

CITY HALL



Guide to Executive Sessions

APRIL 2019

Last updated by LOC Attorneys February 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Disclaimer	3
Definitions	4
Location of Executive Sessions	5
Accommodations for Persons with Disabilities at Executive Sessions.....	5
Attendance at Executive Sessions by Telephone or Electronic Means.....	6
Notice Requirements for an Executive Session	6
Permitted Reasons for an Executive Session	7
News Organizations	10
Starting an Executive Session	12
Final Actions or Final Decisions Prohibited	12
Minutes.....	12
Violations and Liability.....	13
Additional Resources	14
Conclusion.....	14
Appendix A - Model Notice of Executive Session	155
Appendix B – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	166
Appendix C – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	177
Appendix D – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	188
Appendix E – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	19
Appendix F – Model Notice of Executive Session	200
Appendix G – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	21
Appendix H – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	22
Appendix I – Model Notice of Executive Session	23
Appendix J – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	24
Appendix K – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	245
Appendix L – Model Notice of Executive Session.....	246
Appendix M – Formal Attorney General Opinion No. 8291	Error! Bookmark not defined. 7
Appendix N – League’s Opinion on Media and Executive Sessions.....	48
Appendix O – Model Media Policy	511
Appendix P – Sample Script to Announce Start of Executive Session.....	566

Introduction

The policy behind the Oregon public meetings law is that government, including municipal government, requires an informed citizenry to be “aware of the deliberations and decisions of governing bodies and the information upon which such decisions were made.”¹ Within the Oregon public meetings law’s policy statement is an affirmative declaration that a governing body’s decisions should “be arrived at openly.”² Executive sessions are the antithesis of the Oregon public meetings law’s policy as an executive session is a meeting of a governing body that “is closed to certain persons for deliberation on certain matters.”³ Because holding an executive session so contravenes the overarching purpose of the Oregon public meetings law, this type of meeting may only be used in limited circumstances, and in most instances members of the media must be allowed to attend.

This “Guide to Executive Sessions” (“guide”) provides a comprehensive review of when, where, and how municipal governments may conduct executive sessions. Additionally, the guide summarizes the rights provided to news media as they relate to executive sessions, while also providing a legislative history of why news organizations are given an opportunity to attend executive sessions when the general public is prohibited. Finally, the guide contains various model forms and policies that may be useful for public officials to review in creating their own forms and policies. Any model document provided by the League is intended to be used as a starting point in an individual city’s development of their own documents. Each city is unique and any document or policy so adopted should be individually tailored to meet the city’s unique needs.

Disclaimer

This guide is not intended as a substitute for legal advice. Some of the legal issues highlighted herein are not settled law; a city should consult with its city attorney before choosing a course of action based on how much risk the city is willing to take.

¹ ORS 192.620.

² *Id.*

³ ORS 192.610(2).

Definitions

Below are definitions for several relevant and often-used terms when discussing executive sessions in Oregon. These definitions are found in state law.

Decision means any determination, action, vote or final disposition upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, ordinance, or measure on which a vote of a governing body is required, at any meeting at which a quorum is present.⁴

Executive session means any meeting or part of a meeting of a governing body which is closed to certain persons for deliberation on certain matters.⁵

Governing body means the members of any public body which consists of two or more members, with the authority to make decisions for or recommendations to a public body on policy or administration.⁶

Public body means the state, any regional council, county, city or district, or any municipal or public corporation, or any board, department, commission, council, bureau, committee, subcommittee, advisory group, or any other agency thereof.⁷

Meeting means the convening of a governing body of a public body for which a quorum is required in order to make a decision or to deliberate toward a decision on any matter. It does not include: (1) any on-site inspection of any project or program; or (2) the attendance of members of a governing body at any national, regional or state association to which the public body or the members belong.⁸

It is important to note that the Oregon public meetings law, and the executive session provisions contained therein, is applicable to all of Oregon's 241 cities. The law applies to executive sessions held by any of the following:

- City councils;
- Subcommittees of a city council if the subcommittee requires a quorum to conduct business and the subcommittee has the power to make policy or administrative decisions for the council itself or make recommendations to the council;
- City boards or commissions, provided the board or commission requires a quorum to conduct business and the board or commission has the power to make policy or administrative decisions on its own or make recommendations to the council;
- Intergovernmental agencies created pursuant to agreements adopted in accordance with ORS Chapter 190; and

⁴ ORS 192.610(1).

⁵ ORS 192.610(2).

⁶ ORS 192.610(3).

⁷ ORS 192.610(4).

⁸ ORS 192.610(5).

- Any other public body which requires a quorum to conduct business and has the authority to make policy or administrative decisions or make recommendations to a governing body with authority to make policy or administrative decisions.⁹

Location of Executive Sessions

Executive sessions are to be held within the geographic boundaries over which the public body holding the session has jurisdiction.¹⁰ These sessions should typically be held at city hall—or any location where the city council usually holds its regular public meetings.¹¹ If the executive session cannot be held within the city’s jurisdiction, it must be held at the nearest practical location.¹²

There may come a time when a city council, or one of a city’s boards or commissions, needs to hold an executive session with another governing body of a different jurisdiction. In that circumstance, the executive session is to be held within the geographic boundaries controlled by one of the public bodies participating in the session.¹³

In Oregon, public bodies are not permitted to hold an executive session in any place that discriminates against any person on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, or disability.¹⁴

Accommodations for Persons with Disabilities at Executive Sessions

Public bodies are required to hold executive sessions in locations that are accessible to persons with disabilities.¹⁵ If a hearing-impaired person will attend an executive session, the governing body holding the session is required to provide the hearing-impaired person with an interpreter if a request for such an interpreter is made at least 48 hours in advance of the session.¹⁶

Also, the U.S. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) imposes requirements on public bodies that are in addition to those required by Oregon law. For example, the ADA requires cities to ensure that their communications with persons with disabilities are as effective as communications with persons who have no disabilities.¹⁷ Persons with vision impairments may need to be accommodated if written materials are used during public meetings. Cities should be aware that they generally cannot charge a disabled person to cover the cost of providing the additional services or aides.

⁹ ORS 192.610 and 42 Op Atty Gen 187, 188 (1981).

¹⁰ ORS 192.630(4).

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ ORS 192.630(3).

¹⁵ ORS 192.630(5)(a).

¹⁶ ORS 192.630(5)(b).

¹⁷ 42 USC §12131(2); 42 USC § 12132; 28 CFR § 35.160.

Attendance at Executive Sessions by Telephone or Electronic Means

An executive session can be held via the use of a telephone or other electronic means, provided all other requirements of the Oregon public meetings law are satisfied.¹⁸ If an executive session is being conducted via telephone or other electronic means, it is imperative that the media be provided the ability to attend the meeting. For example, if an executive session is being held via telephone and an access code is required to join the teleconference, the media should be provided the access code.

Notice Requirements for an Executive Session

If the only type of meeting to be held is an executive session, the governing body holding the executive session is required to give notice of the session to the following persons or entities:

1. Each member of the governing body (no member of the governing body can be excluded from receiving notice of the executive session – even if it is known that the member is unable to attend the meeting);
2. The general public; and
3. Any news media which has requested to be notified of executive sessions. If a news organization has requested to receive notice of all public meetings of the governing body without specifically referencing a desire to be notified of executive sessions, the news organization in question should also be notified of each executive session.¹⁹

When providing notice of an executive session, the notice is required to state the specific provision of the Oregon public meetings law that authorizes the executive session.²⁰ Unless the executive session is necessary to respond to an emergency, the notice of the session must be provided with a minimum of 24 hours' notice.²¹ A “Model Notice of Executive Session” for each instance authorized by the Oregon public meetings law is included in this guide (see Appendices B through J).

Executive sessions are often held in conjunction with regular public meetings of the governing body. In these instances, the notice required for the executive session, in compliance with the requirements described above, shall be given simultaneously with the notice of the regular meeting.²² The regular meeting shall be noticed in such a way that it is “reasonably calculated to give actual notice to interested persons” of the time and place of the regular meeting.²³ Any news organization that has requested to be notified of regular meetings is required to receive notice of the regular meeting and should also be provided notice of the executive session being held in conjunction with the regular meeting.²⁴

¹⁸ ORS 192.670(1).

¹⁹ ORS 192.640(2).

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ ORS 192.640(3).

²² ORS 192.640(1).

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.*

To ensure compliance with the requirement that reasonable accommodations be provided to those with disabilities, any notice published for either an executive session or a regular session should direct those with disabilities to an appropriate city employee who can obtain interpreters and/or equipment that ensures the meeting is accessible to all.

Because of the subject matter often discussed in executive sessions, it is not uncommon for executive sessions to be part of a governing body's response to an emergency. When executive sessions are held due to an emergency, it may only be held if notice is given "as is appropriate for the circumstances," and the minutes of the emergency executive session "describe the emergency justifying less than 24 hours' notice."²⁵ It is recommended that, even in the event of an emergency executive session, all members of the governing body be notified of the session and that any news organization who has requested notice of meetings also be provided notice.

Permitted Reasons for an Executive Session

As already noted, executive sessions are only permitted for specific statutorily authorized reasons. Note, even when a topic or issue is permitted to be discussed during an executive session, a governing body may choose to discuss the issue during an open public meeting.

The Oregon Legislative Assembly has identified 16 circumstances in which an executive session is authorized. Of the 12 circumstances in which an executive session may be held, twelve are likely to be used by municipalities and are discussed herein.

1. To consider the employment of a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent.²⁶ This does not allow an executive session to be held to:

- Employ a chief executive officer, public officer, employee or staff member unless:
 - The position vacancy has first been advertised;
 - There already exists an adopted regular hiring procedure;
 - In the case of a public officer, the public has had the opportunity to comment on the employment of the officer; and
 - In the case of a chief executive officer, there already exists adopted hiring criteria and policy directives. The adopted hiring criteria and policy directives had to be discussed and adopted in a meeting open to the public and wherein the public had an opportunity to provide comments on the criteria and directives.²⁷
- Fill a vacancy in any of the following: elected office; public committee; public commissions; or advisory group;

²⁵ ORS 192.640(3).

²⁶ ORS 192.660(2)(a).

²⁷ ORS 192.660(7)(d).

- Consider general employment practices, like adopting a personnel manual²⁸; or
 - Discuss an officer's salary in connection with the hiring of that officer.²⁹
2. **To consider the dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent who does not request an open hearing.**³⁰ In order to allow the affected person time to request an open hearing, sufficient notice of the hearing date and time should be provided. Note, absent a local ordinance, personnel manual provisions, or collective bargaining agreements to the contrary, nothing requires that the affected person be allowed to attend the hearing or receive a continuance of the hearing.
 3. **To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations.**³¹ This provision allows city officials to hold an executive session to conduct deliberations with the person they have designated to act on the city's behalf during labor negotiations. Also of note, this is one of the few times news organizations and the media can be excluded from an executive session.³²
 4. **To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.**³³ This provision allows city officials to hold an executive session to conduct deliberations with the person they have designated to act on the city's behalf regarding real property transactions. A real property transaction may include the purchase of real property, the sale of real property, and/or negotiations of lease agreements. The deliberations conducted during an executive session held under this provision must concern a specific piece of property or properties—the executive session may not be used as a general discussion of a city's long-term property needs or goals.³⁴
 5. **To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection.**³⁵ In order to hold an executive session under this provision, the information and records to be reviewed must be those identified in:
 - ORS 192.368 (home address, personal telephone number or email address of certain individuals);
 - ORS 192.371 (identification card or badge of an employee that contains the employee's photograph unless the employee has provided his/her consent);

²⁸ ORS 192.660(7)(a)-(c).

