

# Municipal Research News

LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
SUCCESS

I'm Not Judging You:  
Handling Public  
Records Requests  
Related to the  
Courts | page 3

## ALSO INSIDE THIS ISSUE

1

About MRSC  
MRSC Trivia  
Question

2

MRSC  
Highlights

5

Ask MRSC  
Questions About  
Incompatible  
Offices

7

Lending a Hand  
Offering Public  
Employees PTO  
to Volunteer

9

Battery Energy  
Storage Systems  
– Coming Soon to  
Your Community?

## About MRSC

Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to proactively supporting the success of local governments through one-on-one consultation, research tools, online and in-person training, and timely, unbiased information on issues impacting all aspects of local governments.

For 90 years, local governments in Washington State have turned to MRSC for assistance. Our trusted staff attorneys, policy consultants, and finance experts have decades of experience and provide personalized guidance through Ask MRSC and our extensive online resources. Every year we help thousands of staff and elected officials research policies, comply with state and federal laws, and improve day-to-day operations through best practices.

Municipal Research News is published biannually to inform, engage, and educate readers about ongoing and emerging issues. In print and online at the MRSC Insight blog, we cover such major topics as the Growth Management Act and the ever-evolving complexities of the Public Records Act, to name a few. When the legal landscape changes, we are here to clarify the issues and help local government leaders access the information they need to better serve their communities.



## Washington Trivia Question

Washington's last stoplight on Interstate 90 (I-90) was located in which town?

Answer on page 10

Your ideas and comments are appreciated. If you have news you would like to share, please contact the editor, Leah LaCivita, at [llacivita@mrsc.org](mailto:llacivita@mrsc.org)

# Municipal Research News

LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
SUCCESS

Published by MRSC | [mrsc.org](http://mrsc.org)

## MRSC Board of Directors

President: **Brett Wachsmith**  
Vice President: **Kristi Rowland**  
Secretary: **Ben Wick**  
Past President: **Cynthia Martinez**  
Director: **Chuck Clarke**  
Director: **Kate Dexter**  
Director: **Norma Hernandez**  
Director: **Kevin Overbay**  
Director: **Laura Philpot**  
Director: **Dana Ralph**  
Director: **Kari Sand**  
Director: **Shelly Short**  
Director: **Dale Slack**  
Director: **Larry Springer**

## MRSC Staff

### EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Melanie Harding

### LEGAL CONSULTANTS

Harry Boesche, Legal Consultant  
Flannery P. Collins, Managing Attorney  
Sarah Doar, Legal Consultant  
Jill Dvorkin, Legal Consultant  
Linda Gallagher, Legal Consultant  
Julie Nicoll, Legal Consultant

### POLICY AND FINANCE CONSULTANTS

Leonard Bauer, Planning Consultant  
Steve Butler, Planning & Policy Manager  
Cheryl Grant, Finance Consultant  
Josh Klika, Procurement & Contracting Consultant  
Eric Lowell, Finance Consultant  
Lisa Pool, Public Policy Consultant

### ADMINISTRATIVE

Antoinette Avery, Accountant  
Eric Chang, IT Manager  
Aimy Enriquez, HR & Administration Analyst  
Theresa Gonzales, Rosters Coordinator  
'Ula Kamaka, Partnership & Event Coordinator  
Brynn Linville, Program Support Coordinator  
Lisa Lagerstrom, Rosters Program Lead  
Jon Rose, Finance & Admin. Manager  
Sandra Vong, Controller

### COMMUNICATIONS

Alicia Bones, Research Analyst & Writer  
Ingrid de la Jara, Communications Manager  
Steve Hawley, Research & Communications Analyst  
Leah LaCivita, Communications Coordinator  
Angela Mack, Brand & User Experience Designer  
Gabrielle Nicas, Information Specialist/Librarian  
Jacob Rice, Training & Outreach Coordinator

# MRSC HIGHLIGHTS

## Passing the Torch: Introducing Melanie Harding



MRSC welcomed a new executive director, Melanie Harding in October of last year after the retirement of former executive director Tracy Burrows.

Melanie comes to MRSC with nearly 20 years of non-partisan local government experience in Washington. Prior to joining MRSC, Melanie worked for almost two decades at the City of Tacoma where she held a number of roles, including Employment Standards Program Manager, Chief Policy Analyst to the Mayor, Assistant to the City Manager, and most recently, interim Deputy City Manager. Prior to the City of Tacoma, she worked at the City of Puyallup for nine years in a series of progressively more responsible roles. Melanie has a Master of Public Administration from the University of Colorado Denver, a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Washington, and an associate's degree from Tacoma Community College.

