection 3 because the committee does not determine criminality and "accused" should be changed to "respondent". **Rep. Young** said the draft is organize beginning with the organization of the committee, then the complaint process, etc. **Rep. Horman** said as the process was previously operated it has put the burden of proof on the complainant, just as a matter of function. **Rep. Crane** said he has concerns with ruminant (iv), and the testimony to the committee and in public should be the truth and the person testifying should be held accountable for it. He said the truth should be a part of the process.

**Rep. Barbieri** said any testimony cannot be used against the person in a court. He also questioned in the preliminary investigation is the burden of proof on the complainant, or is it on the committee to investigate the facts to determine if there was conduct unbecoming. **Chairman Dixon** said it is not the complainant who has the burden of proof, it would be the committee. He agreed the burden lies with the committee as they move forward with a complaint. **Rep. Young** said a complainant should carry some burden of proof because the process asks the committee to judge between the two parties. She said she would like to see the committee in a more neutral position.

**Rep. Horman** said it is sufficient for a complainant to file an ethics complaint and the committee to verify the behavior then make a recommendation to the full House. She said the burden is not with the committee but with the full House to make the determination of conduct unbecoming.

**Rep. Gannon** said the complainant doesn't have the ability to subpoena witnesses or investigate, he didn't think it was fair to put the burden of proof on the complainant. He continued saying determining probable cause doesn't involve the complainant or providing the burden of proof, the steps are already there and this addition would confuse things.

**MOTION:** Rep. Crane made a motion to adjourn. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**6:00 P.M.**  
**Room EW41**  
**Thursday, February 24, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
---------	-------------	-----------

---

Review of House Rule 45

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Thursday, February 24, 2022

**TIME:** 6:00 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW41

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Barbieri

**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the session the sign-in sheet will be filed with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

**Chairman Dixon** continued review of the draft on page 2 regarding how one party waiving confidentiality would not be appropriate for the confidentiality to be waived for all parties.

**Rep. Horman** stated line 47 does not comply with the original rule and the committee's review will need to be very specific and clear of all changes to the rule as they are made.

**Rep. Gannon** asked about comparing the draft with the original language and **Chairman Dixon** said the draft rule has been rearranged so it may be difficult to compare the two side by side.

**Rep. Crane** said on page 2 with adding back in the original five allegations, the committee may need a new draft with changes and then make motions to approve each change.

The committee discussed the threshold of probable cause and needing evidence to move to probable cause. **Rep. Gannon** reviewed three points of the probable cause threshold.

**Rep. Young** explained in the next section she wanted the respondent to have the ability to waive the right to confidentiality and have the ability to defend themselves if the complaint became public. Committee members expressed concern with protecting a third party and didn't think there was an incident where this would apply. **Rep. Green** said she didn't think this would be in the best interest of the institution and could be used as campaign material. Committee members discussed protecting the respondent and should a complaint become public, a disclaimer could be added to the rule. **Rep. McCrostie** said every complaint is confidential and any letter given by the committee is subject to a lack of confidentiality. **Rep. Young** said any letter of dismissal could become public and an addition could be added to the rule if the letter of dismissal becomes public then confidentiality could be waived.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Crane** made a motion to delete on page 2, lines 38, 39, 40. **Rep. Green** seconded the motion.

Speaking to the motion, **Rep. Gannon** said a third party won't know about any letter or dismissal and sometimes there isn't a letter. **Chairman Dixon** said there is a potential for things to be exposed and twisted and exacerbated.

The committee continued discussion regarding giving the committee some discretion on what can be released and what may be discussed on social media. **Rep. Crane** argued it's frustrating to see things in social media that the committee can't explain. **Rep. Gannon** said no one is addressing that the person could still make a complaint to the public and not to the Ethics Committee. **Rep. Horman** said the committee has clearly established it's not going to be the social media police and members have civil avenues to follow. She said they need to stay within the rails of the rule and address members of the House.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**Motion carried by voice vote.**

**MOTION:**

**Rep. Gannon** made a motion to delete all of line 32 and continuation of the sentence on line 33 on page 2. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Rep. Gannon** questioned that to dismiss a complaint it takes the majority of the committee but it takes 4/5 of the committee to move forward with a complaint. **Rep. Crane** agreed in order to maintain the bipartisan support of a decision it should be 4/5 to move forward or to dismiss.