²⁹ ORS 192.660(7)(c) and 42 Op Atty Gen 362 (1982).

³⁰ ORS 192.660(2)(b).

³¹ ORS 192.660(2)(d).

³² ORS 192.660(4).

³³ ORS 192.660(2)(e).

³⁴ Letter of Advice dated May 18, 1990, to Representative Carl Hosticka (Or. Op. Atty. Gen. OP-6376).

³⁵ ORS 192.660(2)(f).

- ORS 192.398 (mental or physical health records of a living person that are less than 75 years old; records sealed under a court order that are less than 75 years old; records of a person who was in state custody or under state supervision if they are less than 25 years old; or student records);
 - ORS 192.345 (Records which are conditionally exempt from disclosure. The list of such records is long and should be viewed by reading this statute in its entirety); or
 - ORS 192.355 (Additional records exempt from disclosure. The list of such records is long and should be viewed by reading this statute in its entirety).
6. **To consider preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the governing body is in competition with governing bodies in other states or nations.**³⁶ A governing body may use this provision to meet in executive session when it has good reason to believe it is in competition with other governments regarding the matters intended for discussion.³⁷
7. **To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.**³⁸ The attorney general believes that city councils “should be able to engage in a private and candid discussion with counsel about the legal issues raised by the litigation. Such discussion may include not only procedural options, but also substantive analysis of the legal merits, risks and ramifications of the litigation.”³⁹ A governing body is to exclude any member of the press if the news organization the reporter represents is a party to the litigation being discussed.⁴⁰
8. **To review and evaluate the employment-related performance of the chief executive officer of any public body, a public officer, employee, or staff member who does not request an open hearing.**⁴¹ In order to allow the affected person time to request an open hearing, sufficient notice of the hearing date and time should be provided. Note, with the exception of a local ordinance, personnel manual provisions, or a collective bargaining agreement to the contrary, nothing requires that the affected person be allowed to attend the hearing or receive a continuance of the hearing. An executive session under this provision may not be used to do the following:
- Conduct a general evaluation of a city goal, objective or operation, or any directive given by the city council to personnel considering said goal, objective or operation,⁴² or

³⁶ ORS 192.660(2)(g).

³⁷ 42 Or Op Atty Gen 392, 397 (1982).

³⁸ ORS 192.660(2)(h).

³⁹ *Attorney General’s Public Records and Meetings Manual*, Public Meetings Chapter, Page 166 (June 2019).

⁴⁰ ORS 192.660(5).

⁴¹ ORS 192.660(2)(i).

⁴² ORS 192.660(8).

- Discuss an officer’s salary in connection with his or her job performance evaluation.⁴³

9. To carry on negotiations under ORS Chapter 293 with private persons or businesses regarding proposed acquisition, exchange or liquidation of public investments.⁴⁴ While this provision allows cities to conduct negotiations during an executive session, remember that a final decision or resolution to the negotiations must occur in an open public meeting.

10. To discuss information about review or approval of programs relating to the security of any of the following:

- A nuclear-powered thermal power plant or nuclear installation;
- Transportation of radioactive material derived from or destined for a nuclear-fueled thermal power plant or nuclear installation;
- Generation, storage or conveyance of:
 - Electricity;
 - Gas in liquefied or gaseous form;
 - Hazardous substances as defined in ORS 453.005(7)(a)(b) and (d);
 - Petroleum products;
 - Sewage; or
 - Water.
- Telecommunication systems, including cellular, wireless or radio systems; or
- Data transmissions by whatever means provided.⁴⁵

Labor negotiations may occur in executive session if both parties to the negotiation agree to such an executive session. If a labor negotiation occurs in an executive session, the notification requirements of ORS 192.640 are not applicable.⁴⁶

11. To consider matters relating to the safety of the governing body and of public body staff and volunteers and the security of public body facilities and meeting spaces.⁴⁷

12. To consider matters relating to cyber security infrastructure and responses to cyber security threats.⁴⁸

⁴³ 42 Op Atty Gen 362 (1982).

⁴⁴ ORS 192.660(2)(j).

⁴⁵ ORS 192.660(2)(n).

⁴⁶ ORS 192.660(3).

⁴⁷ ORS 192.660(2)(o). HB 2806 in 2023 Oregon Legislature added this topic to qualify for executive session.

⁴⁸ ORS 192.660(2)(p). HB 2806 in 2023 Oregon Legislature added this topic to qualify for executive session.

News Organizations

Representatives of the news media must be allowed to attend all but two types of executive sessions.⁴⁹ The news media may be excluded from an executive session held to conduct deliberations with a person designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations or an executive session held by a school board to discuss certain student records.⁵⁰ Also, remember that a city council or other public body is to exclude any member of the press if the news organization the reporter represents is a party to the litigation being discussed during the executive session.⁵¹

Even though news organizations are permitted to attend virtually every executive session, governing bodies may prohibit news organizations from disclosing certain specified information.⁵² Unless a governing body specifies what information is prohibited from disclosure, news organizations are free to report on the entire executive session. An example of how to specify what information the news organization may not report is provided in the Sample Script to Announce the Start of an Executive Session located in Appendix N. *It is important to note that there is no penalty for a news organization reporting on a portion of an executive session which the city asked to be kept confidential.*

The term “representatives of the media” is not defined by the ORS or by any judicial opinion to date. However, the Oregon Attorney General’s office has issued an advisory opinion wherein it concluded that under Oregon law “news-gathering representatives of institutional media” are permitted to attend executive sessions and the term is “broad and flexible enough to encompass changing technologies for delivering the news.”⁵³ The conclusion reached by the attorney general seems to imply that bloggers and other social media news entities are authorized to attend executive sessions. In reaching this conclusion, the attorney general relied heavily on what it believes are the stated reasons the Legislative Assembly allowed the media to attend executive sessions when the law was originally adopted. A copy of the attorney general opinion is provided in Appendix K.

The League also analyzed the legislative history of the purpose behind allowing the media to attend executive sessions. The League’s analysis and conclusions differ slightly from the attorney general’s conclusions. A copy of the League’s analysis is provided in Appendix L.

Because there is no bright line determination as to why the Legislature permitted the press to attend executive sessions, the question of which entities or persons qualify as the press is also a question with no steadfast answer. A conservative reading of the law and legislative analysis leads one to conclude that any person providing the public with news, including internet bloggers, are to be permitted into executive sessions. However, a more liberal interpretation of the law may allow cities to exclude non-traditional media representatives from executive sessions, and arguably may further allow cities to limit the number of reporters in the executive session to no more than one. Taking the conservative interpretation is the safest way to ensure compliance with state law and provides the best chance at avoiding litigation. If a city wishes to follow a more liberal reading of the executive session statutes

⁴⁹ ORS 192.660(5).

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ Op Atty Gen 8291 (2016); available at <https://www.doj.state.or.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/op8291.pdf> (last viewed May 8, 2023).

that relate to news organizations, the League strongly encourages the city to undertake a meaningful and in-depth discussion with its city attorney before proceeding down such a path. A liberal reading of the statutes may result in costly litigation.

The League, following a more conservative reading of state law, has updated its model media attendance policy, which is included as Appendix M.

Starting an Executive Session

When starting an executive session, there are four things the presiding officer should keep in mind.

- First, to ensure accurate minutes, the presiding officer should specifically note that the meeting is being held in executive session.
- Second, the presiding officer should publicly announce the ORS provision that allows for the meeting to be held in executive session.
- Third, the presiding officer should announce those persons who are required to exit the meeting space.
- Fourth, the presiding officer should advise the media in attendance of what they can and cannot disclose to the public.

A model script of how a presiding officer should start an executive session is provided in Appendix N.

Final Actions or Final Decisions Prohibited

Final actions and/or final decisions cannot legally be made in an executive session.⁵⁴ This does not prohibit city councils or other public bodies from reaching a consensus in the executive session, but just ensures that the consensus is formally announced in an official fashion during a public meeting wherein the citizenry can witness the announcement. The reason a city council's decision, or other public body's decision, must be made in a public meeting is to ensure that the public is made aware of the result of the city council's deliberations and discussions.

Minutes

Even though executive sessions are held outside of the eye of the public, minutes are still required to be taken and maintained. ORS 192.650(2) requires the minutes to include, at a minimum, the following information:

1. Names of all members of the governing body present at the meeting;
2. All proposals, resolutions, orders, ordinances, measures or topics discussed;

⁵⁴ ORS 192.660(6).

3. The substance of any discussion on any matter; and
4. A reference to any document being discussed at the meeting.

Minutes of executive sessions do not have to be reduced to writing; rather, they can be kept in the form of a sound or video tape or digital recording.⁵⁵ The executive session recording does not have to be transcribed unless required by law (for example, if ordered to do so by a court).⁵⁶

The materials discussed and reviewed during an executive session do not have to be revealed or made public if doing so is “inconsistent with the purpose for which a meeting” in executive session is authorized.⁵⁷ If excluded materials from an executive session become relevant to a court case, the judge is permitted to review the materials privately to render a determination as to whether the materials must be disclosed to a particular party in the litigation or made public.⁵⁸

Oregon law requires minutes to be retained in accordance with the Secretary of State’s Retention Schedule. Pursuant to OAR 166-200-0235(5), executive session minutes are to be retained for a minimum of ten years.⁵⁹ Audio or visual recording devices made during the executive session shall be retained for a minimum of one year after the date the official minutes have been prepared and approved.⁶⁰ Any other records related to the executive session but not put forth as part of the minutes are to be retained for a minimum of five years.⁶¹

Violations and Liability

In addition to the general penalty provisions for violations of the public meetings law described in ORS 192.680, violations of the executive session provisions of the public meetings law carry their own unique penalties. A person who believes that an executive session has been held in violation of state law may file a complaint with the Oregon Government Ethics Commission (“commission”).⁶² It is the commission’s responsibility to review the allegation and investigate the complaint.⁶³

As part of its investigation into any allegation of an executive session violation, the commission may do the following: interview witnesses; review minutes; review other records; and obtain and consider any other information pertaining to the executive session in question.⁶⁴ The city is required to provide the commission the documents it needs to conduct its investigation, but the documents still retain their confidentiality.⁶⁵

⁵⁵ ORS 192.650(2).

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ *Id.*

⁵⁸ *Id.*

⁵⁹ Cities may adopt their own retention schedules which require these minutes to be retained for longer than ten years.

⁶⁰ OAR 166-200-0235(5).

⁶¹ *Id.*

⁶² ORS 192.685(1).

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ ORS 192.685(2).

⁶⁵ *Id.*

If the commission determines that a violation of the executive session statutes occurred, it may impose a civil penalty in an amount that does not exceed \$1,000.⁶⁶ The civil penalty is imposed on individual public officials (i.e., city council members) for violating any executive session provision.⁶⁷ Public officials can avoid the risk of this civil penalty by taking one simple action—getting a legal opinion from the city attorney wherein the city attorney advises that the executive session is lawfully permitted under Oregon law.⁶⁸ As long as a city attorney has advised a governing body that the executive session is legally permissible, the individual city officials cannot have a civil penalty imposed on them by the commission.