Melanie introduced herself via blog in November 2024, which we are excerpting from:

*It is an honor to join MRSC as its next executive director. While I am new to this role, my appreciation for MRSC and its 90-year history is not. In my nearly 20 years of local government service, I was often an MRSC customer who relied on and admired the organization's top-notch resources.*

*In this role, I stand on the shoulders of giants – from past service-minded contributors and executive directors ... to the talented, innovative, forward-thinking team that keeps the organization humming with supportive services and research today. I am excited to support the MRSC Board in furthering our mission of service to cities, counties, special purpose districts, and government partners throughout the state.*

*I am excited to build on MRSC's longstanding reputation and mission to provide trusted guidance and services that support local government success. Local governments today are working in a rapidly changing environment, often with increasing public expectations, and providing essential services with limited resources. I'm honored to join MRSC as a dedicated partner to you in this vital work.*

We look forward to this new chapter in our history and Melanie's leadership at MRSC.



# I'M NOT JUDGING YOU

## Handling Public Records Requests Related to the Courts

The Washington Public Records Act (PRA) has the laudable goal of ensuring transparency and access to the public records of state and local agencies. However, Washington courts have long interpreted the PRA as not applying to court records. Cases such as *City of Federal Way v. Koenig* (217 P.3d 1172, 2009), which reaffirmed the 1986 case *Nast v. Michels* (730 P.2d 54), discuss the difference between records created by the court and other records created by state and local agencies. Despite this, requests for public records related to a local court may make their way to a city or county that has a relationship with that court. How should a non-court agency respond?

BY SARAH DOAR, LEGAL CONSULTANT

### ACCESS TO COURT RECORDS

Despite the PRA not applying to the courts, the Washington Supreme Court has opted to make certain court records available under court general rules (GR). Records that relate to in-court proceedings (case files, dockets, calendars, exhibits, etc.) are governed by GR 31 for most types of cases. Access to family law and guardianship case records is governed by GR 22.

Administrative court records, meaning those records created or maintained by a court or judicial agency that relate to the management, supervision, or administration of the court or judicial agency, are governed by GR 31.1. Under GR 31.1(m), each court must adopt procedures for accepting and responding to requests for administrative records and must designate a public records officer (PRO) to handle such requests. GR 31.1 also contains the following unique provisions that substantially differ from those of the PRA:

- Attorney fees, costs, civil penalties, and fines cannot be awarded for a failure to disclose an administrative record.
- A court or judicial agency may require a deposit in the amount of the total estimated cost of providing copies for a request.
- GR 31.1 incorporates all of the exemptions to the PRA by reference and provides a number of unique exemptions for certain judicial records.
- A court or judicial agency may charge a fee of up to \$30 per hour for the research and preparation services required to fulfill a request taking longer than one hour (the fee may be charged from the second hour onward).

Chamber records, i.e., any writings created by a judicial officer or their staff, are not subject to public access at all, see GR 31.1(m).

MRSC has long advised that when a city or county receives a records request for court records, they direct the requestor to the designated court PRO who can provide the necessary access. But this guidance comes with a big caveat – cities and counties often have their own records related to the administration of the local courts.

### ACCESS TO LOCAL RECORDS ABOUT THE COURTS

There are close financial relationships between a county and its district courts and even closer relationships between a city and its municipal courts. Where a city contracts with the county or another city for court services there will be additional and often duplicate records that might be responsive to a public records request. A

city or county might have a great many records related to its courts, such as budget records, payroll, and emails between court employees and non-court city or county employees. Consider, also, all the records related to property management and premises security when courts share space in city hall or judicial centers. In all these cases, the PRA will apply to the city or county records related to the courts.

### RESPONDING TO REQUESTS

So, what is the safest way to proceed should your agency receive such a request for records “related to the management, supervision, or administration” of the local court? While reasonable minds may disagree, we believe a local agency should provide responsive records it has control over.

**Treat the request as any other:** Just because a records request sounds like it’s solely for “judicial records,” the safest course of action is to treat the request as a request for public records. Responding to public records requests presents an enormous potential liability for agencies, and trying to use GR 31.1 as a “shortcut” – simply referring the requestor to the court’s PRO – could cost an agency thousands of dollars.

**Set up a separate, secured drive:** If the court and city or county is sharing information technology (IT) infrastructure, one strategy for identifying actual “judicial records” is to set up a drive within an agency’s server that can be accessed only by an agency’s judicial officers and staff. The drive could then be used to store judicial records, as defined by court rules, when such records are created by judicial officers and staff. So long as those records are not shared with non-court agency employees, they should remain judicial records not subject to the PRA.

**Refer requestors to the court:** If an agency, in response to a records request, conducts a search of its records pursuant to the PRA and finds only judicial records that are responsive to the request (perhaps on a shared email server), then the agency should inform the requestor that it does not possess any responsive records under

the PRA since judicial records are, pursuant to the Washington Supreme Court’s decision in *City of Federal Way v. Koenig* (217 P.3d 1172, 2009) not “public records” within the meaning of the PRA.