**MOTION:**

**Rep. Gannon** made a motion to remove "a majority" and insert "4/5" on page 2, line 34. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Rep. Horman** said she is fine with making motions now but will reserve right to change her vote as the committee goes through a final rule. **Chairman Dixon** said they can dispense with motions until a final rule comes forward. **Rep. Crane** mentioned on points of contention the committee may need to still make motions.

The committee discussed lines 3 and 4 on page 3, regarding the provision in House Rule 26 for executive sessions. Committee members agreed it would be helpful to have the flexibility of going into executive session during a hearing or after a hearing and not just during the preliminary investigation. It was suggested to take out the reference to Rule 26 and have all preliminary investigation be in executive session.

Discussion continued regarding the deletion of line 7 on page 3 and how the complaint remains confidential until it is dismissed. **Rep. McCrostie** suggested changing the word "until" to "unless"...there is an indication the preliminary investigation will result in a public hearing.

The committee discussed the value of line 9 on page 3 that it may help a new comer understand the rules and it helps with the flow of the rule. **Chairman Dixon** suggested striking "resolved and" from the line.

Discussion was held regarding page 3 lines 17-18 because a complainant may file an answer and the complaint may be resolved. Members disagreed on who could call for witnesses and wanted to maintain more discretion for the committee to call the witnesses at this point in the process. Committee members agreed the process doesn't need to be this spelled out and the original language gives more flexibility to the committee. **Rep. Young** explained her intent was to provide for both parties to be able to be a part of the preliminary investigation. She would like to ensure both sides get an invitation to make a case and bring witnesses. Committee members said the preliminary investigation is to determine if there is probable cause and agreed the original language gives more flexibility and control to the committee of the committee process.

**MOTION:** **Rep. McCrostie** made a motion to keep the original language from the current rule on page 3, lines 18-22. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**3:00 P.M.**  
**Room EW41**  
**Thursday, March 10, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
---------	-------------	-----------

---

Review and Discussion of House Rule 45

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Thursday, March 10, 2022

**TIME:** 3:00 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW41

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the legislative session the sign-in sheet will be filed in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Crane** made a motion to approve the minutes of Tuesday, February 22, 2022 and Thursday, February 24, 2022. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Chairman Dixon** explained the different documents available to the committee. (see attachment)

**Rep. Crane** mentioned on page 3, lines 29 through 34 to re-insert the original five conditions, but romanette (i) may not be applicable. **Rep. Horman** said under the current rule romanette (i) says if a complaint is not dismissed it leads to the public hearing phase. Committee members discussed several scenarios for needing to go to a public hearing including if a respondent does not participate in the preliminary investigation. It was reiterated that probable cause must exist that misconduct has occurred and probable cause is such that there is a need to go to a public hearing. **Rep. Green** said it would be better to retain the decision to not have a public hearing if there isn't enough evidence whether a respondent participates or not. Rep. Horman stated the ruminates should only state the reasons for going to a public hearing and this statement should stand on its own.

**Rep. Horman** mentioned a trigger is needed in the rule for when the documents become public. She said this needs further review because this section is a very difficult deliberation in the process.

**Rep. Young** said she has heard concerns from a member of the body regarding language, about the threshold being the only trigger for a public hearing without the severity of the action being considered. She explained her intent for wanting a change in the language of the current rule. **Rep. Crane** said he felt the language in the working draft is creating another fork with a predetermined path. He said this language is already assigning punishment before a hearing. Rep. Young explained she was asking the committee to not only consider if the behavior has taken place, but also the seriousness of the behavior.

**Rep. McCrostie** mentioned on page 3 the threshold is if probable cause exists or does not exist and at that point of the investigatory process the committee is deciding to go forward to a public hearing or not. He explained there needs to be clear and convincing evidence that conduct unbecoming has occurred. If this language is added it seems the committee is pre-casting judgement, he said the process should move in such a manner that there is not a rush to judgment and predetermination. Rep. McCrostie said he is uncomfortable with the proposed language.