Should the commission decide not to pursue a complaint of an executive session violation at any time before a contested hearing on the matter occurs, the public official who is the subject of the complaint may be entitled to reimbursement of expenses he or she incurred in defending themselves, including attorney fees.⁶⁹ Any such reimbursement is to be deposited in a fund controlled by the governing body.⁷⁰

Additional Resources

The Oregon Attorney General’s Manual on Public Records and Public Meetings has several additional resources public officials may use when determining whether an executive session is appropriate or when holding an executive session. The manual is available on the attorney general’s website.⁷¹

Conclusion

Executive sessions are deviations from the standard rule that the public is entitled to attend public meetings and be privy to discussions held by governing bodies. Because of this deviation, the standards and procedures established by the Legislative Assembly are nuanced and require a thorough understanding by any governmental official who wishes to utilize an executive session. Considering the financial penalties that may be imposed upon public officials who violate the executive session statutes, consultation with the city attorney in advance of any executive session is strongly recommended. Executive sessions are an important tool in successfully governing communities, but the tool should be used wisely and in full compliance with all applicable laws.

⁶⁶ ORS 244.350(2)(a).

⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁸ ORS 244.350(2)(b).

⁶⁹ ORS 192.685(3).

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ Accessible at: https://www.doj.state.or.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/public_records_and_meetings_manual.pdf (last accessed February 2024)

APPENDIX A - Model Notice of Executive Session

To Consider the Employment of a Public Officer, Employee or Staff Member

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(a), to consider the employment of a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷²

⁷² It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX B – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Consider the Dismissal or Disciplining of, or to Hear Complaints or Charges Brought Against, a Public Officer, Employee, Staff Member or Individual Agent

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(b), to consider the dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷³

⁷³ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX C – Model Notice of Executive Session

*To Conduct Deliberations with Persons Designated to Carry on Labor Negotiations on
Behalf of the City*

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(d), to conduct deliberations with a person designated to carry on labor negotiations on behalf of the city.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷⁴

⁷⁴ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX D – Model Notice of Executive Session

*To Conduct Deliberations with Persons Designated by the City to Negotiate
Real Property Transactions*

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the city to negotiate real property transactions.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the Notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷⁵

⁷⁵ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX E – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Consider Information or Records that are Exempt by Law from Public Inspection

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f), to consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection, specifically:

- Records exempt under ORS 192.368;
- Records exempt under ORS 192.371;
- Records exempt under ORS 192.398;
- Records exempt under ORS 192.345; or
- Records exempt under ORS 192.355 [check the applicable box].

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷⁶

⁷⁶ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX F – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Consider Preliminary Negotiations Involving Matters of Trade or Commerce in which the City is Competing with Governing Bodies in Other States or Nations

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(g), to consider preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the city is competing with governing bodies in other states or nations.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷⁷

⁷⁷ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX G – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Consult with Legal Counsel Concerning the Legal Rights and Duties of the City with Regards to Litigation

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h), to consult with legal counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of the city with regards to litigation.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷⁸

⁷⁸ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX H – Model Notice of Executive Session

*To Review and Evaluate the Employment-Related Performance of the Chief Executive Officer,
a Public Officer, Employee or Staff member*

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(i), to review and evaluate the employment-related performance of the chief executive officer, a public officer, employee or staff member.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁷⁹

⁷⁹ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX I – Model Notice of Executive Session

*To Carry on Negotiations under ORS Chapter 293 Regarding Proposed Acquisition,
Exchange or Liquidation of Public Investments*

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(j), to carry on negotiations under ORS Chapter 293 regarding proposed acquisition, exchange or liquidation of public investments.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁸⁰

⁸⁰ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX J – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Discuss Information about Review or Approval of Programs Relating to Security

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(n), to discuss information about the review or approval of programs relating to security, specifically:

- A nuclear-powered thermal power plant or nuclear installation;
- Transportation of radioactive material derived from or destined for a nuclear-fueled thermal power plant or nuclear installation;
- Generation, storage or conveyance of: electricity, gas in liquefied or gaseous form, hazardous substances as defined in ORS 453.005(7)(a)(b) and (d), petroleum products, sewage or water;
- Telecommunication systems, including cellular, wireless or radio systems; or
- Data transmissions by whatever means provided [check the applicable box].

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁸¹

⁸¹ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX K – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Discuss Information about, Review, or Approve Programs Relating to the Safety of Governing Body and/or Public Body Staff/Volunteers and/or Security of Public Body Facilities

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(o), to consider matters relating to the safety of the governing body and of public body staff and volunteers and the security of public body facilities and meeting spaces.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁸²

⁸² It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX L – Model Notice of Executive Session

To Discuss Information about, Review, or Approve of Programs Relating to Cyber Security Infrastructure and/or Cybersecurity Threats

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council of [insert name of city], Oregon, will hold an executive session on [insert month, day and year] at [insert time of day, including a.m. or p.m.] at City Hall, [insert complete street address].

The executive session is being held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(p), to consider matters relating to cyber security infrastructure and responses to cyber security threats.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours prior to the executive session. Please contact [insert name of city employee who will handle accommodation requests] at [insert phone number of relevant city employee] to make a request for an interpreter or other accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Distributed to:

- All members of the city council;
- [Individually list all news media organizations provided a copy of the notice];
- [Individually list any other person or entity provided a copy of the notice]; and
- Posted and/or displayed publicly at [insert all applicable locations].⁸³

⁸³ It is recommended that whoever posts and/or distributes the notice keeps a record of the date and time the notice was posted and/or distributed.

APPENDIX M – Formal Attorney General Opinion No. 8291

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
ATTORNEY GENERAL



FREDERICK M. BOSS
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Justice Building
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301-4096
Telephone: (503) 378-4400

April 18, 2016

No. 8291

This opinion answers several questions asked by the Oregon Government Ethics Commission concerning the Public Meetings Law requirement that “representatives of the news media” be allowed to attend executive sessions of public meetings. We first provide a short summary of the opinion, then set out the questions and our short answers, followed by a lengthier discussion.

SUMMARY

The Oregon Public Meetings Law, ORS 192.610 to 192.690, generally requires Oregon governing bodies to allow the public to attend their meetings. ORS 192.660, the “executive session law,” sets out the exceptions. That provision allows a governing body to have a discussion in “executive session” under certain circumstances. Although the public may be excluded from executive sessions, “representatives of the news media” must be allowed to attend except in very limited cases. ORS 192.660(4). The Oregon Government Ethics Commission (commission), among its other functions, investigates complaints that public officials have violated the executive session law. ORS 192.685.

This opinion addresses several issues pertaining to the commission’s duty to investigate and enforce the requirement that representatives of the news media be allowed to attend executive sessions. It first attempts to clarify the meaning of “representatives of the news media.” We conclude that the law permits news-gathering representatives of institutional media to attend executive sessions. We determine that the term “news media” is broad and flexible enough to encompass changing technologies for delivering the news. We also clarify the meaning of several related terms as set out below in “Question 1.”

We next conclude that a governing body may not exclude a representative of the news media from an executive session except as provided in ORS 192.660(4) and (5). We then address the commission’s authority to make rules to carry out its duty to enforce the executive session law. Since the commission first inquired, the Legislative Assembly has clarified in



ORS 244.290 that the commission may adopt rules to carry out its duty to enforce the executive session law. The legislature established one exception, however: The commission is prohibited from adopting a rule that establishes which entities are considered representatives of the news media. ORS 192.660(10).

We next explain that a governing body may not lawfully enforce a policy that permits it to exclude from executive session a representative of the news media who would be permitted to attend under ORS 192.660(4) and (5). Finally, we conclude that in evaluating allegations that an individual was wrongly excluded from executive session, the commission must assess compliance with the statute regardless of a governing body's policies.

QUESTIONS AND SHORT ANSWERS

QUESTION 1

What is the meaning of the following terms as used in ORS 192.660(4), ORS 192.660(5), and the ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS MANUAL (2014)(Manual):

1. "Representatives of the news media" [ORS 192.660(4)];
2. "Employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization" [ORS 192.660(5)];
3. "Member of the news media" [ORS 192.660(5)];
4. "Institutionalized news media" [MANUAL p 172]; and,
5. "Bloggers and others using these technologies" [MANUAL p 172]?

SHORT ANSWER

1. For purposes of ORS 192.660(4), "representatives of the news media" means individuals who gather news and who have a formal affiliation, whether through employment, by contract or some other agency authorization from or with an institutional news media entity, including both general interest media and media that cover specific subject areas for special audiences.

2. For purposes of ORS 192.660(5):

(a) "employee of a news media organization" means a person who is paid wages or a salary by a news media organization;

(b) "contractor of a news media organization" means a person who contracts to perform work for a news media organization; and,

(c) "agent of a news media organization" means a person who is authorized to act for or in the place of a news media organization.

3. "Member of the news media" as used in ORS 192.660(5) is effectively synonymous with a representative of the news media.

4. "Institutionalized news media" means an entity that is formally organized for the purpose of gathering and disseminating news.

5. "These technologies" as used in the phrase "bloggers and others using these technologies" in the Manual refers to more recent news mediums, including the internet, that are used to disseminate news in addition to traditional print, radio and television. "Bloggers" refers to individuals who use online technology to disseminate the news. A "blog" in the sense of a regular feature appearing as part of an online publication may qualify as a "news medium," depending on the particular facts.

QUESTION 2

Are there any permissible grounds to exclude representatives of the news media from attendance at executive sessions other than those identified in ORS 192.660(4) and (5)?

SHORT ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 3

May the commission adopt administrative rules to carry out the duties imposed on it by ORS 192.685?

SHORT ANSWER

Yes. As amended in 2015, ORS 244.290(2) gives the commission explicit authority to adopt rules necessary to carry out its duties under ORS 192.660 and 192.685. However, ORS 192.660(10) prohibits the commission from adopting a rule to establish which entities are representatives of the news media for purposes of ORS 192.660(4). ORS 244.290(2)(h) also requires the commission to adopt a rule specifying the criteria it will use to impose civil penalties for violations of ORS 192.660.

QUESTION 4

When evaluating alleged violations of ORS 192.660(4), what is the significance of policies adopted by governing bodies to implement the statutes? Specifically, what would be the legal significance of a policy to exclude a person who:

1. Does not meet adopted screening criteria to determine who qualifies as a "representative of the news media";
2. Does not gain preapproval of media credentials in advance of executive sessions;
3. Fails to give advance notice of attendance; or,

4. Is believed to have unlawfully reported on a prior executive session or to represent a news media organization that did?

SHORT ANSWER

Public bodies are required to comply with the statute. They cannot modify the statutory requirement by adopting a policy. In evaluating allegations that an individual was wrongly excluded from executive session, the commission must assess compliance with the statute regardless of a governing body's policies.

With respect to the specific types of policies the commission asks about (numbered 1 through 4 above) we answer as follows:

1. If enforcement of the policy definition results in the exclusion of a representative of the news media, that exclusion would violate ORS 192.660(4).

