

SBMA BOARD MEETING Transcript

July 21, 2025, 8:44 a.m.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 0:03
Starting, we're transcribing.

J **Gerry Weiner** 0:04
OK. You have a meeting call to order. Is there a motion to accept the previous minutes?

PC **Peter Carozza** 0:11
So moved.

J **Gerry Weiner** 0:12
Is there second.

Betty Kuehnel 0:14
2nd.

J **Gerry Weiner** 0:16
Betty 2nd. All in favor say aye.

PC **Peter Carozza** 0:19
Aye.

Betty Kuehnel 0:19
Aye.

J **Gerry Weiner** 0:21
Opposed? No opposed, unanimous approval of the Minutes. Old business. We're going to ask Doug to go into his report.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 0:32
As usual, I'm going to share my screen. Can you all see it?

J Gerry Weiner 0:39
Yeah.

PC Peter Carozza 0:40
Yes.

CD Cho, Douglas 0:41
OK, great, great. Minimize this a bit. Hopefully that's not too small. And here's the board package. The minutes you just approved. And moving down, these are the figures from grievances for the last two months. In comparison to the previous two months. They're a little bit down. They're trending downwards. Some of that could be attributed to the summer where things slow down a bit, but there is definitely somewhat of a downward trend, so that's worth noting and keeping an eye on.

Betty Kuehnel 1:23
Just start it.

CD Cho, Douglas 1:36
But other than that, it's about the same. There are no late awards as you can see, so that's good.

J Gerry Weiner 1:42
Heard anything from anyone about why we're down? Why they not? Sending him more cases, have we?

CD Cho, Douglas 1:49
No one's told me anything. I do know that that they've been settling a lot of cases. It seems like we do get a lot of withdrawals at the last second.

J Gerry Weiner 1:55
Yeah.

CD Cho, Douglas 2:02
That doesn't really address, you know why we're not getting filings in the first place.

But that's part of it. That just creates a slowdown. Also, I think state cases might be a little bit down as well. We typically get more corrections. But we've talked in the past about trying to get more state cases and there's a few reasons we don't get them. You know, we can continue to have that discussion at a different time in terms of what we have to do to convince the state to give us more arbitrations because it's definitely something that's achievable. It's just a matter of whether or not the board wants to make some policy changes.

J **Gerry Weiner** 2:43

Corrections seems to be settling a lot of cases. I had a lot of settled cases with them recently.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 2:49

They do, and, and they've used our mediators on a number of occasions. They definitely have tried to mediate cases, which is good for them and good for the system, but not, you know, obviously not great for the arbitration panels who don't get the work. But yeah, it's I say some of it, if you ask me, they're obviously the number one filer of cases by far. So whatever they do, I mean, I'm not aware that they've made any dramatic decisions or policy changes. We still get a lot of corrections cases. It's just not as many.

J **Gerry Weiner** 3:26

I think they've had a lot of turnover with their employment, with their representatives. I've seen new guys, new people come on.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 3:27

That is true as a matter of fact, they hired a new attorney who was in private practice for a long time. Who's definitely a very seasoned person, so, he's brand new and you're right, there are a number of other new faces we've seen. So, people have retired, and they bring the new people. So that could be some of it.

J **Gerry Weiner** 3:57

OK.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 3:59

OK, moving down. These are the mediation figures for the past two months. Again, the figure in the right with the asterix is the previous two months prior to the two-month period were in. So you can compare and contrast the trend. Mediations are actually up slightly in terms of scheduled and conducted and concluded so that that's good, Sean and Tom, are busy and of course effective.

CD Cho, Douglas 4:33

We've we're about to send out is the binding arbitration letters in the first week of August. 300 plus letters will be going out to various towns and unions, so that of course creates a flurry of activity in binding arbitration, both in terms of panels selected and also, hold on, let me just stop for one second. I think Dennis is coming in. Yep, here's Dennis. Good morning, Dennis.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 5:11

Good morning, all.

