

# **Minutes**

## **Racial Profiling Prevention and Data Oversight Board Regular Meeting**

Pursuant to section EXECUTIVE BRANCH 20 ILCS 2715  
Racial Profiling Prevention and Data Oversight Act  
(625 ILCS 5/11-212)

November 20, 2025  
10:00 am- 12:00 pm

Location  
Via WebEx Video Conference/Teleconference

### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Jermaine Harris (CO-CHAIR) called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. The CO-CHAIR announced a roll call of members. A quorum for the meeting was achieved.

### **Board Members Present & Absent**

| <b>Member Names</b>                                               | <b>Present</b> | <b>Absent</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Representative Cabello                                            | x              |               |
| Bieneman, Holly (IDOT Designee)                                   | x              |               |
| Curran, John (IL State Senator)                                   |                | x             |
| Davis, William (IL House Representative)                          |                | x             |
| De Jesus, José (IL State Police Designee)                         | x              |               |
| Dominguez, Dulce (Community Org. Representing Minority Interests) | x              |               |
| Garcia, Delila (Law Enforcement)                                  |                | x             |
| Harris, Jermaine ( <b>CO-CHAIR</b> – Law Enforcement)             | x              |               |
| Logan, Phyllis (Community Org. Representing Minority Interests)   | x              |               |
| Futterman, Craig (Member of the Illinois Academic Community)      | x              |               |
| Sheehan, Patrick (IL House of Representative)                     | x              |               |
| Thompson, Amy (Community Org. Representing Minority Interests)    | x              |               |
| Jordan, Elizabeth                                                 | x              |               |

### **Also present were:**

IDOT – Jessica Keldermans  
Morreale Communications – Ashni Pabley  
Morreale Communications – Mary McIlvain

## **Call to Order and Approval of Minutes**

The August 21, 2025, board meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with a vote.

## **Discussion Items**

Craig Futterman introduced his law student, Harmela Antana, to take the group through the changes for the traffic stop form.

Harmela explains that she is a third-year law student and a member of the Civil Rights Clinic with Professor Futterman at the University of Chicago, and she is grateful for the opportunity to walk everyone through the proposed updates. She notes that, in general, the Clinic's recommendations focus on adding important data points missing from the current forms, correcting gaps identified through their work, aligning the traffic stop form with the pedestrian stop form where appropriate, and updating the form to reflect current Illinois law—particularly recent changes to cannabis laws.

She emphasizes that the overall goal is to improve accuracy and consistency in documenting traffic stops, enhance transparency for the public, and ensure officers are protected by having clear, complete records of their interactions. Harmela then walks through the form section by section, identifying changes that have already been approved and implemented, as well as new recommendations being brought forward. She explains that most suggested updates are simple but meaningful, and—aside from the proposed section on documenting use of force—do not require new legislation because they fit within the existing data-collection framework under Illinois statute.

Beginning at the top of the form, she notes that everything highlighted in red reflects proposed changes. The first approved update involves replacing the single “time” field with separate start and end times. She also highlights previously approved additions such as the address of the stop, city, state, ZIP code, and vehicle body type. Under driver race, she points out the addition of a checkbox for Middle Eastern or North African, which was previously approved to ensure more accurate data.

Harmela then explains a new recommendation under “result of stop”: adding a checkbox for “arrest.” This field already exists on the pedestrian stop form, and including it here will improve consistency and allow for better analysis of arrests arising from traffic stops, including potential racial disparities. If “arrest” is checked, officers will be able to list the charges below.

When she moves to the section on how the stop was recorded, she notes previously approved updates to identify whether body-worn or in-car cameras were used. She introduces the Clinic's new recommendation to include a required field on whether force was used. While this addition may require new legislation since current statutes do not reference use-of-force data, she explains that it is essential given the high number of traffic stops involving force—disproportionately

affecting Black and Latino motorists. Without this data, the state cannot effectively evaluate traffic-stop practices, training outcomes, or emerging trends. If force was used, officers would indicate the type from eight listed categories, including strikes, takedowns, batons, pepper spray, tasers, and firearm pointing or discharge.

Moving to the section on searches, Harmela highlights the first of two changes related to cannabis law. Officers would indicate whether probable cause justified the search, and if so, whether it stemmed from the odor of raw cannabis or another basis. She notes the critical legal distinction: under Illinois' recent Supreme Court ruling, the odor of *raw* cannabis may still establish probable cause, but the odor of *burnt* cannabis—because of legalization—does not, on its own. She adds that a small edit is needed: the form should list “odor of raw cannabis” only. Under “what was found,” the form now distinguishes illegal cannabis from other illegal drugs to reflect current law.