**Rep. Horman** agreed saying in the current rule, the trigger is a "may" and she would be open to language concerning serious discipline, rather than censure or expulsion but she is not comfortable with the proposed language. **Chairman Dixon** and **Rep. Crane** agreed the language was not needed and the consideration of severity of the action was already a part of the process. **Rep. Young** reiterated she would like the rule to reflect how the committee can determine in executive session if the behavior is warranted enough to put the respondent through a public hearing.

The committee moved on to notification and determining when documents become public, **Rep. Horman** said from previous examples a vote was taken by the committee and they determined it was at this moment the documents are public. She said she wants to make sure the committee first makes notifications before anything is released and wants to put in time frames depending on whether the legislature is in session or not in session. She suggested on line 39, insert "within 72 hours of the respondent's notification the documents become public". **Rep. Gannon** said this would be consistent with public records laws and members agreed with this suggestion. **Rep. Horman** also suggested having consistent language with notifying the complainant and the respondent then all association documents are no longer confidential and become public. Committee members discussed using the 72 hours to allow for the redaction of names and the public records law is specific on whose names can be redacted and the need for specific reasons under public records law to redact names.

**Rep. Horman** mentioned having "all associated records" becoming public and the documents had to be released per the public record law. Discussion was held regarding what documents are a part of the deliberations and do not need to be released.

Committee discussion was held regarding the review of line 46, and if rules of procedure and rules of evidence should be added as part of the rule. Members considered adding some rules of procedure for the public hearing

**MOTION:** **Rep. Crane** made a motion to include the original language on page 3 line 37, concluding at page 4 line 4 and adding amended language on line 16, concluding on line 19.

**Rep. Horman** agreed with having clarification on the last sentence regarding putting the burden on the respondent to obtain and review the documents, and not on the committee to provide the documents and the respondent shall provide their documents to the committee.

**VOTE ON MOTION:** **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**MOTION:** **Rep. Horman** made a motion to adopt the suggested language on page 4, lines 4 and 5 with **Rep. Chew's** recommended language. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**MOTION:** **Rep. Crane** made a motion to strike lines 6 and 7 on page 4. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

Committee members discuss the language on page 4 lines 8, 9, and 10 on the working draft with suggestions to strike some language in subsection 6 at the bottom. **Rep. Gannon** thought this sentence was appropriate to give the committee the ability to call a recess during the public hearing if new evidence comes forward. Discussion regarding giving the Chairman the discretion to pause the hearing giving either side the ability to review new information. **Rep. McCrostie** mentioned using the word "may" might be discretionary enough. Committee members expressed concern a recess may delay the process and if this is in the rule the privilege should be given to all parties.

**MOTION:** **Rep. McCrostie** made a motion to add the language discussed on page 4, lines 9, and 10. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

Discussion regarding line 11 on page 4 revealed an issue with "subject to approval of the speaker".

**MOTION:** **Rep. Gannon** made a motion to accept paragraph (f), with the two suggested additions and to strike "procedure only".

The committee discussed lines 16, 17 and 18 in this section, not wanting to tie the hands of the committee regarding consulting with council. Several members were uncomfortable with the suggested language and agreed flexibility needs to stay with the committee to have witnesses questioned by experts. **Rep. Horman** suggested this be specific to third party witnesses or more specific to alleged sexual assault victim because the committee does not want to re-traumatize a victim. **Rep. Green** said she was hesitate to go into too much detail and not take into context the situation. **Rep. Young** said there is a problem when there is a state funded Deputy Attorney General assuming the role of a prosecutor. She said if the state isn't providing legal council for the respondent and not actively advocating for the them in a persecutory role it gives the appearance they are on the other side. **Rep. Crane** said there could be a perception of a political overtone but the committee is sitting in judgement and having someone else ask questions is necessary because committee members still need to work with the person who is the respondent.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST:** **Rep. Gannon** asked unanimous consent to amend the motion to revise the last two sentences and delete "subject to approval by the speaker" and delete "procedure only" on page 4 line 12 ending on 15.

