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1:53ish - 12:05ish

Carolyn Kearns

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

We agree - I need to call him

The request for extension

Doc: e4b 12:20ish?

→ any std crlt vs member

→ Policy

IV. A. Last sentence no other ref, so, by implication, only named (i.e) to extend necessary to conduct investigation

→ Standard motion made at
  rag of Ethics Committee
  (i.e. on agenda) (This
  motion has been used since 1986)
  (sdp - dissappr, most employment setting)

→ runs to credit both parties pending
  investigation

→ in all if no violation
  finding

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

→ if settlement, still runs to complainant

?? What about the alleged violator?

• we agree, depends on what
  stage of investig vs post finding/remain

(outline of how we worked through theoretical/legal
basis for confidentiality issues)
Dod sent to committee:
Carolyn might be a fact witness. I am therefore going to use Att ck+2 agree -- stay with this explain for now

- ad intake offices
- ad person authorized to access back records, required to be kept for 7 yrs.
- cleaners for her to not be present (use Slbl ao holdup)
- for minutes to reflect her absence

- no problem wrt ck hrg any new info
- problem is w/ Qs members may ask her

- ck ao resource for procedure only

TMW -> agenda

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

8:11Z 215-2120 Sheryl Reich

see more detailed notes stapled to copy of their request letter
DOD on 8/11/12

2:25 - 2:35

1. Read him the letter + added the telecom w/ Sheri Frisch - 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 8/14, so Comm will have VL response and our investing report on 8/16 and can make decisions on 8/16.

3. Brief rundown of why Caroline + I decided cleaner, not to have her at mtg. His concern is he can’t tell Bill why prior investing he brings up as models are distinguishable.

He will call Caroline to discuss.

8/11/12 2:55 - 3:05 Kevin Mintzer

Possible interviews by me + Kevin Engel of both, possibly next week (not to get precisely what he worked on; so far)

If to be done, we can do in his offices.

He will call clients, find out if they are willing to be interviewed - neither he nor I thought there would necessarily have to be interviews (not a far right possibility) plus better.

His concern is that they not have to do an interview and then have to testify at a hearing - he don’t think that will happen, but can’t guarantee, depends on response we get from alleged harasser - his position is that intro + testimony just to complain of s.t.

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 investig/ make decisions is clear
Gis to act on approval on Claud-rander
(so not coming back to full comm for every detail)

Binders are kept by Counselor thru
meetings

my discussions w/ Mintzer

has concern re voit minutes
so maybe should wait til
get full response
push for earlier response