She also explains that firearms have been separated from other weapons to allow more precise tracking of firearm recovery during traffic stops. Because firearms currently appear only within a broad “weapons” category, the state cannot identify how often guns are recovered or evaluate racial disparities; this change addresses that gap.

Further down, in Section D, Harmela describes the recommendation to add a pat-down and frisk section. Since this already exists on the pedestrian stop form, including it here improves consistency and ensures the state can track when pat-downs occur during traffic stops, the justification for them, and any disparities. The layout mirrors the pedestrian form to align with existing officer reporting practices.

Finally, she notes that the last addition provides clearer detail on the outcome of a pat-down or frisk, allowing officers to specify exactly what, if anything, was found—such as drugs or other contraband. Harmela concludes by noting that she has covered all the proposed changes.

Futterman offers a brief clarification regarding Section E, explaining that this section concerns searches conducted *beyond* a pat-down. He notes that when an officer performs a pat-down and, based on what they see or feel, identifies something that justifies a broader search, Section E captures that follow-up search. He emphasizes that this language is directly imported from the pedestrian stop form, just as Section D was, ensuring that the same information captured for frisks and subsequent searches on the pedestrian side is mirrored in the traffic stop form for consistency.

Futterman adds that all of the recommendations reflected in the form come from the data subcommittee as a whole. As he points out, most of the updates shown are items the full board has already voted on; Harmela simply did an excellent job compiling them into a single markup so members could clearly see how the changes would function in practice. He then suggests pausing to determine whether the group would like to discuss these updates now or move forward to reviewing the proposed changes to the pedestrian stop form.

McIlvain pulls up the changes on the pedestrian stop form.

Keldermans walked the group through the changes. Keldermans begins by noting that the pedestrian stop form has been updated in parallel with the traffic stop form. She explains that where the form previously listed only the “time of stop,” it now includes both the start and end times, along with a new field for the location of the stop so officers can record the exact address. She adds that the form now captures how the stop was recorded—whether by body-worn camera, in-car camera, or both—since this information was missing from both prior forms. Keldermans also highlights the addition of a question asking whether force was used during the stop. She notes that she has already discussed this section with Craig during the previous day’s subcommittee meeting and will provide draft legislative language to the subcommittee later today so members can see how that addition might look in statute. She further explains that the newly added Middle Eastern/North African race category, as in the traffic form, would also require a legislative change.

As she continues walking through the form, Keldermans points to the pat-down section and clarifies a recent modification: one of the previously listed checkboxes—“actions indicative of engaging in violent behavior”—has been removed, reducing the total from seven to six. She then reviews the “search beyond a pat-down” section, noting that officers can now indicate whether contraband was found and specify the type if so. She adds that, based on Harmela’s earlier feedback, she will revise the distinction between firearms and other weapons and ensure that update is reflected in the next draft. Keldermans concludes by saying that these are all the current changes to the pedestrian stop form, and if anyone notices additional items that need revision, they should let her know so the forms unit can incorporate them promptly.

Thompson raises a question regarding the traffic stop form, specifically about how searches are categorized across different sections. She notes that Section B already includes fields for documenting when an officer conducts a search of the driver or a search of a passenger, and she understands that this is where such information is currently captured. Thompson then points to the newly added Section E—covering searches conducted beyond a pat-down or frisk—and asks how these two sections relate to one another.

She clarifies that she recognizes Section E is requesting different information and supports collecting it, but she wants to understand whether these are essentially the same searches being documented in two separate places. Thompson asks whether the searches referenced in Section B and Section E overlap, and if so, how officers should distinguish between them when completing the form.

Futterman explains that the purpose of the last two sections—covering pat-downs and searches beyond a pat-down—is simply to capture data that the previous traffic stop form failed to collect. He notes that the omission of pat-down documentation in the original form was likely inadvertent, especially since this information has long been captured in the pedestrian stop form.

He clarifies that the proposed updates ensure pat-downs are now recorded on the traffic stop side as well, and that when a pat-down leads to a broader search, the form includes a corresponding section to document that progression—mirroring the structure of the pedestrian stop form. Futterman emphasizes that the existing section on full searches remains separate and intact; these additions are solely to incorporate the pat-down component and track what occurs afterward, consistent with how pedestrian stops are already documented.