**VOTE ON MOTION:** **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Chairman Dixon** reviewed lines 16, and 17 on page 4 regarding the attorney general may assist with the final report. Committee members discussed the committee having the ability to ask questions and having someone else conduct the hearing or examine the witnesses. The committee also discussed how they are examining their peers and may have different questions than the attorneys. **Rep. Horman** said if the respondent has the ability to use an attorney to question their peers it only seems fair for the committee to have the right to an attorney to question their peers also. **Rep. Green** said she was hesitant to put limiting language in the rule for future committees. Some committee members agreed they liked the ability to bring in council if it was needed and still have the ability to ask questions and if the respondent has the ability to have council, the committee should have it also.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Crane** made a motion to adjourn the committee. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee the meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

**AMENDED AGENDA #1**  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**Upon Adjournment of the House**  
**Room EW41**  
**Tuesday, March 15, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
---------	-------------	-----------

---

Review and Discussion of House Rule 45

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Tuesday, March 15, 2022  
**TIME:** Upon Adjournment of House  
**PLACE:** Room EW41  
**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representative(s) Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew  
**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representative(s) Horman  
**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the session the sign-in sheet will be filed with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

**Chairman Dixon** said there was a new draft available with changes by the committee up to the March 10th, 2022, meeting. He said the committee will continue to work with the draft that is color coded and continue on page 4, lines 17 through 26 to add back in the five conditions from the current rule.

The committee discussed lines 28 and beyond regarding reprimand, sanctions, censure and dismissal. It was mentioned dismissal is built into the rule before a public hearing but it should also be put in after the public hearing. **Rep. McCrostie** suggested on line 27 the vote should be 4/5 vote by the committee to recommend dismissal, reprimand, or sanction. The clarifying language of reprimand and censure and the graduating effect of the language on lines 27 through 33 was discussed and agreed to.

The committee reviewed the suggested new language on line 33 and it was pointed out the suggested language is not in line with what is stated in the Constitution. **Brian Kane**, Deputy Attorney General addressed the committee reminding them that whatever the committee decides is only a recommendation to the full body. He said this is limiting what the committee can recommend for expulsion without the consideration that someone won't adhere to the rules of the body even if multiple complaints have been filed and there has been continued reprimand or censure.

**Rep. Crane** said he didn't have an issue with using language for expulsion, up to reasonable doubt or even require a unanimous vote of the committee to recommend expulsion but he was not comfortable with limiting the language and the committee needs more flexibility. **Rep. McCrostie** said there are some challenges with the current rule because the Idaho Constitution says with 2/3 vote of either house the body can expel a member. The current language in the rule may fall outside of what the Constitution says. He said he would be comfortable with the language beyond reasonable doubt in case of a holdout for a unanimous vote but 4/5 is clearly more than a majority and a good vote.

**Rep. Green** said if 2/3 of the House members are needed to vote for the recommendation this would go beyond a reasonable doubt. She would rather allow for future committees to make that decision. **Rep. Young** said she would want language to protect the respondent and the vote should be either unanimous or 4/5. She said the body would always have the ability to go beyond the recommendation. **Chairman Dixon** said expulsion should have a high bar and he was inclined to agree with the suggested language as a safeguard. The committee agreed they would not take votes in this meeting but make suggested language changes to review and vote another day.

The committee discussed line 36 regarding allowing new evidence and relevance of new evidence through the process. **Mr. Kane** said the committee can determine what evidence is relevant or not relevant. He expressed to the committee some other thoughts on some of the suggested language regarding time lines taken from judicial time lines and such time frames like 30 days to issue a report and 14 days for a response from the respondent may be too long in legislative time lines depending on if the legislature is in session or not. He also suggested instead of the Attorney General's Office helping with a committee report, it should be any attorney that may have helped the committee during the process and who is familiar with the complaint.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

**AMENDED AGENDA #1**  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**9:30 A.M.**  
**Room EW41**  
**Tuesday, March 22, 2022**

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
----------------	--------------------	------------------

---

	Review of House Rule 45	
--	-------------------------	--

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Tuesday, March 22, 2022

**TIME:** 9:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW41

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Crane

**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be held in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the session the sign-in will be retained with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Green** made a motion to approve the minutes from Thursday, March 10 and Tuesday, March 15, 2022. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Chairman Dixon** explained there is a new draft with changes suggested by the committee. In response to committee questions, **Kristin Ford**, LSO legislation drafter said some things were changed but other suggestions which the committee was indecisive on were left unchanged.