CD Cho, Douglas 5:15

I think most of them are muted and they would say hi, but they're muted, OK.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 5:20

All right.

CD Cho, Douglas 5:21

Let's see here. I was sharing my screen. We were going through mediation figures. And I was saying that binding arbitration letters for August are going to be going out obviously in the first week of August. To probably 300 plus towns and unions notifying them that their contracts are expiring. And that we're going to be imposing, binding arbitration within the month of August if they don't file a waiver or select a panel so that always spurs on a lot more activity. OK, now covering the motions to vacate. Let's see this first one, Torrington and Peters. That case is really over because the Supreme Court denied the petition for certification.

CD Cho, Douglas 6:15

This is the reinstatement of Officer Peters, the police officer who'd been fired in Torrington. So, that case is over. There are just some post appellate decision motions

being filed with the court for things like costs and fees. But I believe for all intents and purposes, that case is concluded. Madison, Foito, that's a termination that's ongoing. The next case is Waterbury, involving Officer Hinkle. That was a termination. There was a remand back because the motion to vacate was granted. On the remand, the panel met again, issued a new award. So this is the second application to vacate filed by this time by Waterbury, and they're challenging the award for a number of reasons. So this one is a hold tight. This is kind of an important case for SBMA, these two cases, these Middlebury cases, they're fairly notorious, a lot of press coverage.

CD Cho, Douglas 7:28

To officers Ireland and Cronin they were both terminated. Both reinstated by separate panels. Ken Baldyga, Peter Carozza on both of them, but Lou Pittocco and Linda Yelmini were the neutrals on the two cases. Both reinstated unanimously. The court vacated both awards via separate rulings, of course, but essentially identical decisions. If you read them, they're pretty much identical, but except for the names of the officers and a few circumstances. Yeah, the court pretty much ignored or disagreed, I guess, with the panel's findings that just cause wasn't proven by the Town of Middlebury. So these have been appealed by the Union, both cases, so they're going up to the appellate court.

CD Cho, Douglas 8:19

So this one's going to be very interesting because it really challenges the panel's authority on deciding issues of just cause.

J Gerry Weiner 8:29

Was it a public policy case? Also, I read the two decisions both of them were public policy.

CD Cho, Douglas 8:29

Good. Yeah. That's what the judge grounds his decision on, public policy, saying that the panel found clearly that these two officers violated certain rules about going out on patrol. They just weren't out on patrol, and they should have been repeatedly. But I think the gist of the award was, first of all, I don't think the panels necessarily found those things that the judge says they found. But nevertheless the panels both found

that the Town of Middlebury clearly didn't follow their rules for investigating these types of complaints.

CD Cho, Douglas 9:15

They pretty clearly skirted the rules in multiple ways. And they were quite obvious and based on that, I think the panel said. The panel said that they didn't have a choice but to rescind the determinations, and the judge is now saying if it's bad enough and the context bad enough, there's you got to just keep them terminated and find other ways to address the failure to follow the proper procedure, which is kind of quizzical because he didn't really elaborate on how you would do that, but nevertheless that is going to be one of the main issues as well as a public policy issue, so this is going to be a very interesting and relatively important appellate court decision for our practices.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 10:05

Hmm.

CD Cho, Douglas 10:09

This Montville decision. It had been dismissed because I think inaction by the Town of Montville. But they filed a motion to reconsider the dismissal and the court agreed or granted the motion and appealed, I mean, excuse me, restored the appeal back to the docket. This is a Dennis Murphy, Michael Culhane, Peter Carozza case involving I think it's minimum staffing or shifts. So that's back on the docket. This case is still live. It's Bridgeport, the Mercado case. This Suffield case was withdrawn by the City. So I'm guessing they settled it. That's a Gerry Weiner, Ken Baldyga, Peter Carozza case.

J Gerry Weiner 11:15

Yep.