Thompson responds that she understands the intent behind the additions and appreciates the goal of mirroring the pedestrian stop form. She reiterates her support for the increased clarity and consistency these updates provide.

However, she raises a concern about potential duplication between the two sections and whether the overlap might confuse officers about where specific information should be recorded. Thompson suggests considering whether the sections should be merged or streamlined to avoid any ambiguity while still preserving the improvements and uniformity the changes aim to achieve.

Futterman agrees that Thompson's point makes sense and says it is worth examining further. He emphasizes that no one on the data committee intends to create confusion or add unnecessary or duplicative work; the goal is to simplify the process and stay consistent with what officers are already accustomed to.

He notes that her suggestion ties into a broader question he has been considering—whether traffic and pedestrian stop data could ultimately be combined into a single form. Because officers often scroll through similar fields, consolidating the forms might reduce redundancy, with certain sections applying only to traffic stops and others only to pedestrian stops. Futterman reiterates that the committee's priority is eliminating duplication and making the form as clear and efficient as possible.

Thompson thanks the group and raises a second question, this time focused on data collection and the backend systems that process the information. She explains that she is not an expert on the technical infrastructure and wonders whether someone on the call can clarify how the current system would handle new “check all that apply” fields.

She notes that existing downloads typically show single numerical entries—such as “1,” “2,” or “3”—in the spreadsheet. With the proposed changes, officers may select multiple items, meaning fields could reflect “1, 3, and 4,” for example. Thompson emphasizes that while she fully supports collecting more detailed information, she wants to ensure the state's data systems can properly accept and process these expanded inputs.

She then raises a related concern about adding specific offense categories to the form. She is enthusiastic about collecting these details but questions whether the current system can accurately upload and categorize them—for instance, distinguishing between a Chapter 11 vehicle code violation and a registration offense—so the data can be meaningfully analyzed at an

aggregate level. Thompson stresses that the enhancements will be valuable only if the state's infrastructure is prepared to handle the more complex data once submitted.

Futterman responds by noting that most of Thompson's questions are best directed to the IDA and backend support teams. However, he offers one clarification: the final issue she raised—regarding the system's ability to collect and categorize specific violations and charges—is already addressed on the pedestrian stop side. Since that data is currently being captured without issue, he explains, the traffic stop form would simply be requesting the same type of information. His assumption is that, because the infrastructure already supports this functionality for pedestrian stops, it should likewise be capable of handling it for traffic stops.

Keldermans explains that the department's Bureau of Information Processing—essentially their IT division—would handle any backend updates needed to support the revised forms. She adds that their internal contact there can make these adjustments without difficulty, so adding additional checkboxes or other data fields should not pose any issues for the system.

Jordan thanks the data committee for their work and then raises a clarification question about the “search conducted by” section. She asks whether, when an officer selects “probable cause,” the form will require them to choose one of the subcategories—such as “odor of raw cannabis” or “other probable cause”—before moving on, or if an officer could simply mark “probable cause” without specifying the underlying reason.

Futterman responds that the intent is for officers to provide more detail when selecting “probable cause.” He explains that the form should include a text box—just as it does in other sections and in the pedestrian stop form—so that if an officer checks “search conducted by: probable cause,” they must also specify whether it was due to the odor of raw cannabis or another basis, and then clearly describe that basis in writing. He adds that this text box already existed on prior versions of the form, and the only true addition here is the cannabis-related distinction, which aligns the form with recent changes in Illinois law.

Harris raised a couple of questions for the group, noting the need to clearly distinguish between probable cause and investigatory stops. He explained that most departments have policies governing when certain forms must be completed, which is why there tends to be more detailed documentation for street or pedestrian stops. These interactions are typically investigatory in nature or based on reasonable suspicion, whereas vehicle stops are more often tied to a specific traffic offense. As a result, they fall under different thresholds within the Fourth Amendment.

He recommended that the group take some time to explore these distinctions further—either by leveraging the expertise of the board's law enforcement professionals or by working with the available law enforcement liaisons (LELs). Harris suggested using these resources to identify whether existing departmental policies contribute to incomplete reporting, particularly in situations involving use of force. In many cases, he noted, a separate report may not be filed because the information is instead captured in an arrest report.