**Chairman Dixon** began review line by line of the draft starting on page 1, line 19. The committee discussed the need for a provision in case of a tie in votes for ranking alternates. Idaho statute provides for a coin toss, it was suggested this be added. Committee members discussed how to fill vacancies in the case of a temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy and added those suggestions to the rule. **Kolby Reddish**, LSO legal council clarified this language

The committee reviewed and it was clarified by **Mr. Reddish** regarding the intent of the committee to keep records confidential and when documents could become public record. Committee members discussed document and record retention and it was determined the documents would be held for the term of service of the Representative. **Rep. Horman** stated the retention of records needs to comply with the rule on page 1, lines 28 and 29 regarding if someone is sanctioned by the committee they are not allowed to serve on the committee. Rep. Horman said on advise of council, to clarify the records are confidential and should be retained for sitting members to the end of their service.

**Rep. Young** suggested on line 40 to add a 3/5 threshold to dismiss a complaint and a 4/5 threshold to move forward to a public hearing. **Chairman Dixon** said a 3/5 vote may appear to be partisan and having a 4/5 vote would need to include a minority member. Other member agreed.

**Mr. Reddish** reviewed the processes in subsection 4 regarding the differences in the initial review and the preliminary investigation. Committee members discussed keeping the language consistent, the initial trigger that starts the process, and if there is only one processes and not two. **Rep. Young** said the intent from her suggested language is to have the initial review a part of the preliminary investigation.

**Rep. Green** reiterated she was more comfortable with a 4/5 threshold rather than a 3/5 threshold and would like this kept in on line 40. **Ms. Ford** made language suggestions for the bottom of page 2 to the top of page 3 and changing the order of romanette (b) and (c).

**Chairman Dixon** continued reviewing the draft line by line. **Rep. Young** suggested adding "all" in front of "evidence" and wanted to make sure the committee was comfortable with line 9 on page 3. **Rep. McCrostie** expressed concern regarding a dismissal of a complaint then it becoming no longer confidential. He said he has a problem with this language. **Rep. Gannon** said he thinks if there is a dismissal the complaint should remain confidential. He continued, saying if the complainant wanted it public, in the rule, the complainant would not be able to disclose a complaint was filed. **Rep. Green** said she is not comfortable with the complaint becoming public if it is dismissed, because it could be used to attack others. **Rep. Barbieri** said to be practical he did not want it to be an ethics violation to say a complaint was dismissed. **Rep. Young** said her intent was to give the respondent the ability to say a complaint was dismissed without putting the burden back on the committee to decide when the dismissal could become public. **Rep. Gannon** said the complaining party can still go to the public and complain, and the respondent can respond without mentioning the Ethics Committee or the complaint, he felt the committee should be left out of it.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Barbieri** made a motion to have the current draft made into an RS with the changes suggested by the committee.

**Chairman Dixon** expressed concern there was still over a page of the draft to be reviewed by the committee and not all members were present.

**VOTE ON MOTION:** **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee the meeting adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary



AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
Upon Adjournment  
Room EW41  
Tuesday, March 22, 2022

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
---------	-------------	-----------

---

Review and Discussion of House Rule 45

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Tuesday, March 22, 2022  
**TIME:** Upon Adjournment  
**PLACE:** Room EW41  
**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew  
**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Barbieri  
**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the session the sign-in sheet will be retained in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

**Chairman Dixon** mentioned there is a new draft with some of the underlying changes made this morning. He review some changes saying the added language on page 3, line 23 to allow a respondent to reveal an ethics complaint against them when it has been dismissed has been removed. He said subsections (b) and (c) have been swapped in their order and pick up again on subsection (d). He asked if there is anything to be reviewed regarding what was discussed this morning.

**Rep. Crane** said section 2(b) doesn't comply with 2(a) and is irrelevant and deferred to **Kristin Ford**, LSO drafter, for further definition. **Rep. McCrostie** pointed out the conditions should have "or" added so it would include any one of the three conditions on line 10 and not all three.