2. To the extent that a credentialing requirement simply requires an individual to demonstrate that he or she is a representative of the news media, its enforcement would be consistent with the law. But if a policy requires specific credentials, and an individual offering different credentials that are sufficient to demonstrate that he or she is a representative of the news media is excluded based on that policy, that exclusion would not be consistent with ORS 192.660(4).

3. Advance notice of attendance is not required by the Oregon Public Meetings Law. Excluding a representative of the news media for failure to comply with a policy requiring advance notice of attendance would violate ORS 192.660(4).

4. The Oregon Public Meetings Law does not authorize any mechanism for enforcing the requirement that representatives of the news media refrain from reporting designated information discussed in executive session. Enforcement of a policy excluding representatives of the news media on this basis would violate ORS 192.660(4).

DISCUSSION

I. Statutory background

A. ORS 192.660 – Executive session law

ORS 192.630(1) requires governing bodies to allow the public to attend their meetings “except as otherwise provided by ORS 192.610 to 192.690.” ORS 192.660(2) lists eighteen subjects that governing bodies may discuss privately in “executive session.” For example, when a governing body consults with its attorney about pending litigation, it may do so privately.

Although the public may be excluded from executive sessions, “representatives of the news media” usually must be allowed to attend. ORS 192.660(4). However, governing bodies may exclude even the news media when deliberating with their labor negotiators, considering the expulsion of minor students, or examining students’ confidential medical records. *Id.* And governing bodies meeting with their counsel about pending or likely litigation must exclude a “member of the news media” who is a party to the litigation or an “employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization that is a party to the litigation.” ORS 192.660(5). When representatives of the news media attend executive sessions, the governing body “may require that specified information be undisclosed.” ORS 192.660(4).

C. ORS 192.685 – Commission’s authority to enforce executive session law

ORS 192.685(1) permits persons to complain to the commission that a public official violated the executive session law. When the commission receives a complaint, it reviews and investigates it “as provided by ORS 244.260” and may impose civil penalties “as provided by ORS 244.350.” ORS 192.685(1).

D. ORS 244.260 – Procedure for addressing alleged violations

ORS chapter 244 sets out ethics laws for Oregon public officials and charges the commission with enforcing those laws. ORS 244.260 establishes the complaint, investigation and adjudicatory process for violations of ORS chapter 244. ORS 192.685 requires the commission to use the process specified in ORS 244.260 to respond to complaints of executive session law violations.

E. ORS 244.350 – Civil penalties

ORS 244.350(2)(a) authorizes the commission to impose civil penalties of up to \$1000 for a violation of any provision of ORS 192.660, except as provided in subsection 2(b). Subsection 2(b) prohibits the commission from imposing a civil penalty “if the violation occurred as a result of the governing body of the public body acting upon the advice of the public body’s counsel.”

II. Question 1 - Meaning of terms concerning news media

We first address the meaning of “representatives of the news media” for purposes of ORS 192.660(4). We then clarify the meaning of terms used in Attorney General Opinions that attempted to clarify the meaning of “representatives of the news media,” specifically “institutionalized” news media and “bloggers and others using these technologies.” Last, we discuss the meaning of “member” of the news media and “employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization” as used in ORS 192.660(5).

A. “Representatives of the news media”

The fundamental issue underlying the commission’s questions is the difficulty of interpreting and applying the provisions of the Public Meetings Law permitting “representatives of

the news media” to attend executive sessions of public meetings. Understanding the scope of this statutory phrase will illuminate many of the related questions posed by the commission. The Public Meetings Law itself does not define “representatives of the news media” for purposes of ORS 192.660(4) and Oregon appellate courts have not interpreted the phrase. This office has interpreted the phrase in several Attorney General Opinions, including the Manual. We start by summarizing those opinions.

1. Attorney General Opinions

a. 1976 Opinion

ORS 192.660(4) was enacted as part of the original Public Meetings Law in 1973. Or Laws 1973, ch 172, § 6. In 1976 we were asked to specify the criteria that a public body should use to determine whether a person qualifies as a “representative of the news media.” We were also asked whether high school newspapers qualified as “news media.” Letter of Advice dated May 31, 1978, to Representative Dave Frohnmayer. We opined that by using the word “representatives,” the legislature intended the requirement to be limited to “institutionalized” news media. We did not expound on our thinking or explain what we meant by “institutionalized.” We also concluded that “news media” encompassed only media that have a natural interest in the subject matter of the executive session, because only they would use information gained in executive sessions for future reporting. We further opined, based on federal law from another context, that the size of the medium’s audience is not a proper criterion. Finally, we advised that determining who is a representative of the news media is a question of fact to be made in accordance with those criteria. Applying those criteria, we concluded that a reporter for a high school newspaper was a representative of the news media. *Id.* at 2.

b. 1979 Opinion

In 1979 we were asked essentially the same question – whether a high school newspaper reporter qualified as a representative of the news media for purposes of an executive session held by a school board. 39 Op Atty Gen 600 (1979). We observed that the purpose for allowing news media representatives to attend executive session was twofold: (1) to permit them to get background information to understand and report about the ultimate decision; and, (2) to serve as watchdogs to help ensure that governing bodies use executive sessions for legitimate purposes. *Id.* at 600-01. We concluded that the first purpose:

is fulfilled by attendance of *news-gathering* representatives (i.e. reporters) of those news-disseminating media which ordinarily report activities of the body. Thus the advertising manager of a newspaper is *not* a representative of the newspaper for purposes of this statute, and a periodical containing only hunting and fishing news and related material is not a news medium for purposes of the statute.

Id. at 603 (emphasis in original).

We concluded that a “bona fide representative of a school newspaper” is a representative of the news media if “the newspaper ordinarily covers news germane to the subject of the executive session.” *Id.* We further concluded that, if the board had prohibited the paper from covering the matters discussed in executive session (such as faculty discipline), the paper would not qualify as a news medium for purposes of ORS 192.660(4), because it would not cover news germane to the subject of the executive session. In other words, it was not enough that the paper ordinarily reported about activities of the school board, it qualified as a news medium for purposes of ORS 192.660(4) only if it also covered the matters to be discussed in the executive session.

c. 2014 Manual

In Attorney General Manuals issued after those opinions, including the 2014 update, we clarified that:

[Representatives of the news media] include[s] *news-gathering* representatives of institutionalized news media that ordinarily report activities of the body. This interpretation should be expanded to include representatives of media that ordinarily report to the general public on matters of the nature under consideration by the body.

MANUAL at 172 (2014) (footnote omitted) (emphasis in original). Under that test, a person could qualify as a representative of the news media *either* because the news medium that they represent ordinarily reports activities of the governing body *or* because the medium ordinarily reports to the general public on the matters being considered by the governing body.

In addition, the Manual observes that “[c]urrent technologies make it easy to disseminate information to a potentially broad audience. Bloggers and others using these technologies sometimes * * * assert[] that they are representatives of the news media.” *Id.* We opined that “representatives of the news media” is not limited to “traditional print media[.]” *Id.* We advised that, because “[t]he law does not establish bright lines regarding publication schedule, the size of the media organization, or audience size” and “no clear definition of ‘news media’ exists” the decision whether representatives of non-traditional news media qualify “must be made on a case-by-case basis.” *Id.* We advised governing bodies to consult with counsel when faced with such a request. *Id.*

2. Reconsidering the meaning of “representatives of the news media”

a. Methodology for interpreting statutory text

The commission asks us to clarify the meanings of “representatives of the news media,” “institutionalized” and “bloggers and others using these technologies.” It also asks whether a governing body may exclude a person claiming to be a representative of the news media because the person is not a “news-gathering” representative, or because the medium they represent does not ordinarily report about the activities of the governing body or matters under consideration by the body.

Our 1976 and 1979 opinions predate the Oregon Supreme Court's adoption of the current statutory interpretation methodology in *PGE v. Bureau of Labor and Industries*, 317 Or 606, 610, 859 P2d 1143 (1993) as modified in *State v. Gaines*, 346 Or 160, 171, 206 P3d 1042 (2009). These questions prompt us to revisit the meaning of "representatives of the news media" applying that methodology.

Under that methodology, the goal is to determine the legislature's intent. We do so by examining the text, context and pertinent legislative history. *State v. Gaines*, 346 Or at 171-172. If the meaning of the text remains ambiguous after examining the text, context and pertinent history, we may apply maxims of statutory interpretation. *Id.* at 172.

b. Text

Courts usually give commonly-used terms their ordinary meanings. *See, e.g., State v. Briney*, 345 Or 505, 511, 200 P3d 550 (2008) (stating rule). The phrase "representatives of the news media" has no commonly-accepted plain meaning. *See* MANUAL (1973) at 5, n 3 ("there is no common definition of 'representatives of the news media.'"), MANUAL (2014) at 172 ("no clear definition of 'news media' exists.").

Alternatively, courts will apply the well-established legal meaning of a phrase. *See, e.g., Nibler v. ODOT*, 338 Or 19, 22, 105 P3d 360 (2005) (applying well-established legal meaning of a term gleaned from the case law). But "representatives of the news media" does not have a well-established legal meaning either. To the contrary, many courts have pointed out that determining who is a representative of the media is notoriously difficult. *See, e.g., Snyder v. Phelps*, 580 F3d 206, 219 n 13, (4th Cir 2009), *aff'd* 131 S Ct 1207 (2011) ("Any effort to justify a media/nonmedia distinction rests on unstable ground given the difficulty of defining with precision who belongs to the 'media.'"); *Flamm v. Am. Ass'n of Univ. Women*, 201 F3d 144, 149 (2d Cir 2000) ("a distinction drawn according to whether the defendant is a member of the media or not is untenable.").

Because the phrase has no clear ordinary meaning or well-established legal meaning, we attempt to determine its meaning by first parsing its constituent words. There are two pertinent ordinary meanings of the noun "representatives." The first is "one that stands for a number or class (as of persons or things) : one that in some way corresponds to, replaces, or is equivalent to someone or something else[.]" WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INT'L DICTIONARY at 1926-27 (2002).¹⁷ The second is "one that *represents* another or others in a special capacity: such as * * * * *b* (1) : one that represents another as agent, deputy, substitute, or delegate usually being invested with the authority of the principal[.]" *Id.* It is not clear from the text alone, whether the legislature intended "representative" in the first or second sense.

Turning to "news media," the plain meanings of "news" are "a report of a recent event: new information: fresh tidings[.]" "what is reported in a newspaper, news periodical, or news broadcast[.]" and "matter that is interesting to newspaper readers or news broadcast audiences : matter that is suitable for news copy." *Id.* at 1524. "Media" is the plural of "medium" the pertinent definition of which is "a channel, method, or system of communication [or]

information * * * <a book needs the widest possible discussion in the reviewing *media* of the country – whether magazine, newspaper, radio, television, or public platform[>.]” *Id.* at 1401, 1403, respectively. Putting the terms together, “news media” means channels, methods, or systems of communicating recent events or new information of interest to the recipients. Daily or weekly newspapers or broadcasts, for instance, would qualify as they report “recent events” and “new information” that is newsworthy.