Harris emphasized the importance of thoroughly reviewing these issues to determine whether policy barriers have affected reporting practices in the past and how the group might help address them. His guidance was to use focus groups or targeted discussions with LELs to ensure these questions are fully examined so that the group does not encounter future challenges related to non-compliance or a lack of completed documentation.

Futterman expressed complete agreement with Harris's assessment. He noted that this presentation was only an initial introduction intended to give the full board early visibility into the proposed changes. He clarified that the next planned step aligns exactly with Harris's recommendation—engaging law enforcement partners to examine how these revisions can be implemented effectively, efficiently, and in a manner consistent with current policies.

Futterman added that many of the changes have already been discussed with a consensus forming around their value. However, he stressed that the critical question now is whether the implementation process will make practical sense for departments. He emphasized that this collaborative approach—developing the changes together rather than in isolation—is essential.

He also referenced a discussion from the previous meeting, during which it was suggested that the board adopt some changes immediately and others later. Futterman noted that law enforcement stakeholders strongly advise against such a piecemeal approach, as it would create duplicated work, redundant training, and conflicting policy adjustments. This is why, he explained, the goal is to bring the full set of proposed changes to the board at once, allowing everyone to understand the complete framework before moving forward.

Logan added that Chairman Harris had emphasized at the previous meeting that the Law Enforcement Subcommittee should meet with representatives from COPA and another personnel representative to develop a set of ideas for review. She explained that coordinating between the Data Committee and the Law Enforcement Subcommittee is essential now that the board has created a centralized body subject to public scrutiny.

Logan noted that this collaboration would help the board gain greater clarity about what occurs during specific types of stops. Logan expressed his appreciation for the law enforcement members' willingness to participate and support the process of breaking down and examining these issues in detail.

#### Law Enforcement Subcommittee

Over the past year, the subcommittee has engaged in extensive work to better understand the barriers that hinder or complicate departmental compliance. The primary focus has remained on identifying the obstacles that prevent agencies from achieving full compliance and determining how the board can support departments in moving closer to that goal statewide.

To that end, the subcommittee has prioritized direct engagement with departments. After conducting and sharing a statewide survey with the board last year, the next step is to move into

focus groups. Harris notes that the intention is to bring together large, medium, and small departments from across Illinois to hold in-depth conversations about how they collect, record, and submit their street stop, traffic stop, and investigatory stop data. The objective is to determine whether there are ways to streamline these processes and reduce friction for departments.

Currently, the subcommittee is working closely with the law enforcement liaisons to identify the departments that will participate, ensuring a representative mix across size and geography. A standardized survey instrument has been developed and will be used consistently across all focus groups.

Harris also emphasizes that, to avoid redundancy and reduce the burden on departments, other subcommittees interested in conducting their own focus groups are invited to collaborate. By coordinating efforts, the board can prevent multiple visits to the same departments and ensure a more efficient, unified approach.

Bieneman added further context regarding the role of the law enforcement liaisons (LELs). He noted that Jessica had recently shared an encouraging update indicating that there are clear paths forward for engagement. The LELs already maintain established relationships with several departments that currently receive state grants, which may provide a useful entry point for the subcommittee's focus group outreach. He also emphasized that, if the board prefers to engage departments that are not current state grantees, the LELs are equally willing to assist in facilitating those connections. Bieneman concluded by noting that progress is underway and expressing optimism about the next steps.

Harris inquired if Data Collections had more to say.

Futterman added that he wanted to emphasize one significant proposed change—one that goes beyond improving efficiency, reducing errors, or ensuring consistency. As Chairman Harris had noted, the addition of use-of-force data collection to the form represents the most consequential update under consideration. Futterman explained that this idea did not originate recently; rather, it stems from earlier recommendations made by the full board before he joined. Although it was not a unanimous recommendation at the time, there was a clear majority and a broad consensus that the board supported pursuing it.

He underscored that this particular change stands out not only for its impact but also because it would require the greatest amount of work, including legislative action.

Logan echoed the concern about the legislative process. She noted that her primary question related to whether such a change would be legally permissible and, if so, how long it would take to receive approval and incorporate the revised form into practice. She emphasized that understanding potential delays is important for establishing realistic timelines for implementing the updated form.

Dominguez didn't have anything to add.

Keldermans emphasized that, as previously noted, she is fully prepared to update the form to align with the proposed legislation regarding use-of-force reporting. However, she reiterated that a member of the board will need to formally advance that legislation through the General Assembly. She noted that while she can revise the previously drafted form changes to incorporate the updated use-of-force definition for the board's further review, the legislative component must be shepherded by a board member during the upcoming spring session.