CD Cho, Douglas 11:16

See the next one. It's a termination case. New Haven Chesson is the case. Ann Bird, Ken Baldyga, Peter Carozza, they filed the decision. Parties are awaiting the decision on that one. Same true with this Manchester Police officer case, Richard Chief, I

believe was terminated. That one's pending as well. And this case here, this Stanford case, it was withdrawn by the Union, so they must have settled it.

J Gerry Weiner 11:57
OK.

CD Cho, Douglas 11:58
It's a Bird, Baldyga, and Carozza case. And I've given you the judge's memorandum decision in the Middlebury cases. First one, here's the Randy Ireland case. The second one is the Cronin case. Further on down, like I said there the decisions are almost identical. But you can read through the judge's decision and his reasoning to see what you think.

Betty Kuehnel 12:24
Read it.

J Cho, Douglas 12:24
And also attached after each of the decisions is the other panel's respective awards. So you can see what the two panels said. Here's the first one. I believe this is Lou Pittocco and all the way at the bottom is, oops, should be Linda Yelmini's award. Hopefully I included it. Think I did. If not, I'll send it separately if it's not included.

J Gerry Weiner 13:00
It should be there.

CD Cho, Douglas 13:01
I'm sure I'm giving you all a migraine. Here it is, Linda Yemini. Yep, Yelmini's award is there and the court's decision for that case involving Cronin, Officer Cronin is also attached. So that's the status of motions to vacate, and that's all I have for that. The FMCS update. There's nothing in this package pertaining to that but the discussion we're having.

M Michael Culhane 13:36
Hmm.

CD Cho, Douglas 13:37

The Commissioner Bartolomeo had a discussion with the Governor's chief of staff, whether or not SBMA should have a more active role in offering our services to the FMCS due to their large staff cutbacks. As you know, they had a staff of approximately 200 people and 143 mediators were in that staff of 200. And they're down to either four or six mediators from 143 for the entire country. So they've been basically decimated. They only do mediations in the largest strikes in the country. That's it. They don't mediate any grievances anymore. None. They went from, I think, a staff of almost 60 administrative people down to 8, I think. So there's a question as to whether or not they can administrate grievances and contracts, and I'm talking about the arbitrations of them, not the mediations. As I said, they're not mediating grievances anymore. But can they put together arbitrations for grievances and contracts anymore like they have? They still have the same arbitrators. The arbitrators are like ours. They're independent. And they're not federal employees. They don't get paid by the federal government. They're paid by the parties and there's approximately 1000 of those arbitrators nationwide. They're unaffected as far as I know by the cutbacks. These are DOGE cutbacks that is. So they exist, but I don't know if eight people, clerical people, can administer that many. I mean they do 10,000 arbitrations a year. That's a lot of arbitrations. I don't know if they can handle the paperwork for that, it remains to be seen.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 15:27

Well, Doug, actually I get one or two or three of those cases a year. And they don't have a lot of administrative duties. They simply send out the initial appointment.

CD Cho, Douglas 15:43

Mm-hmm.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 15:45

And the arbitrator handles it all from there. Schedules the case. You know creates the zoom and then simply notifies them when it's over. So they do have an initial processing thing, but they may have difficulty doing that given the number of cases they handle nationally, with just six people.

CD Cho, Douglas 16:06

Yeah, I understand, Dennis. And they don't, they're not as hands on or as task driven as our staff is in terms of with the cases and, but nevertheless 8 people and 10,000 cases, that's a lot of cases.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 16:15

Right.

CD Cho, Douglas 16:21

So it remains to be seen.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 16:22

Yeah.

CD Cho, Douglas 16:23

Especially if you had a staff of 60 down to 8. I'm not sure if they can handle it so.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 16:26

Yeah, that's horrific.

CD Cho, Douglas 16:31

The discussion I had with the regional director of FMCS, Kathy Hall, who's out of New Jersey, was very favorable. She contacted us actually just to let us know, this is a few months ago, that they're essentially out of business for certain things and not that they were asking for our help, but just letting us know as a courtesy, just in case things came our way.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 16:55

Hmm.