**Rep. Horman** suggested removing lines 23 through 25, but if the are kept in should say "without providing any details of the complaint". **Rep. Gannon** reiterated he would like to keep the committee out of this section all together. He continued saying there are a lot of reasons why a complaint could be dismissed that is not based upon the merit or lack of merit of the complaint. He said the committee should be ether in or out of this portion, but not part way. Committee members discussed removing this portion or altering it. Members agree this may cause the committee problems and there is a reason the preliminary portion is kept in executive session. Some members were in favor of the original rule language and thought it was a better approach than this suggestion.

There was discussion regarding members not being present and running out of time in the session in getting an RS ready to print and be heard by a committee. **Rep. Green** said at some point the committee needs to move forward and make decisions.

**Rep. Crane** needed clarification on when documents become public and discussion was held regarding this being addressed later in the draft document. **Kolby Reddish**, LSO legal council, commented on where this is placed now and how it is relating to that stage in the process of staying in executive session.

Moving on to subsection (d), the committee discussed the 4/5 vote threshold in two instances and **Rep. Horman** said the language "in testimony" was restrictive and removal was suggested.

Adding the language to provide evidence within 72 hours after notification to give time for redactions was discussed. **Rep. Young** said the committee is not under time constraints before this time and can make redactions. **Rep. Horman** said from experience the committee needs to have attorneys do the redactions and there is a need for time to accomplish this. There was discussion regarding subsections (g) and (f) and **Mr. Reddish** said these subsections are not duplicative because the evidence may have evolved. He explained there are differences in what evidence is attached. **Rep. Crane** questioned if this was putting more of a burden on the committee with providing evidence. He continued saying this is a disciplinary issue and these examples of evidence may move into a judicial issue. **Chairman Dixon** suggested this should be more explicit and include all evidence in support of the complaint. **Rep. Young** said everything that is released to the public should be released to both parties. **Ms. Ford** suggested language changes, striking line 33 and the first part of line 34. **Chairman Dixon** said it is the intent of the committee to release the response also so both sides are treated equally. He said the committee should release the complaint, response and evidence.

Committee members discussed what documents should be released to the public. Discussion was held regarding transcripts from interviews during the committee investigation and some members would like the language to not be so explicit and just say what will be released. The committee discussed keeping the release of documents to relevant information at the discretion of the committee. **Chairman Dixon** stated all documents should be shared by both parties and questioned if lines 33 through 34 should be removed. This is in a different phase and some documents should be made public during different phases. Discussion was held regarding changing what "evidence" is public and it was mentioned there also may need to be some language in the rule or on a case by case basis for supplying documents for public records. **Mr. Reddish** said because constitutionally the legislature can create their own rules, there are rules that provide for exemptions.

**Chairman Dixon** continued review on page 4. Committee members discussed the redundancy of continually saying the respondent is allowed to obtain and review all the evidence. It was pointed out this is original language and the committee agreed they want to retain the respondent's duty to obtain and review the documents. **Rep. Horman** expressed concern with outlining the respondents portion of the hearing, without outlining the committee's portion of the hearing and during the process the structure of the hearing was negotiated. **Rep. McCrostie** said in reviewing the differences with the current rule, there is not much different and members agreed they should just move forward knowing this has been addressed.

The committee discuss using legal council to ask the questions during a public hearing, because it can be uncomfortable to question peers and committee members may not be trained to ask questions. **Rep. Gannon** agreed saying the committee should be more like a jury or judge instead of a prosecutor. He said it is different work to prepare for examination during a hearing and they could be viewed more as an advocate. The committee shouldn't be an advocate. **Ms. Ford** gave examples of a more general rewrite for using legal council. **Rep. Young** discussed equity of legal council and if the committee should pay to provide council to the respondent if the committee has legal council. **Chairman Dixon** said the current rule already provides for the ability of both parties to have legal council they only need to determine if the committee is going to pay for it. **Rep. Chew** said if a third party is involved to make sure those people are protected otherwise they won't complain and justice won't be served.

**Ms. Ford** read and reviewed other proposed language to provide for the committee to pay for council for either or both parties that had been discussed in previous meetings. The committee agreed with some of the suggested language. **Rep. Gannon** said with the issue in **Jane Doe's** case and providing testimony, to add something in the rule. **Chairman Dixon** said this would fall under the rule already and **Rep. Crane** said this would fall under the committee providing protection of the identity of a third party. **Mr. Reddish** said this is already in the rule with the subpoena power of the committee, the language would not require the committee to do this if it felt there was enough evidence already.

In discussion regarding the 4/5 vote threshold in subsection 6, **Mr. Reddish** said this points back to the Constitution. **Chairman Dixon** reviewed the portion regarding the committee report and the 30 day time line for the report. Chairman Dixon further reviewed the portion of the rule regarding the committee recommendation to the House and House actions.

**Rep. Crane** mentioned he didn't want to move forward without one member of the committee and that member should not have veto power because they are not present. Several committee members said they would like to move forward with this tonight and others mentioned they would like to see an RS before making a final decision.

**MOTION:** **Rep. McCrostie** made a motion to strike lines 23 through 25 on page 3, the underlined language. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary

AGENDA  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
Upon Recess  
Room EW41  
Wednesday, March 23, 2022

For members of the public to observe the meeting, please click on the following link:  
<https://www.idahoptv.org/shows/idahoinsession/ew41/>

---

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
---------	-------------	-----------

---

Review of House Rule 45

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Dixon  
Rep Horman  
Rep Crane  
Rep McCrostie  
Rep Gannon

Rep Barbieri  
Rep Young  
Rep Green  
Rep Chew

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Susan Werlinger  
Room: EW45  
Phone: 332-1161  
Email: [hethics@house.idaho.gov](mailto:hethics@house.idaho.gov)

MINUTES  
**HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Wednesday, March 23, 2022  
**TIME:** Upon Recess  
**PLACE:** Room EW41  
**MEMBERS:** Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew  
**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None  
**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of the session the sign-in sheet will be filed with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Dixon** called the meeting to order at 10:40 a.m.

**Chairman Dixon** reviewed the newest draft of the rule which has the strikeouts and additions to House Rule 45. The committee discussed and reviewed what had been changed. During review of the draft, **Rep. Horman** said she believed on page 5, sections 5 and 6, lines 23 and 24 are covered in page 4 lines 29 and 30 unless legal council thinks there is value in restating them, otherwise there would be no ability for the committee to govern itself. **Rep. McCrostie** said on page 5, lines 29 through 30 should be put back in. He said discussion was to not get locked in to a particular format but for the committee to have the flexibility to create its own rules, he would be in favor of restoring page 5, lines 25 through 30.

**Rep. Green** mentioned a minor edit on page 4, line 34 to change "him" to a neutral gender. **Rep. Crane** asked to add "a" in the language at the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4. **Rep. Horman** had a legal question in the same paragraph regarding redaction. Knowing other people's names may need to be redacted who were drawn in by association, she questioned if the committee would legally be able to redact those names when documents became public. **Kolby Reddish**, LSO legal council, said the Constitution gives the House the ability to create its own rules. The rule would give the committee and any future committee a lot of discretion to redact what is necessary. **Rep. Crane** mentioned on lines 2 and 4 the complainant and respondent could have unredacted copies. Mr. Reddish said unredacted copies could be provided but it would be an ethical violation to release the unredacted copies.

**Kristin Ford**, LSO drafter recapped the suggested changes made by the committee.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Gannon** made a motion to adopt draft 460 with the changes discussed incorporated therein. A roll call vote was requested. **The motion carried by a vote of 9 AYE, 0 NAY, 0 ABSENT/EXCUSED.** Voting in favor of the motion: **Reps. Horman, Crane, McCrostie, Gannon, Barbieri, Young, Green, Chew and Chairman Dixon.**

**Chairman Dixon** expressed his appreciation for the committee's work. **Rep. Crane** said he wanted it known publicly and on the record how the committee had done at least 30 hours of work in the revision of this rule whether it comes at the end or beginning of the session. He said there was a tremendous amount of work put into this piece of legislation.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

---

Representative Dixon  
Chair

---

Susan Werlinger  
Secretary