Questions left unanswered by examination of the text alone are: (1) whether a person must demonstrate a special relation to a particular news medium to qualify as a “representative”; (2) if so, what that relationship must be; (3) whether and what “public platforms” qualify as “news media” and, (4) how often a medium must publish or broadcast for what it reports to be considered “recent events” or “new information?”

c. Context

Turning to the context, the phrase is used in ORS 192.660, the executive session law. The purpose of that law is to permit governing bodies to discuss certain matters outside of public view. It reflects the legislature’s judgment that the public is better served by confidentiality than transparency in those circumstances. Consistent with that judgment, ORS 192.660(4) permits governing bodies to require news media who attend executive sessions not to disclose sensitive information to the public. At the same time, the function of the news media is to disseminate news to the public. ORS 192.660(4) permits media representatives to attend executive sessions and report non-confidential information to the public while keeping sensitive information confidential. This statutory context does not shed much light on who the legislature intended “representatives of the news media” to include.²⁷ On the other hand, the history of media technology advances prior to 1973 provide compelling contextual reasons to think that the legislature would have anticipated that new mediums for disseminating news could emerge. There is nothing to suggest that the legislature intended to preclude individuals working in as-yet undeveloped mediums from qualifying as representatives of the media for purposes of executive session attendance.

d. Legislative history

ORS 192.660(4) was a provision of the original Public Meetings Law, which was enacted in 1973 as Senate Bill 15 (1973). Or Laws 1973, ch 172, § 6. As introduced, Senate Bill 15 did not require governing bodies to allow news media to attend executive sessions. The first suggestion that it should permit such attendance arose in a public hearing before the Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility. Co-chair Ingalls mentioned that “newspapers” had been attending school board meetings and labor negotiations and asked if the bill would close those meetings. He also asked whether school boards or teachers could vote to close those meetings to “the press.” Charles Habernigg, representing Common Cause, responded that although the public would not have a right to attend labor negotiations, if a “member of the press” had a previous understanding, it should continue. Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), February 26, 1973 at 6. Myer Avedovech, Attorney for the City of Milwaukie, testified that the city council often held “pre-meetings” before its public

meetings. Representative Paulus asked if “the press” was invited to those meetings. He replied that they were invited but most chose not to attend; usually one reporter came. *Id.* at 9.

In a March 5th meeting of the committee, two other witnesses testified about instances where “the press” had been allowed to attend private meetings. A Woodburn Common Council member, Harold Reaume, testified that the city regularly held non-public pre-meetings that “the press” was welcome to attend. He opined that when the press did not attend “undesirable things” happened. He said that pre-meetings were used to obtain agreement before the public meeting and that statements made in the pre-meeting were not repeated in the public meeting, hence citizens had no way of knowing their public officials’ opinions on the issues. Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), March 5, 1973 at 2.

Bill Keller, an education reporter for *The Oregonian*, testified about an instance where “the press” had been allowed to attend a closed school board meeting but had been asked not to disclose any information except the board’s general direction. He testified that although there were times that school board business should be conducted privately, the privilege could be abused. He suggested that when a school board met privately, the press should be allowed to attend “as observers.” In response to a question from Co-chair Ingalls, he testified that he felt no obligation to obey a prohibition on reporting certain information and would report matters he felt vital to the public unless given good reason not to. *Id.* at 3-4.

Representatives from several local newspapers and from the Oregon Newspapers Publishers Association (ONPA) testified at a hearing on March 12th. Wally Cowen, a local newspaper publisher and representative of the ONPA, testified that “the press” and the public were the same thing and that the press was a vehicle for information to the public. He felt that Senate Bill 15 did not afford any privilege to the press, but assured the public access, through the media, to the workings of the bureaucracy. Cowen testified that the ONPA’s position was that all meetings should be open to the public. Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), March 12, 1973 at 1-2. Senator Fadeley asked whether he would support executive sessions if the press was allowed to attend but the public was not. Cowen answered that if the press were entitled to attend, then everyone should be invited. *Id.* at 2.

Phil Bladine, also a newspaper publisher and representative of the ONPA, testified against allowing any executive sessions except in personnel cases where he suggested that the press should be allowed to attend but “use good judgment in relating things to the public.” He stressed that it was a “newspaperman’s responsibility” to see that the public get to meetings. He said that in sensitive areas concerning individuals the press “has a confidence with that individual and it is seldom broken.” Chair Ripper asked about the problem of an “unfriendly press” and what should be done when it distorted facts. Bladine responded that everyone should not be penalized for the actions of a few. *Id.* at 3. Hal Schlitz, a publisher of a local paper, testified that relations between the paper and the public bodies had been very good. *Id.* at 4.

Following that testimony, the bill was amended to permit – but not require – representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions. It specified that they could attend under such conditions governing the disclosure of information “as may now exist” and may be

agreed to by the governing body and the representatives of the news media. Amendments to Second Amended Draft SB 15, § 6(3) (1973). The committee considered those amendments at a March 19th work session. An unidentified legislator suggested that the section be deleted. Senator Heard responded that the section was in the bill because of the testimony heard by the committee that some members of the press had good relations with governing bodies and that if the section was not included, this relationship would change. Co-chair Ingalls said that without the section the press could be excluded from meetings where they were presently included. Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), March 19, 1973 at 10. Senator Fadeley suggested making the requirement mandatory rather than permissive. Co-chair Ingalls suggested deleting the “as may now exist” language. Both suggestions were adopted. *Id.*

At an April 7th meeting, Senator Carson moved to delete the requirement, which he considered potentially “dangerous.” Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), April 7, 1973 at 7. He stated that the press in Lane County had an excellent working relationship with governing bodies that should not be disturbed by permitting the press to be the only “public” invited to watch the governing body. He argued that if the meeting concerned something the public should know, the public should be allowed to attend and a requirement that allowed only “the press” to watch the governing body might endanger good relations with governing bodies, because who, he asked, would watch the press? He also observed that allowing the press to attend and to operate under a shield law would put them in a very interesting position. *Id.*

Co-chair Ingalls replied that the press was allowed to attend executive sessions not to report the meeting but to use the results of the meeting as background information for future reporting. *Id.* He asked Roger Williams, a representative of the ONPA, for his thoughts. Williams testified that “the press” did not want the privilege of attendance; it wanted to be the vehicle for reporting. *Id.* at 7-8. Senator Carson’s motion to delete the requirement failed. *Id.* at 8.

Subsequent discussions and proposed amendments concerned whether the requirement should be mandatory or permissive and whether the governing body and representative were required to agree to nondisclosure. For example, on May 15, 1973, Senator Carson expressed concern that the bill mandated that parties agree to what could not be disclosed and the effect would be to have “the news media (rather than the legislature) determining what is or is not an executive session.” He recommended remedying that by making both press attendance and nondisclosure agreements discretionary. Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), May 15, 1973 at 1.

Senator Heard agreed and said that he felt the Senate members on the floor would feel the same way. *Id.* Co-chair Ingalls said that the “question was a matter of honor” and “the news media would not print information until they received background information.” *Id.* Senator Heard suggested that the news media be excused from the meeting if agreement could not be reached about what could be reported. Senator Carson agreed. Co-chair Ingalls felt that the bill already stated that. *Id.* The committee ultimately decided to amend the bill to provide that

representatives of the news media “shall” be allowed to attend “under such conditions governing the disclosure of information as may be agreed to by the governing body and the representatives of the news media prior to such executive session.” Or Laws 1973, ch 172, § 6(4).

In sum, legislators and lay witnesses alike referred to “the press” when discussing the requirement to permit “representatives of the news media” to attend executive session. They appeared to consider “representatives of the news media” to be synonymous with “the press.” Pertinent definitions of the “press” are “newspapers, periodicals, and often radio and television news broadcasting regarded as a group * * * news reporters, publishers, and broadcasters as a group.” WEBSTER’S at 1794. Those definitions are consistent with “representatives of the news media” in the sense of representatives of newspapers, news periodicals and radio and television news broadcasts. Additionally, representatives of state and local newspapers, newspaper publishing associations and broadcasting associations were the ones who testified at the Public Meetings Law hearings generally and specifically about having been invited to attend closed meetings in the past.

The history also reveals that the purposes of the requirement were to: (1) require governing bodies to continue to allow news-gathering representatives who had been invited to closed meetings before enactment of the Public Meetings Law to attend executive sessions after enactment of the Public Meetings Law; (2) to foster good relations with news media organizations; (3) to provide a mechanism to ensure that governing bodies limited executive sessions to permissible purposes; and, (4) to permit the media to gain valuable background information for future reporting. At the same time, the legislature was concerned about the press not disclosing confidential information.

It is evident from the history that the legislature had in mind the news-gathering representatives of state and local newspapers who had been invited to attend closed meetings before enactment of the Public Meetings Law. Permitting their attendance served all of the purposes identified for the requirement. That limited and known group of trained professional journalists also would have been accountable for disclosing conflicts, reporting fairly, and protecting legitimately confidential information.

On the other hand, the legislature used broad and ambiguous language in enacting the requirement that potentially includes many other types of media representatives. The history contains no discussion about whether other types of media representatives should be allowed to attend executive sessions. And the 1973 Legislative Assembly could not have foreseen subsequent technological changes that would enable the rise of a large class of “citizen journalists.”

3. Application of Interpretative Methodology to the Commission’s Questions

Having set out the framework for interpreting these provisions, and having identified the relevant text, context and legislative history, we now apply those tools to the commission’s various questions about the phrase “representatives of the news media.”

a. “Representatives” means news gatherers

We conclude that “representatives” in the phrase “representatives of the news media” is intended to encompass “news-gathering representatives.” This determination is based on the legislative history, which strongly suggests that news gatherers were the people the legislature had in mind. The history establishes that news-gathering representatives would have been the ones invited to closed meetings before enactment of the Public Meetings Law, which is the practice that the legislature sought to codify. They are also the ones who would report non-confidential information and gather information for future reporting.

b. “News media” means “institutionalized” news media

We next address whether the requirement is limited to “institutionalized media” as our earlier opinions conclude, and, if so, what that means. “Institutional media” is a phrase often employed by the federal courts as a synonym for “the media” or “the press.” *See e.g., Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 US 652, 668, 110 S Ct 1391, 108 L Ed 2d 652 (1990) (stating that the “media” exception is meant to prevent hindrance to the “institutional press.”); *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Building Inc.*, 472 US 749, 784, 105 S Ct 2939, 86 L Ed2d 593 (1985) (distinguishing between “institutional media” and “other individuals or organizations engaged in the same activities”). “Institutional media” appears to be used as a term to distinguish between “media” and individual speakers engaged in speech. *Id.* at 784 & n 10 (noting the distinction between “institutional media” and other individual speakers and organizations as the distinction between “media” and “nonmedia.”); *see also* 39 Op Atty Gen at 601 (concluding that “news media” means “institutionalized news media” because it applies to “representatives.”).

As discussed, a “representative” represents others or another, rather than appearing personally. The statute’s use of the term “representatives” is consistent with our longstanding interpretation that “news media” means institutional news media. An “institution” is commonly understood to mean an established society, corporation or organization. Hence, “institutional” news media” means an established news media organization.

Federal courts have not attempted to define “institutional media” with any precision. Instead, they consistently have concluded that it is not possible, for purposes of First Amendment analysis, to distinguish between the “institutional media” and other speakers. An Oregon Federal District Court, for instance, stated that:

The protections of the First Amendment do not turn on whether the defendant was a trained journalist, formally affiliated with traditional news entities, engaged in conflict-of-interest disclosure, went beyond just assembling others writings, or tried to get both sides of a story.