CD Cho, Douglas 16:56

Or if private employers reaching out to us, things like that. So I talked to the Commissioner at that time, and she said by all means, if you guys can do this work, which we can under our statutes, there's no barrier to SBMA doing grievances.

Both arbitrations and mediations and their contracts, if they came to us and gave us signed authorizations.

 **Betty Kuehnel 17:17**

They came to us.

 **Cho, Douglas 17:20**

So I said we can do it if they want to come to us, but then we had a discussion more recently as to whether or not we should be more proactive and reach out to the FMCS and tell them please send us that work when parties inquire. And the Commissioner said that the Governor's office is very receptive to that idea, so I've been sending her certain documents to get that proposal in front of the Governor and see where it goes. So we might be getting more work if that in fact happens. So stay tuned on that.

 **Gerry Weiner 17:58**

But yeah are we just talking about Connecticut grievance disputes from Connecticut companies or is this we would be doing nationwide disputes?

 **Cho, Douglas 18:00**

Yep it would only be Connecticut, Gerry. Our statutes do say Connecticut employers only. So our enabling legislation gives us that authority to hear Connecticut employers.

 **Gerry Weiner 18:14**

OK.

 **Cho, Douglas 18:21**

But it doesn't distinguish private versus public or, you know, municipal things like that. It just evolved over time that we've primarily serviced municipalities and the state, but more municipalities as you know. And exclusively municipalities for binding arbitration. But like I said, the basic statutes for SBMA may allow us to do more than that if we want. If it comes to us. And in fact, we do that once in a while, some stray random case from a private employer comes to us because they've named us as the arbitration board to hear their grievances and we do it. I remember doing a couple

when I was a neutral, from a private employer in Hartford. But the question is when they do that, can they handpick our rules? And I don't think they can. I think they have to say if they name us, they bind to all of our rules and regulations as a board. So that's all I have for that. Moving forward, I think in order to talk about the new mediator, we should go into executive session. So for that we need a motion and a second and a vote.

J Gerry Weiner 19:36

Mm-hmm. Is there a motion to go into executive session to discuss, the 2nd?

PC Peter Carozza 19:41

So move.

KB Kenneth Baldyga 19:44

2nd.

J Gerry Weiner 19:45

OK. Second by Dennis, all in favor to go into executive session for the mediator discussion, please say aye.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 19:53

Aye.

PC Peter Carozza 19:53

Aye.

M Michael Culhane 19:54

Aye, aye.

Betty Kuehnel 19:55

Aye.

□ **Cho, Douglas** stopped transcription

Transcript Part 2

July 21, 2025

[RETURN AFTER EXECUTIVE SESSION COMPLETED]

J **Gerry Weiner** 0:04

Next issue is on the agenda. I think we got it. I think we're done. Anybody have anything else they want to bring up?

KB **Ken Baldyga** 0:14

Yes, I do. Just really quick the last. I don't know several here virtual hearings. We've been getting documents either not getting them or getting them the night before. And when we asked how come we didn't get them, they'll say, well, you know, we put him in the mail. And we said, well, maybe you should overnight them, but the policy is on the instructions. It says all exhibits are to be postmarked no later than four calendar days prior to the hearing date. Exhibits are to be sent to each arbitrator by regular mail only, and that's underlined. So I really think we should take a look at do we really need them to only do regular mail because four days before the hearing, you know, the US Postal Service hardly ever gets it there on time within four days.

J **Gerry Weiner** 1:12

So that's a good, good question. You know the rule that you just read, Ken, is something that we sort of improvised off the seat of our pants when we first started to have virtual meetings. Right, during COVID. And it has no validity in law or in the regulations. It's something that we just said and it's true that we want to them to comply with it, and we could, we could end in a registered, a letter or a certified letter. But I don't want to put any more burden on these parties than we need to because it is and I always look at it when I don't get it. I changed my position. I now, if we don't have them on the day of the morning of the hearing, I ask that somebody has to reschedule, and we do reschedule. But we get it the day before, even I've had situations in the morning of the hearing and everyone as it is what to make of. What's the difference? Keep in mind, when we have an in-person hearing, we don't get the exhibits until the day of the hearing until they're introduced by the parties. And why do we need to put a bigger burden on people to do when we're doing a virtual which is a benefit for us, we don't have to.

KB Ken Baldyga 2:36
No, Gerry Weiner, I'm not. I'm only suggesting that we eliminate regular mail only. And leave it up to the town or the Union to decide whether to overnight it.

J Gerry Weiner 2:50
Oh, not requiring overnight.

KB Ken Baldyga 2:52
Well, yeah. Well, no, no, not requiring. You just eliminate regular mail only because that's what the instructions are saying.

J Gerry Weiner 2:56
Oh.

KB Ken Baldyga 2:59
No, no, not to require overnight mail, but just on the instructions to eliminate the statement, Regular mail only.

J Gerry Weiner 3:10
What do we say by regular mail?

KB Ken Baldyga 3:12
Well, I wouldn't say anything. Yeah, just four days prior, but let them decide whether or not they want to overnight it. The true issue really is that the fact that most of them are overnighing them anyway.

J Gerry Weiner 3:25
So what difference does it make?

KB Ken Baldyga 3:28
Well, the only thing I'm saying is remove by regular mail only allow them.

J Gerry Weiner 3:32
But why?

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 3:32
Yeah.

J **Gerry Weiner** 3:33
What different if you get it the day before? Are we going to say that you lose the case or not have the hearing?

KB **Ken Baldyga** 3:39
No, no, it's not a question of not getting it at all. What happening is they'll put it in regular mail and when it doesn't get there in time, so then we have to reschedule the hearing.

J **Gerry Weiner** 3:47
And. Right.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 3:52
So the quote is what? I hear it looks like a directive from us that the parties are prohibited from sending evidence in overnight mail because the instructions say by regular mail only.

J **Gerry Weiner** 4:07
OK.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 4:07
So I don't think it's an unreasonable request that Ken is making to simply say that the parties are responsible to get the, you know, the evidence to the panel before the hearing and at least. You know, send it out four days before and let them decide whether regular mail will do it or not.

J **Gerry Weiner** 4:29
OK. I get it. I miss the point. That's not a, that's a point.

KB **Ken Baldyga** 4:32
Yeah. Thank you, Dennis.

CD**Cho, Douglas** 4:32

I can if I may. This has actually been the subject of a lot of discussion and debate as to how to do this. Because when COVID obviously forced this issue because the parties in the past have had this history of scrambling the night before to pull together their case and try to get enough copies and get there the next morning by 10:00. And that's how everyone's developed their practice. The reps that is. But when everything became 100% virtual during COVID, that had obviously changed. And this office played around with different requirements as to when they had to mail the exhibits. And it was actually, I think, longer than four days when they first started. But there was, according to Pat Fitton, a ton of pushback from the parties because it was so dramatically different. They just weren't used to putting together all of their exhibits a week early and it drove everybody nuts, and I think AFSCME was one of the ones that complained the most about this. So I think the four-day requirement was something that was just a compromise, like something they could live with because a week was too much. I think 10 days was once too. I mean, if you look at federal court and you look at SBLR, they have longer, longer deadlines to get them out, but at the same time, their people are used to it under those rules, and I think it's in their rules.

CD**Cho, Douglas** 6:00

So in any event, four days is sort of the sweet spot. Do the exhibits get there in time? Often they don't, unfortunately, because four days isn't enough. The reason overnight is not allowed is because a lot of arbitrators enough have PO boxes, and you can't overnight to a PO Box number. So that becomes a problem. And some arbitrators are moving targets. They have two different addresses and you're not sure where they are. Some go away for a month, whatever, and its question when we have an arbitrator who's in North Carolina who can't get overnight, she says. It's not allowed at her house, so it becomes problematic that way. The other issue is one of cost.

J**Gerry Weiner** 6:44

The document wants to go to the. That happened as well.

CD Cho, Douglas 6:54
Sorry, Gerry?

J Gerry Weiner 6:55
Sometimes there's a requirement that you have to sign for the document, and I've had to go if I'm not home, make me go to the post office to pick it up. And that was a pain in the neck, too.

CD Cho, Douglas 7:08
The other issue to is one of cost. I mean, Federal Express is pretty expensive and frankly the employers get an advantage there and also the law firms. I mean, for them it's just a pass-through cost. So they're happy to do it and they have a staff to do it. The unions, most of the unions don't have the staff or the capability to Federal Express something late in the day to get it overnight the next day. And they don't have the budgets for that. So it's an additional burden on them that seems a little that they're not appreciative of, I'll say that much.

KB Ken Baldyga 7:44
I think you're misunderstanding.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 7:44
Then they should simply.

KB Ken Baldyga 7:45
I think you're misunderstanding what I'm saying. The only thing I'm asking or only thing I'm bringing up is that it says regular mail only if we can just remove that and leave it up to them whether they want to send it overnight. Regular mail, that's fine.

CD Cho, Douglas 7:59
What will happen I think is, the Parties with more assets will just routinely overnight things. They won't even do it the four days before, but they'll also do it the day before to get things there and the unions will send things by regular mail. Their stuff won't get there, and they'll be potentially prejudiced by that. But once again, if the board decides they want to do that.

J **Gerry Weiner** 8:24

Thank you.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 8:25

Well, tell the unions to send it earlier.

J **Gerry Weiner** 8:28

No, no, no. The question is, should we? Do we want to prefer regular mail as opposed to? Is why overnight is.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 8:41

Gerry, Gerry, you're breaking up. I'm not getting all the words.

J **Gerry Weiner** 8:46

Maybe, but anyway. Any better? OK.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 8:52

Yeah, just get closer to the mic, I think, Gerry.

J **Gerry Weiner** 8:55

I'm right here. OK. I'm on top of it. Do we want to suggest that they can do overnight mail, or should we leave that up to them? And when we say regular mail only, are we? Do we want to establish a preference just for regular mail as Doug has expressed reasons why we don't want overnight mail expense?

J **Gerry Weiner** 9:22

I need to go to the post office. And I think the way we have it; I think we want to prefer regular mail is something that I think is fair to the parties. Plus, what difference does it make? If we only get it the day of the only time, we have a problem where we have to continue cases when we don't have it at all. And they don't send it. Everybody gets on. Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot to send it. I have it here. Can I e-mail it in those situations when you're at the hearing and you don't have it? I think we, as in every neutral, has his own position on. This should say we need to have it at least before we start this hearing and therefore, we're going to continue the case for you

to get it to us. If I get it the day before what's the big difference? I don't look at it until the hearing anyway. Just as if we have an in-person hearing, we don't look at the exhibits until the minute they deliver it to us. It doesn't really matter. And because it's arbitration, we have this leniency on all, I think to give the parties the opportunity to have their day in court on the day we signed it, so long as we have it before we start the meeting. And I don't think that we are original if we put on the minute that we start the meeting. Case has to be. It's up to the staff to do. And my preference is always to have the hearing. I've even said OK e-mail it. Can you e-mail it to everybody at the arbitrators? Can you have an e-mail? Can you get the exhibits? Yeah, we get the exhibits that morning. What's the difference? It's like I was an in-person case. I would get it the same time at the same way. We'd like to get it, we prefer to get it earlier. Some arbitrators will look at it in advance maybe, but really, practically the rule is it doesn't make any difference whether we get it the day before or days before, 10 days before, or even the morning of the hearing. If it comes in the mail. I could be wrong, but that that's my preference. But I we can do whatever you guys want. We can take that out. We can just say by have it to the panel four days before the hearing and leave it out.

KB **Ken Baldyga** 11:32
Yeah.

J **Gerry Weiner** 11:33
If you prefer.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 11:33
Well, I think, Gerry, everything you said makes sense. But Doug, you might want to consider Ken's concern and you might want to change the instructions to say, should the parties wish to overnight the exhibits, please understand some arbitrators can't receive direct mail and/or overnight mail because they have a PO box. So if you're going to do that, please confirm in advance. Said the arbitrator's capable of receiving it. You know something, you know, just common sense. Just say, you know, if you're if, if you're not prepared in time, as you should be with this case and you, you know, you prepare it the day before. Make sure the arbitrator is able to get overnight mail. I don't know.

J **Gerry Weiner** 12:25

I don't know. You know the good thing about the rule, and I gravitate. This is against my position of getting these in advance. It does give the parties the opportunity to look at the file before the hearing and see what the kind of the case they have to see, hey, maybe I don't have a real anything to substantiate my position. Maybe I should try and settle it. That's the good news. It avoids getting the file out two hours before the hearing and looking at it for the first time. So there is some benefit.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 12:52

Yes.

J **Gerry Weiner** 12:56

To getting it in advance for the parties, not for us. It doesn't make any difference to us because really, how many guys look at it in how many men or women look at it in advance.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 13:02

Yeah.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 13:08

I do. But then I'm weird.

J **Gerry Weiner** 13:10

Yeah.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 13:13

Dennis, your suggestion is not a bad one except.

J **Gerry Weiner** 13:16

Hey, we agree with that one, Dennis.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 13:21

The Devil's in the details, Dennis, if we put out everything, we put in those form

letters, a lot of them gets disregarded one way or the other, for what it's worth, so additional complications are going to be...

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 13:35

Yep.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 13:40

.. Misconstrued and ignored, if we say in there, contact us before you overnight something, make sure the person who will get it. Well, what they'll do is they'll reach directly out to the arbitrator, which they should not be doing, or they'll ask the staffer to do it - can you please ask? So the staff will have one more thing at the last second of contacting the arbitrator to check and make sure they can get it. If they say no, they only have a PO Box, then they'll say well, can I have their home address? And some others don't want that, which is why they have the PO Box. We will be asking them hey, can they overnight this to your house? They'll say, well, no, I don't.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 14:16

Wait, wait, wait, wait. As a public official appointed by the Governor, of course they need to disclose their home address.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 14:23

Not necessarily for these mailings if, unless that's the policy you want to adopt.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 14:30

Well, it's a matter of public record.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 14:34

I know for a fact, notwithstanding that, Dennis, I know for a fact there are certain arbitrators that only have PO boxes, and that's all they want to disclose. So be it.

D **Dennis C. Murphy, Esq.** 14:46

Well, maybe. Maybe if they want to be an arbitrator, they need to have a home address.

CD **Cho, Douglas** 14:47

I suppose we, if that's the direction the board wants to take this discussion, that's sort of a different.

J Gerry Weiner 14:58

Hey, let me interject. It's 9:50. Some of us have hearings. I have a hearing. I know a couple of us have hearing at 10. So why don't we pass this and really think about it? Give it some thought on both of these valid points, but Ken has a valid point. Doug has valid points. Let's think about it and try and come up with something creative that satisfies everybody's position. To some extent. OK, we'll talk.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 15:21

Good suggestion.

J Gerry Weiner 15:24

We'll talk about this in between Doug and have conversations with us. Or we can definitely do it at our next meeting for sure.

D Dennis C. Murphy, Esq. 15:32

All right, move to adjourn.

J Gerry Weiner 15:33

OK.

CD Cho, Douglas 15:34

Thanks folks.

J Gerry Weiner 15:36

Thank you all. Is there a second by Peter? Have a great day, everybody, and I'll see a couple of you in a few minutes. Yes.

KB Ken Baldyga 15:43

You too.

CD Cho, Douglas 15:44

Take care everybody. Have a good day.