Keldermans clarified that only after the General Assembly passes the required legislation will IDOT be authorized to add the additional race category and other related elements to the form. She stated that, assuming the legislation is approved, IDOT would then complete the necessary internal updates and distribute the revised materials to agencies with sufficient time for implementation. Under that timeline, the updated form could be fully deployed for officer use on January 1, 2027, enabling a complete calendar year of data collection under the new requirements.

Logan inquired about the legislators on the call and asked for their perspective on this issue.

Davis provided a detailed overview of the legislative process, noting that the primary consideration is the legislative calendar, which is available on the official House and Senate websites. He explained that any proposed legislation must first have its draft submitted to the Legislative Reference Bureau (LRB) for formal drafting. From there, the bill would follow standard deadlines for introduction and progression through the legislative process, with specific timing depending on whether the bill originates in the House or the Senate. He also clarified that, to her knowledge, no senators currently serve on the board.

Davis provided guidance on the legislative timeline, emphasizing the need for a bill to be processed in both chambers. He noted that if a senator is engaged in the process, they could assist in advancing the bill, while members of law enforcement on the board may also provide input. Davis stressed the importance of following the legislative process, explaining that if the bill starts in the House, someone will need to sponsor it in the Senate, and vice versa. He highlighted key deadlines, including the submission of draft language to the Legislative Reference Bureau (LRB) by mid-January—potentially January 16—to allow proper drafting, and noted that the bill could potentially be implemented by January 27, assuming it successfully navigates the legislative process.

Logan raised questions about the sequencing of the process, noting that early 2026 would be the target for proposing the changes given that the LRB needs draft language to proceed. She asked whether the forms should be submitted now with the use-of-force line item included, to confirm that it is the only outstanding concern, or if the team should wait until the legislative piece is completed before finalizing the full data form. Essentially, she sought clarification on which step should come first.

Harris clarified that the legislative process needs to come first. He emphasized that the legislature must approve the addition before it can be included in the form, indicating that moving the legislative piece forward is the immediate priority.

Thompson asked for clarification, noting that the next meeting would likely occur after the LRB introduction deadline. She wanted to confirm that, although the drafting work for the use-of-force language is ongoing, the draft would still be forwarded to Representative Davis in the interim.

Keldermans explained that her plan was to incorporate the use-of-force language into the draft. She intended to first send it to the data form subcommittee for review and then forward it to Representative Davis, if that was the preferred approach.

Davis explained that from the agency's perspective, once the draft is ready, he can submit it under his name if it's going to start in the House, since a legislator's name needs to be attached to get it into the LRB. He noted that the agency could also submit drafts directly to LRB. If his name is attached, the draft would return to him for filing, and once filed, a bill number would be assigned. From there, he would request the Speaker's review, after which the leadership team would assign it to a committee for a hearing and move it through the House process. Harris emphasized the importance of the Senate side as well, noting that even if it passes the House, a senator would need to take it through the Senate process to get it passed by both chambers and sent to the governor.

Bieneman added that IDOT has a limited capacity for legislative proposals. Since this is a recommendation of the Commission, it would be preferable for Commission members, such as Representative Davis, to carry it forward. However, IDOT is happy to provide draft language and technical assistance to support the process. She noted that the forms committee would review and approve the language before it is forwarded to the representative.

Davis noted that he is fine with that approach but wanted to clarify that, from the administration's perspective, any proposal typically needs approval from someone within the administration. He explained that agencies and commissions often have to run proposals "up the flagpole" to ensure the governor's office is ultimately supportive of what is being proposed. He acknowledged that he was unsure exactly when that step would occur in this process, if at all.

Bieneman clarified that they would be able to facilitate.

### Model Policies

Keldermans explained that she likely needs further clarification regarding subcommittee membership. She noted that two board members have expressed willingness to serve on the subcommittee. Representative Cabelo had been appointed by House Republican Leader McCombie, but she observed that Representative Sheehan, or his staff, was also listed. Her understanding was that Representative Cabelo had taken the place of Representative Sheehan,

who had agreed to serve on the Model Policies and Training Subcommittee. Keldermans indicated that she may need to contact the Leader's office to confirm whether both representatives will serve on the board or only one. Once that is clarified, she can proceed with scheduling the Model Policies and Training Subcommittee meeting.

Harris noted that this was a good segue into the next agenda item, which is the review of subcommittee assignments. He requested that someone share and display the current assignments for discussion.

Harris emphasized that, as the board prepares for 2026, it is important to solidify subcommittee participation. He reminded members that the full oversight board meets only quarterly, and much of the substantive work occurs within the subcommittees. He encouraged each member to be actively engaged in at least one subcommittee to help advance the board's work. He then suggested taking some time to review the specific responsibilities of each subcommittee for members who are not yet assigned, and asked whether anyone needed him to provide that overview.

Keldermans explained that the Law Enforcement Compliance Subcommittee focuses on agencies that are not currently compliant with the Stop Study, working to identify ways to bring those agencies into compliance. She noted that last year, the subcommittee conducted a survey to understand how different agencies handle the process of submitting data and who within each agency is responsible. Building on that work, the subcommittee is now moving toward conducting focus groups to explore how to support agencies in meeting compliance requirements.

She further explained that the Data Collection Forms Subcommittee reviews the Stop Study forms themselves. This has been particularly important because the traffic stop form was last updated in 2012, and the pedestrian stop form started updates in 2016, making it essential to bring both forms current in 2025.

Regarding the Model Policies and Training Subcommittee, Keldermans noted that it has not yet met, but there is interest from a few board members in participating. This subcommittee will research, develop, and propose model policies and training for the Racial Profiling Oversight Board related to the Stop Study. She added that the subcommittee could create its own processes, but it might also coordinate with the Law Enforcement Compliance Subcommittee to help non-compliant agencies by recommending policies or procedures to improve participation. She emphasized that while the Stop Study is statutory, some agencies face challenges such as staffing constraints that prevent them from submitting data. Keldermans concluded by inviting others to provide input if she had missed any important points.

Harris opened the floor for commentary and interest.

Will Davis requested being added to the Law Enforcement and Compliance subcommittee.

Logan raised a question regarding the Model Policies and Training Subcommittee. She suggested that the work of the Data Collection Forms Subcommittee needs to be completed first, and that compliance should be established to understand which agencies are submitting data and how. Only after that foundation is in place could the board effectively review and develop policies or research through the Model Policies Subcommittee. She proposed that, once data collection and compliance efforts are complete, members from the Data Collection Forms Subcommittee might transition to the Model Policies Subcommittee to ensure a more engaged review of the interaction between data outcomes and policy recommendations.

Harris emphasized the importance of active subcommittee participation, noting that now that members have had a chance to review the subcommittee assignments, he will continue to encourage anyone not yet engaged to join one. He highlighted how critical these subcommittees are for maintaining momentum, citing the effectiveness of working closely with staff like Amy and Holly. Harris underscored that consistent engagement in subcommittee meetings directly impacts the board's ability to advance work, particularly in preparation for legislative priorities, which is a year-long process. He reiterated that ongoing participation is essential to achieving the board's goals for 2027 and invited any additional input or ideas regarding subcommittee involvement.

#### Open Discussion

Logan asked whether this would be an appropriate time for the board to discuss leadership, specifically the selection of a chairperson, and whether Harris would be willing to lead the board.

Harris proposed to himself as being nominated as chairperson and Logan seconded this nomination.

Thompson agreed and gave her seconds.

Keldermans and Bieneman will email the governor to inform them about this recommended change in leadership.

Logan amended the motion to nominate Jermaine Harris as Chair subject to the Governor's approval.

Thompson also amends her second.

Harris called a roll call vote.

All board members approved.

Dulce put herself up for vice chair and Logan submitted her motion to Harris.

Dulce was voted in as vice chair.

Bieneman will send those recommendations to the Governor.

Harris opened the meeting up for public comment.

There was no one available for public comment.

#### New Business

Call for agenda items for the next meeting on Thursday, Feb. 19, 2026.

Representative Davis mentioned that the general assembly is in that day so it may need to be moved accordingly.

Bieneman said they would look into it.

Harris inquired about future dates.

McIlvain confirmed that all 2026 dates have sent out.

McIlvain noted that the proposed meeting dates are May 21, August 20, and November 19. She added that the session schedule will be checked against these dates to ensure there are no conflicts. She also mentioned that invitations have been sent out, and anyone who has not received theirs should contact her.

Representative Davis remarked that May 21<sup>st</sup> conflicts with General Assembly.

McIlvain and Bieneman agreed to amending the date for this meeting at some point next week.

Meeting ended.