Obsidian Finance Group v. Cox. No. 12-35319 at 7 (January 17, 2014).

But ORS 192.660(4) is not intended to ensure a First Amendment right. The United States Supreme Court has opined that the press has no constitutional right to access information not available to the public or to attend executive sessions. See *Branzburg v. Hayes*, 408 US 665, 684-85, 92 S Ct 2646, 33 L Ed 2d 626 (1972) (observing that the First Amendment does not guarantee the press a constitutional right of special access to information not available to the public generally and that the press is regularly excluded from executive sessions); see also, *Trimble v. Johnson*, 173 F Supp 651 (D DC 1959) (press has no constitutional right to attend meetings closed to the public). In fact, we are not aware of *any* other jurisdiction that permits representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions.

In this context, the legislature appears to have intended to distinguish between individuals and media entities and to permit only the latter to attend executive sessions. Without that distinction executive sessions essentially would be open to the public. Accordingly, we conclude that “representatives of the news media” for purposes of ORS 192.660(4) includes news-gathering representatives who have a formal affiliation with an institutional news medium. A news media entity is institutional if it is formally organized for the purpose of gathering and disseminating news. As discussed below, however, the proliferation of technologies for disseminating information can make it difficult to identify which entities are institutional news media.

c. Specialty publications and broadcasts may qualify to attend

We conclude that media that cover specific subject areas for a special audience rather than a general audience also may qualify as news media if they regularly publish or broadcast the news. In previous guidance we have suggested that representatives of such media entities could only attend executive sessions if the entities ordinarily report on the activities of the governing body. Occasionally, we have also suggested that the specialty media must also ordinarily cover matters that are the subject of a particular executive session. Under that approach, a representative of a periodical containing only hunting and fishing news could attend the executive sessions of the Fish and Wildlife Commission but not of the Board of Chiropractic Examiners.

We see nothing in the text of the statute that requires or even suggests this result. Nor does the legislative history provide any reason to think that the legislature intended a rule under which news-gatherers would be admitted to some executive sessions but not to others. The text unambiguously permits representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions. Presumably the legislature intended that those representatives would select for themselves which executive sessions they were professionally interested in attending. Although that rule might marginally increase the likelihood of individuals attending executive sessions for reasons other than the reasons the legislature had in mind, we do not see any reason to expect that representatives of specialty media would be more likely to do so than representatives of general news media. We consequently conclude that news gathering representatives of specialty media entities are permitted to attend executive sessions, whether or not the public body generally exercises authority relevant to their specialty area.

d. Use of technology to distribute news

We next address whether the requirement applies to mediums of communication like the internet. We suggest in the Manual that the requirement might apply, depending on the particular facts to “bloggers and others using these technologies.” MANUAL at 172. When the 1973 Legislative Assembly enacted the language in ORS 192.660(4) technologies like the internet, cable and satellite broadcasting either did not exist or were not commonly used to disseminate news.

But there is no indication that the 1973 Legislative Assembly intended to foreclose mediums that did not yet exist from qualifying as “news media.” On the contrary, the Oregon Supreme Court has declared that there is a “familiar legislative penchant for using general terms like a bucket, allowing various concepts to fall in (or out) with the passage of time. * * * * * [T]he legislature need not constantly update each new addition to * * * [a] class—[if] the general terms are broad and flexible enough to adjust to changing circumstances.” *Cook v. Workers’ Comp. Dept.*, 306 Or 134, 142, 758 P2d 854 (1988).

In this particular context, that “familiar legislative penchant” is consistent with the reality that legislators in 1973 probably did not regard “news media” as a fixed concept. Television news, for example, had started to become prominent only in the late 1940s – meaning that it was approximately 25 years old when the Public Meetings Law was adopted. The use of the medium for news distribution purposes had continued in the intervening years. Smith ed., *Television: An International History* (Oxford University Press 1995), 122-133 (tracing the development of television news from the late 1940s through the 1970s). Indeed, *local* television news came to prominence in the United States “[s]ometime around 1970[.]” *Id.* at 131. That shift presumably would have been familiar to legislators in 1973. And, given that the reporters most likely to attend executive sessions would be local reporters, the development would presumably have informed legislators’ understanding about the nature of the “news media” in this context. Radio news, meanwhile, was approximately fifty years old, having developed since the 1920s and 1930s. Gorman and MacLean, *Media and Society in the Twentieth Century* (Blackwell 2003) at 57-58 (explaining the development of radio as a news medium starting in these decades). Both of these innovations represented significant advancement from the distribution of printed news following the introduction of the mobile printing press to Europe in the fifteenth century. There is nothing in the text, context or legislative history of the Public Meetings Law that suggests that, notwithstanding this history of innovation and change, legislators intended to adopt a definition of “news media” that would tie that concept to specific formats prevalent in 1973. We conclude that the term “news media” is broad and flexible enough to encompass subsequent technologies for delivering the news.

As a result, whether an online publication or broadcast qualifies depends on the same criterion for existing mediums: the entity must be institutional. “Blogs,” for example, come in two general varieties. The first is “an online personal journal with reflections, comments and often hyperlinks, videos, and photos provided by the writer.” www.merriam-webster.com/.^{3/} The second is “a regular feature appearing as part of an online publication that typically relates to a particular topic and consists of articles and personal commentary by one or more authors[.]”

Id. The first type of “blogger” is an individual rather than a representative of a news media organization. But the second type of blogger might qualify as a representative of the news media depending on whether the particular facts demonstrated that the blogger represented an institutional news medium. Indications that an entity is institutional might include its business structure, the nature of its overall operations, regular public dissemination of news, and similar factors that demonstrate that it is formally organized for the purpose of gathering and disseminating news. For instance, an individual who regularly posts for websites maintained by traditional media companies, such as nytimes.com or cnn.com, would constitute a “representative of the news media” within the meaning of ORS 192.660(4). Short of an affiliation with a traditional media outlet, indications that a blogger represents institutionalized media might include the existence of staff (rather than a single individual), a formal business structure within which the blog operates and regular publication.

B. Terms used in ORS 192.660(5)

We now turn to the meaning of terms used in ORS 192.660(5). A governing body may convene an executive session to consult with counsel about current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. ORS 192.660(2)(h). ORS 192.660(5) requires governing bodies to “bar any member of the news media from attending the executive session if the member of the news media is a party to the litigation or is an employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization that is a party to the litigation.” The commission asks us to clarify the meaning of the terms used in that provision relating to the news media.

1. Member of the news media

The relevant definition of “member” is “one of the individuals composing a society, community, association or other group.” WEBSTER’S at 1408. “Member” appears at first to be a potentially broader term than “representative.” However, as ORS 192.660(5) is implicated only if a person is a “representative of the news media” otherwise entitled to attend executive sessions, in practice a “member of the news media” may be treated as synonymous with a “representative of the news media.” The obvious purpose of this language is to bar individuals from using ORS 192.660(4) to gain access to confidential attorney-client discussions about litigation to which they are parties whether or not the media organization that they represent is a party.

2. Employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization

The prohibition on admitting “an employee, agent, or contractor of a news media organization that is a party to the litigation” precludes a news media organization from gaining access through their representative to confidential discussions about litigation to which the organization is a party. An “employee” is “one employed by another usually in a position below the executive level and usually for wages.” *Id.* at 743. The pertinent definition of “employ” in this context is “to provide with a job that pays wages or salary or with a means of earning a living.” *Id.* An “employee of a news media organization” would mean a person who has a job with a news media organization that pays the person wages or a salary. The pertinent definition of “contractor” is “one that contracts: a party to a bargain: one that formally undertakes to do

something for another * * * one that performs work according to a contractual agreement.” *Id.* at 495. A person who contracts with a news media organization to cover stories or to report on matters specified in a contract would be a contractor of a news media organization. An “agent” is a person “who is authorized to act for or in the place of another.” *Id.* at 40. “Agent” is a broad term and may include representatives who are not “employees” or “contractors.” The legislature likely specified all three of these terms to ensure that everyone who might qualify as a “representative of the news media” for purposes of gaining admittance to a meeting where the governing body discussed litigation with its counsel would be barred from attending if the news media organization that they represent is a party to the litigation.

III. Question 2 - Permissible Grounds to Exclude News Media Representatives

The commission next asks whether governing bodies may exclude representatives of the news media from executive sessions for any reason other than those identified in ORS 192.660(4) (exclusion from deliberations with labor negotiators and meetings to consider confidential student records or expulsion) and ORS 192.660(5)(exclusion for parties to litigation being discussed with counsel).

A. Limit attendance to one representative from each news medium

The Manual states:

[a] governing body probably would be able to limit attendance to one representative of each medium wishing to be represented. The body should be able reasonably to limit total attendance to a number that would not interfere with deliberations.

MANUAL at J-5. Although this is a sensible policy and would not thwart the apparent purposes of the requirement, no statutory language supports it. The statute requires governing bodies to admit “representatives of the news media.” That requires governing bodies to admit any person who qualifies as a representative of a news medium and who is not subject to exclusion under ORS 192.660.

An alternative interpretation would require us to insert language into the statute to specify that governing bodies are required to admit “one” representative from each medium. A governing body could request that a news medium send only one representative, but, in the event that the request is ignored, the governing body should admit representatives who ask to attend.

B. Representatives with a personal interest in the matter discussed

The Manual also states that, with the exception of ORS 192.660(5) for parties to litigation being discussed with counsel, ORS 192.660 does not permit a governing body to exclude representatives who have a personal interest in the matter being discussed or a close relationship with someone who does. But we say that “[i]f the attendance of a reporter with a *direct* personal interest would frustrate the purpose of the executive session, a governing body could justify

barring the individual. A reporter's mere relationship to someone with a personal stake in the matter is probably not sufficient justification." MANUAL at J-6.

On reconsideration, we conclude that a governing body has no authority to exclude a reporter who has a direct personal interest in the matter being discussed other than as provided in ORS 192.660(5). ORS 192.660(4) requires governing bodies to permit representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions. While the scope of the statutory phrase "representatives of the news media" may be ambiguous, the requirement to admit those who qualify is not. ORS 192.660(5) states the only ground on which a governing body may exclude a representative who has a direct personal interest in the matter being discussed. The legislature could have specified other grounds, but it did not.

C. Exclusion for failure to agree to nondisclosure or for disclosing confidential information from a prior executive session

The commission next asks whether it is lawful for a governing body to exclude a reporter who disclosed information from an earlier executive session that the governing body had specified should not be disclosed. ORS 192.660(4) requires governing bodies to allow media representatives to attend, but permits the body "to require that specified information be undisclosed." "Require" means "to ask for authoritatively or imperatively : claim by right or authority : insist upon usually with certainty or urgency : DEMAND, EXACT." WEBSTER'S at 1929. Although the provision does *not* state that a representative who refuses to agree to nondisclosure may be excluded from the meeting, one plausible interpretation is that the authority is necessarily implied from the governing body's authority to "require" that specified matters not be disclosed.

But the provision's amendment history does not support that interpretation. *See Krieger v. Just*, 319 Or 328, 336, 876 P3d 754 (1994) (amendment history is context for present version of statute); *Strunk v. Public Employees Ret Bd.*, 338 Or 145, 189-90, 108 P3d 1058 (2005) (applying presumption that material changes in language create material changes in meaning). As enacted in 1973, the provision required governing bodies to allow representatives to attend "under such conditions governing the disclosure of information as may be agreed to by the governing body and the representatives of the news media prior to executive session." Or Laws 1973, ch 172, § 6(4). That language generally was construed to allow governing bodies to exclude representatives who refused to agree to nondisclosure and to bar attendance at future sessions for violating an agreement. 38 Op Atty Gen 2122, 2124 (1978). That interpretation was consistent with the legislative history of the 1973 version of the statute discussed above.

But the 1975 Legislative Assembly amended the statute to remove the language that had been construed to allow governing bodies to condition attendance on a nondisclosure agreement and to bar future attendance for violating an agreement. Or Laws 1975, ch 664, § 3. This office explained that:

The purpose of this amendment was evidently to make clear that news media representatives *must* be allowed to attend executive sessions * * *. At the same

time, the governing body is given specific authority to *require* that specified information be undisclosed. However no specific statutory sanction is provided for use against a reporter who violates the nondisclosure requirement. The legislature apparently chose to rely upon the good faith of reporters in complying with the requirement.

38 Op Atty Gen at 2125.

In 1981, we specifically addressed whether a governing body could exclude a reporter who had disclosed confidential information from an earlier executive session until the reporter agreed to nondisclosure. Letter Opinion of the Attorney General dated March 30, 1981, to Representative Ben ‘Kip’ Lombard. We concluded that the statute provided no means of enforcement and we refused to imply one:

While it is possible that a court will hold that the right to impose an appropriate sanction is implied, we decline to read into the statute something not placed there by the legislature. It is quite conceivable that the legislature did intend to rely only on the good faith of media representatives. We accordingly construe the statute as it reads, and it reads ‘[r]epresentatives of the news media shall be allowed to attend executive sessions.’ We conclude that such a representative, who has arguably or actually violated a valid instruction not to disclose, cannot be barred from attending a later executive session.

In a 1982 opinion, we were asked whether a governing body had any method to ensure that the media does not disclose confidential information. In light of that question “we reconsidered [the 1981 opinion] but f[ound] no basis for modifying it.” 42 Op Atty Gen 392 (1982). We opined that a governing body “has no method of insuring that the media will not disclose confidential information. It can only request nondisclosure and rely on the good faith cooperation of the media, or drastically limit its own use of confidential information.” *Id.* at 398. We continue to hold to the conclusion in those opinions.

IV. Question 3 - Commission’s authority to adopt rules to carry out its duties

We are next asked whether the commission has authority to adopt administrative rules to carry out its duty to review and investigate alleged violations of the executive session law. At the time the commission asked the question, it did not have explicit statutory authority to make rules. But since the commission asked the question, the Legislative Assembly has amended ORS 244.290, which gives the commission express rulemaking authority. Section (2) provides:

The commission shall adopt rules necessary to carry out its duties under ORS 171.725 to 171.785, 171.992, 192.660 and 192.685 and this chapter.

But the legislature simultaneously amended ORS 192.660 to exclude from the commission’s rulemaking authority the ability to determine by rule who qualifies as a representative of the news media:

(10) Notwithstanding ORS 244.290, the Oregon Government Ethics Commission may not adopt rules that establish what entities are considered representatives of the news media that are entitled to attend executive sessions under subsection (4) of this section.

Hence, the legislature has given the commission express authority to adopt rules necessary to carry out its duties under ORS 192.660 and 192.685. However, the commission may not adopt a rule that establishes what entities are representative of the news media.

We note that, in addition to its general rulemaking authority, the commission is required by ORS 244.290 to adopt one particular rule. Specifically, ORS 244.350(2)(a) authorizes the commission to impose civil penalties of up to \$1000 for a violation of ORS 192.660. ORS 244.290(2) requires the commission to adopt certain rules to implement ORS chapter 244, subsection (h) of which requires the commission to adopt a rule to “[s]et criteria for determining the amount of civil penalties that the commission may impose.” ORS 244.350(2) is a provision of ORS chapter 244 that authorizes the commission to impose civil penalties; therefore it must adopt a rule setting criteria for determining the amount of those penalties pursuant to ORS 244.290(2)(h).

V. Question 4 – Effect of policies adopted by governing bodies

The next question arises because local governing bodies have begun adopting comprehensive policies establishing who they will consider to be “representatives of the news media” and what proof they will require to prove that status. The commission asks about the legal significance of such policies that: (1) impose screening criteria for determining who qualifies as a representative of the news media; (2) require preapproval of media credentials; (3) require advance notice that a representative of the news media will attend; or, (4) exclude persons for failing to give advance notice of attendance.

The short answer to this question is that governing bodies are bound by the statutory requirement to admit representatives of the media to executive sessions. To the extent that enforcing a policy would result in the exclusion of a person statutorily entitled to attend an executive session, the policy is inconsistent with ORS 192.660(4). In evaluating allegations that an individual was wrongly excluded from executive session, the commission must assess compliance with the statute regardless of a governing body’s policies.

Turning to the first particular type of policy the commission is concerned about, governing bodies may adopt screening criteria for “representatives of the news media” that are consistent with the meaning intended by the legislature as described in this opinion.


On the other hand, governing bodies are not required to accept a person’s mere assertion that they qualify as a representative of the news media. Consequently, a policy requiring proof of media status can be consistent with the Oregon Public Meetings Law. If the application of the policy results in excluding a person who offers sufficient proof to demonstrate that the person is, indeed, a representative of the news media, that outcome would be out of compliance with the

Public Meetings Law. (This seems most likely to arise if a policy requires specific types of credentials.) Similarly, the statute does not authorize excluding representatives of the news media for failure to provide their credentials within certain deadlines. The same is true for a policy requesting media representatives to notify the governing body in advance of their intent to attend an executive session. While that might be a good idea, and a courtesy, it cannot be made a requirement.

Finally, as discussed above, the Public Meetings Law does not permit a public body to exclude media representatives who have disclosed confidential information from prior executive sessions or who represent news media organizations that have done so. Enforcing a policy to the contrary would violate the statute.

CONCLUSION

The law permits news-gathering representatives of institutional media to attend executive sessions. The statutory term “news media” is broad and flexible enough to encompass changing technologies for delivering the news. A governing body may not exclude a representative of the news media from an executive session except as specifically allowed by ORS 192.660(4) and (5). The commission generally may adopt rules to carry out its duty to enforce the executive session law, but it is prohibited by ORS 192.660(10) from adopting a rule that establishes which entities are considered representatives of the news media. Governing bodies may adopt policies relating to the admission of media representatives to executive sessions, but those policies cannot limit the statutory right of representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions. In evaluating allegations that an individual was wrongly excluded from executive session, the commission must assess compliance with the statute, regardless of a governing body’s policies.


ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General

AEA:nog/DM6782066

¹ The phrase was enacted by the 1973 Legislative Assembly. Or Laws 1973, ch 172, § 6. The pertinent definitions in the 1971 version of Webster’s do not differ from the 2002 version so we cite to the latter for ease of reference.

² ORS 192.660(5), which excludes from attending certain executive sessions “members of the news media” and an “employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization” does not shed light on the meaning of ORS 192.660(4), because the latter was adopted by the 1973 Legislative Assembly and the former was not adopted until 1997. Or Laws 1997, ch 596, § 1; *See Stull v. Hoke*, 326 Or 72, 79-80, 948 P2d 722 (1997) (stating that a later-enacted statute is not context for interpreting an earlier statute).

³ “Blog” is not defined in the 2002 print version of Webster’s, but is defined in the online version.

APPENDIX N – League’s Opinion on Media and Executive Sessions

Introduction

This memorandum addresses the purposes behind the executive session provision in Oregon’s public meetings law. Specifically, this memorandum answers why the Oregon Legislature included a requirement that “representatives of the news media” be allowed to attend executive sessions, even though other members of the public were excluded from those same meetings.

The legislative history of Oregon’s public meetings law demonstrates that the Legislature believed that members of the news media should be allowed to attend executive sessions for primarily two reasons: (1) information gathering for future reporting, and (2) to act as a “watchdog” over a governing body, in light of the fact that no other member of the public would be in attendance. The following analysis lays out the evidence supporting those two purposes.⁸⁴

Analysis

The Legislature first enacted the public meetings law as Senate Bill (SB) 15 (1973). *Or Laws 1973, ch 172*. As introduced, SB 15 did not require governing bodies to allow members of the media to attend executive sessions. SB 15 moved to the Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility. At a committee meeting on February 26, co-chair Robert Ingalls noted that “newspapers” had traditionally attended school board meetings and labor negotiations, and asked if the bill would end that practice. *Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), Feb. 26, 1973, at 6*. Various witnesses responded that many governing bodies had informal agreements with the press to allow the press to attend closed meetings. Those witnesses opined that the practice could continue under the new law.

The committee met again on March 5, 1973 and heard extensive testimony on SB 15. Relevant here, some witnesses testified that the press should be allowed to attend executive sessions because, otherwise, no one from the public could act as a watchdog on the governing body. For example, Woodburn Common Council member Harold Reaume testified that the city regularly held non-public pre-meetings, at which the press was welcome to attend. Mr. Reaume worried that if the press was excluded from those non-public meetings, “undesirable” things would occur, such as public officials reaching a consensus on an issue out of the public eye. *Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), March 5, 1973, at 2*. *Oregonian* education reporter Bill Keller

⁸⁴ This memorandum uses the terms “representatives of the news media,” “members of the news media,” and “the press” synonymously. The Attorney General takes the view that “representatives of the news media” means:

“[I]ndividuals who gather news and who have a formal affiliation, whether through employment, by contract or some other agency authorization from or with an institutional news media entity, including both general interest media and media that cover specific subject areas for special audiences.”

Op Atty Gen No 8291, p. 2 (April 18, 2016).

echoed that concern, but also noted that the press needed access to private meetings for information gathering purposes. Mr. Keller acknowledged that school board business should sometimes be conducted privately, but even in those circumstances the press should be allowed to attend as “observers.” Mr. Keller testified that the press was under no obligation to refrain from reporting on matters in the public interest. *Id. at 3-4.*

The committee held another hearing on March 12, 1973. Most of the witnesses who testified at the March 12, 1973 meeting took the view that the press should be allowed to attend executive sessions for information gathering purposes. For example, Wally Cowen of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association testified that the “press” and “public” were the same thing, and the press was simply a vehicle for conveying information to the public at large. *Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), March 12, 1973, at 1-2.* Mr. Cowen further argued that SB 15 should permit members of the press to attend executive sessions to ensure that the wider public had access to “the workings of democracy.” *Id.* Other witnesses made similar comments, emphasizing the important role of the press in conveying information to the public.