However, in order to provide the “fullest assistance” in such circumstances, the agency should suggest to the requestor that they ask the relevant court for the records because that court, which possesses those records, will be able to disclose them in accordance with the relevant court rules.

### Consider the administrative burden:

A non-court agency should really think about whether it wants to take it upon itself to forward a records request to a court. Such a policy would create a new administrative burden for the agency that it would not otherwise be obligated to carry out. Specifically, the Washington Supreme Court in *Limstrom v. Ladenburg* (963 P.2d 869, 1998) noted that an agency does not have a duty to go outside its own records and resources to try to identify or locate requested records that it does not use.

### I'M NOT JUDGING YOU, BUT OTHERS MAY

As with most aspects of complying with the PRA, cities and counties can minimize their potential risk of litigation by adopting (and following!) clear policies and procedures outlining how they will handle requests that may involve court and other judicial records. Providing an explanation to the public in advance, such as posting the court records contact information along with your own records request contact information, may help requestors direct their questions to the correct agency in the first place.



Sarah Doar, Legal Consultant, writes on many aspects of government business, including compliance with public records and opening meeting laws, land use issues, and environmental law. [sdoar@mrsc.org](mailto:sdoar@mrsc.org)

# ASK MRSC

## Questions about Incompatible Offices

Every month, Ask MRSC receives hundreds of inquiries from Washington cities, towns, counties, and certain special purpose districts. The following is a sample of these inquiries and the answers provided by our skilled legal and policy consultants.

**Can a town mayor also simultaneously hold the town administrator position?**

To answer this question, we must consider the “doctrine of incompatible offices.” The doctrine of incompatible offices prohibits an individual from simultaneously holding two offices that are considered “incompatible.” Offices are considered incompatible when, by their nature and duties, it is deemed improper from a public policy standpoint for one person to simultaneously serve in both.

Courts apply this legal principle case by case, which can complicate the understanding, but despite this, one legal observation has remained constant since recognized in a 1960 Office of the Attorney General (AG) opinion: a person holds legally incompatible public offices if they simultaneously hold one office that is subordinate to another. AG opinions in 1983 and 2016 have reaffirmed this conclusion.

RCW 35.27.070 provides that all “appointive officers and employees shall hold office at the pleasure of the mayor,” so this makes an appointed town administrator clearly subordinate to a town mayor, which means the two offices would be incompatible.

However, the incompatible office doctrine does not prevent a town’s former mayor from holding a mayor subordinate position. So, the mayor could become the town’s administrator (assuming this person is otherwise qualified) once their mayoral term concludes.

**May a county planning commissioner run for the Washington State Legislature?**

We have a helpful table on our Incompatible Offices webpage, where we summarize case law and AG opinions on the issue. The table indicates that most county elected official positions are compatible with serving in the state legislature.

**May one person serve simultaneously as a commissioner on both the public utility district (PUD) board and the public hospital district (PHD) board?**

There is a two-part test to determine whether the doctrine of incompatible offices applies:

1. Does an individual simultaneously hold more than one “public office”?
2. If so, are the public offices “incompatible” with one another?

In this case, PHD and PUD commissioners are two public offices: The question is whether the two offices are incompatible with each other. In AGO 2016 No. 7, the AG recognized that incompatibility can arise in following two situations:

- Where one office is subordinate to another; or
- Where the offices, although separate and distinct, are statutorily interrelated such that one individual trying to simultaneously perform the duties of the multiple offices would give rise to inconsistent loyalties to the public.

While the first form of incompatibility would not apply, the second might. Since both a PUD and a PHD commissioner are policy-making positions at the highest level, there is a potential that incompatibility concerns could arise if interests of the jurisdictions become at odds in some situations. For example, the two governing bodies may have differing views regarding contract interests, such as with an interlocal agreement.

In situations like this, it is best to consider all potential conflicts of interest and consult with the respective attorneys for each agency.

**Is the position of city mayor incompatible with the office of a county planning commissioner?**

MRSC is not aware of an AG opinion addressing whether the office of mayor and the office of a county planning commissioner are incompatible. However, it does appear that there could be situations where the county planning commission considers land use policies or decisions that could have either a direct or indirect impact on the city (or vice versa). This would give a rise to inconsistent loyalties, which is one of the primary considerations for the incompatible offices test.

Unlike other legal conflicts, office incompatibility cannot be “cured” by the office holder recusing themselves from specific duties on a case-by-case basis. Instead, the legal remedy for incompatible offices is a court order requiring the office holder to vacate one of the incompatible positions entirely.

**Have a Question? Ask MRSC.** