

Wed 8/1/12 - page 1 of notes

11:53ish - 12:05ish

Carolyn Kearns

Mintzer called her yesterday evening - wants to talk to me about the investigation

We agree - I need to call him → set up intro logistics so can go fdr if needed
→ tell him VL rep by GBLT request for extension

to ck ofct + back 12:20ish?
~~12:20ish~~ - 2

Disc w/ CK 12:?? - almost 2

any st # cplt vs member

→ Policy ~~III~~ IV. A. last sentence
no other ref, so, by implication,
only waived (?) to extent necessary
to conduct investigation

→ standard motion made at
beg of Ethics Comm mtg
(II on agenda) (this
motion has been used since 1986)
(sop - disapproval, most employment settings)

→ runs to ~~all~~ both parties pending
investig \in

→ to all if no violation finding

→ if violation found, runs to cplt
does not run to violator

→ if settlement, still runs to complainant
?? what about to alleged violator?

• we agree, depends on what
stage of investig # 2 (investig
vs post-finding/remedy)

(outline of how we worked through theoretical/legal
basis for confidentiality issues)

prior
DOD stmt to committee: Carolyn might be a fact witness
I am therefore going to use Att

ck + I agree - stay with this explain for now

- as intake offices

- ~~██████~~ • as person authorized to access back records, required to be kept for 7 yrs

cleaner for her to not be present (use GBL as big bad wolf)
and for minutes to reflect her absence

- no problem w/ ck wrq any new info
- problem is w/ Q's members may ask her

- ck as resource for procedure only

TMW → agenda

- don't add item for: emp/personnel issues separate from investig
- me to discuss w/ DOD raising early to get off table

8/1/12

2:15-2:20

Sheryl/Reick

see more detailed notes stapled to copy of their request letters

DOD on 8/1/12

2:25 - 2:35

- ① read him the letter + added the telcon w/ Sheryl Reich - his reaction is: that's ridiculous
- ② his inclination is to give them to the 16th to respond + schedule mtg for 16th
Give them to 9th or 10th to tell us how they're going to respond
Have me + Kevin Engel interview witnesses before 8/16, so Comm will have VL response and our investg report on 8/16 and can make decision on 8/16
- ③ brief rundown of why ~~that~~ Carolyn + I decided cleaner not to have her at mtg
His only concern is OK abt to tell Calill why prior investg's he brings up as models are distinguishable
~~Brief discuss~~
He will call Carolyn to discuss when

8/1/12

2:55 - 3:05

Kevin Mintzer

possible interviews by me + Kevin Engel of both, possibly next week (info to get; precisely who KE works for; I said, so far) as I know, Assemto minority

if to be done, we can do in his offices

He will call clients, find out if they are willing to ~~be~~ be interviewed - neither he nor they thought there would necessarily have to be interviews (tho' he realized possibility) plus letters

his concern is that they not have to do an interview and then have to testify at a hearing - I don't think that will happen, but can't guarantee, depending on response we get from alleged harasser - his position is that intro + testimony just to complain of s.H. wd be unduly burdensome.

We agree - this is all still just a possibility - I will try to get back to him by Thurs pm but certainly by Friday re whether Assembly wants to interview his clients

4-4:15

Carolyn - make sure my authority
to write letters, do investg/make decisions re who
to interview, etc
→ is to act ~~is~~ on approval on chair + ranker
(so not coming back to full comm for every detail)

2111 binds
a BL list + we
can copy, hole punch, hand
out

binders are kept by course of bkwn
meetings

my discussions w/ Mintzer

his concern
re mult interviews -
so may he shd wait til
get ~~the~~ response +
push for earlier
response