Following the March 12, 1973 meeting, SB 15 was amended to permit, but not require, representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions. The amendment specified that the press could attend under such conditions that covered the disclosure of information “as may now exist” and may be agreed to by the governing body and the representatives of the news media. *Amendments to Second Amended Draft, SB 15, § 6(3) (1973).* The committee considered those amendments to SB 15 at a March 19 work session. Senator Fadeley suggested making the requirement mandatory and co-chair Ingalls suggested deleting the “as may now exist” language. The committee adopted both suggestions. As amended on March 19, 1973, SB 15 stated, in part:

“Representatives of the news media shall be allowed to attend executive sessions under such conditions governing the disclosure of information as may be agreed to by the governing body and the representatives of the news media.”

SB 15, § 6(3), March 19, 1973.

At the April 2, 1973 committee meeting, Senator Carson moved to delete Section 6(3), viewing it as “dangerous.” In Senator Carson’s view, if a meeting concerned something in the public interest, the entire public should be allowed to attend, not just the press. *Minutes, Joint Special Committee on Professional Responsibility (SB 15), April 2, 1973, at 7.* Senator Carson further argued that allowing only the press to attend executive sessions may foster adverse relationships between the press and the governing body. Co-chair Ingalls replied that, in his view, the press was not permitted to attend executive stories to simply report on the meeting. Rather, the press would use the information from the meeting as background for future reporting. *Id.* Co-chair Ingalls then asked Roger Williams, the representative from the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, for his thoughts. Mr. Williams agreed with co-chair Ingalls’ understanding of the media’s role; that is, Williams agreed that members of the media would use access to executive sessions as a way of gathering background information for new stories. *Id. at 8.*

Ultimately, as enacted by the Legislature, SB 15 required governing bodies to allow representatives of the news media to attend executive sessions, but left the details regarding disclosure of information up to agreements between the media and the governing body:

“Representatives of the news media shall be allowed to attend executive sessions under such conditions governing the disclosure of information as may be agreed to by the governing body and the representatives of the news media prior to such executive session.”

Or Laws 1973, ch 172, § 6(4), codified at ORS 192.660(4).

The Legislature has amended ORS 192.660 numerous times since 1973. See, e.g., Or Laws 1975, ch 664, § 2; Or Laws 1979, ch 644, § 5; Or Laws 1985, ch 657, § 2; Or Laws 1995, ch 779, § 1; Or Laws 1997, ch 173, § 1; Or Laws 2003, ch 524, § 4; Or Laws 2007, ch 602, § 11; Or Laws 2015, ch 421, § 2; Or Laws 2015, ch 666, § 3. For example, the Legislature specified that representatives of the news media are not entitled to attend executive sessions held under ORS 192.660(2)(d) (labor negotiations) or ORS 332.061 (executive sessions allowed to consider expelling minor student from a public school or to examine the medical records of a minor student). Interestingly, in 2015 the Legislature amended ORS 192.660 to provide that the Oregon Government Ethics Commission “may not adopt rules that establish what entities are considered representatives of the news media that are entitled to attend executive sessions[.]” ORS 192.660(10). Those amendments may affect what types of executive sessions the media can attend, but does not alter the basic purpose for allowing the media to attend such meetings.

Conclusion

The foregoing legislative history demonstrates that the Legislature had two purposes in mind when crafting a law that would permit members of the media to attend executive sessions. First, witnesses at the committee hearings spoke of the role of the media as a “watchdog” for the governing body, and worried about adverse consequences if the press was excluded from executive sessions. Second, legislators themselves (such as co-chair Ingalls) expressed the view that members of the media would use the information learned during an executive session as “background” material for future news stories. Those purposes, of course, are not mutually exclusive. But, because the lawmakers who ultimately enacted the law emphasized the fact-finding function of the media in attendance at an executive session, the scale likely tips more towards that purpose than towards the oversight purpose.

APPENDIX O – Model Media Policy

City of [Insert name of City] Executive Session News Media Attendance Policy

WHEREAS, Oregon public meetings law provides that representatives of the news media shall be allowed to attend certain executive sessions of public bodies, but may be requested to not disclose specified information (ORS 192.660(4)); and

WHEREAS, because at the time state law relating to media attendance at executive session was adopted, “news media” consisted of entities that were institutionalized and structured to support compliance with the requirements of ORS 192.660(4), the law includes no express mechanism for enforcing those requirements; and

WHEREAS, technological advances since the time the public meetings law was initially adopted have resulted in development of communication mechanisms allowing virtually any individual or entity to disseminate information widely; and

WHEREAS, the city council finds that in that absence of a statutory definition of “news media” as that term is used in ORS 192.660(4) it is necessary to adopt a policy that implements the intent of the public meetings law relating to executive session attendance without precluding attendance by internet-based or other “non-traditional” information disseminators that are institutionalized and committed to compliance with ORS 192.660(4); and

WHEREAS, the city council recognizes that this policy is solely for determining eligibility to attend executive sessions, which requests non-disclosure of specified information from executive sessions, and is not intended to otherwise define “news media” or to determine eligibility to report on the city’s activities or to limit access to other city meetings by any person;

The city council hereby adopts the following policy:

1. Recognized News Media Organizations. The following entities are recognized as news media organizations eligible to attend executive sessions:
 - (A) Daily newspapers, non-daily, and small-market newspapers/publications, as well as those publications that are released as digital and multiplatform products; or
 - (B) A newspaper or publication that the city uses for publication of public notices and that meets the requirements of ORS 193.020; or
 - (C) An entity that is organized and operated to regularly and continuously publish, broadcast, transmit via television, radio or the internet or otherwise disseminate news to the public, and that regularly reports on activities of public concern.
2. Attendance at Executive Sessions. Representatives of news media organizations recognized pursuant to Section 1 of this policy shall be allowed to attend executive sessions, except as described below in paragraphs (C) and (D) of this section, pursuant to the following process:
 - (A) The representative must provide substantial evidence persuading the city that he or she is a news reporter for the recognized news media organization. In making its

determination whether to recognize the person as a representative of the news media organization, the city may require:

- (a) A press badge or identification issued by the recognized news media organization, plus proof of identity (such as a driver's license); or
- (b) A recently published news article in the recognized news media organization publication or broadcast, with the person's byline, or a masthead showing the person's name as a member of the news gathering staff of the news media organization, plus proof of identity; or
- (c) A letter on letterhead from an editor of the recognized news media organization in which the editor states that the reporter is covering the meeting for the news media organization, plus proof of identity.
- (d) Any other credentials or evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the individual is a representative of the news media.

The city requires that requests to be recognized as a representative of a news media organization be made in writing on a form provided by the city. The form shall require disclosure of the person's name, and the entity for which he or she is a representative and shall require submission of evidence described in subsections 2(A) of this policy. The form shall also include a certification that the person is a representative of a recognized news media organization, that the information given is true, and that the person agrees to comply with ORS 192.660(4). The form will be made available on the city's webpage and upon request by any individual.⁸⁵

- (B) The city council is prohibited from making final decisions on any matter in executive session. Therefore, representatives are requested to provide the above evidence to persuade the city that they are a representative of the recognized new media organization in advance of the schedule executive session. In the event that a person claiming to be a representative of the news media fails to provide advance evidence of their credentials, the representative should either be allowed to attend the executive session, or the executive session shall be postponed until a later time.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ A model form is included below.

⁸⁶ The LOC intentionally selected the words "should either be allowed to attend" in this policy as it is the most conservative approach related to permitting news media representatives — please seek city attorney advice on the use of this word in your policy. See Op Atty Gen No 8291, 2016 WL 2905510 (Apr 18, 2016), available at <https://www.doj.state.or.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/op8291.pdf> (last accessed February 2024), and Or Atty Gen Public Record and Meetings Manual (2019) at 175-177.

The process for postponement will depend upon each individual city's local procedures. One method may be for the presiding officer and city manager to decide to postpone the executive session prior to the meeting being called to order.

- (C) Representatives of the news media are not permitted to attend executive sessions involving deliberations with persons designated to carry on labor negotiations. ORS 192.660(4).
 - (D) If the executive session is being held to confer with counsel about current litigation or litigation likely to be filed, the city shall exclude any member of the news media from attending if the member is a party to the litigation to be discussed or is an employee, agent or contractor of a news media organization that is a party to the litigation. ORS 192.660(5).
3. Recording Devices Prohibited. Cameras, tape recorders and other recording devices shall not be used in executive sessions, except for the official executive session tapes made by city staff.
 4. Application to Boards and Commissions. These policies and procedures shall apply to the city council and all of its boards and commissions.

Model Recognized New Media Representative Application⁸⁷

Pursuant to the City of [city name]'s Media Policy, those claiming to be representatives of the news media are requested to complete this form. Please provide the requested information below, complete and sign the certification section, and submit the completed form to [designated staff member's name] in advance by: (1) personal delivery to [designated staff member]; (2) sending the completed form via e-mail to [e-mail address]; or (3) delivering a completed copy to city hall located at [address].

NOTE: If the city is unable to verify this information prior to the start of an executive session, your attendance at the executive session may be denied or the executive may be postponed.

YOUR NAME

NAME OF THE NEWS MEDIA ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATION:

I, _____ certify the following to be true and accurate:

I represent the following:

- A daily newspaper, non-daily, or small-market newspaper/publication, or publication that is released as a digital or multiplatform product.
- A newspaper or publication that the city uses for publication of public notices and meets the requirements of ORS 193.020.
- A news media organization that is organized and operated to regularly and continuously publish, broadcast, transmit via the internet or otherwise disseminate news to the public, and that regularly reports on actives of the city or matters of the nature under consideration by the city council.

The news media organization that I represent is committed to complying with the requirement that confidential executive session information be undisclosed.

I have provided the following credentials sufficient to allow the city to determine that I am a representative of the above identified news media organization (select all that apply):

⁸⁷ The LOC intentionally selected the words “may be denied” in the “Note” textbox to provide specific notice to the applicant that the city could reject their application based on what evidence of media relations provided. This language differs slightly with the policy language in Appendix O(2)(B). See Op Atty Gen No 8291, 2016 WL 2905510 (Apr 18, 2016), available at <https://www.doj.state.or.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/op8291.pdf> (last accessed February 2024), and Or Atty Gen Public Record and Meetings Manual (2019) at 175-177.

- A press badge or identification issued by the news media organization, plus proof of my identity;
- A copy of a recently published news article showing my name as a member of the news gathering staff of the news media organization, plus proof of my identity;
- A letter on letterhead from an editor of the news media organization that states that I am covering the meeting for the news media organization, plus proof of my identity; or
- The following evidence sufficient to show that I am a representative of the above identified news media organization: _____

As a representative of the news media, I agree to comply with ORS 192.660(4).

SIGNATURE

DATE

APPENDIX P – Sample Script to Announce Start of Executive Session

Given by Presiding Officer

“The city council will now meet in executive session for the purpose of [cite the specific purpose(s) for each subject to be discussed – this should mirror the language found on the notice of the executive session].

“The executive session is held pursuant to ORS 192.660 [cite the specific statute that authorizes the executive session for each subject to be discussed – this should mirror the section(s) found on the notice of the executive session].

Representatives of the news media and designated staff and other persons⁸⁸ shall be allowed to attend the executive session. All other members of the audience are asked to leave the room.

Representative of the news media are specifically directed not to report on any of the deliberations during the executive session, except to state the general subject of the session as previously announced.

No decision will be made in this executive session.

At the end of the executive session, we will return to open session and welcome the audience back into the room.”

⁸⁸ The city council may choose to allow other specified persons to attend the executive session.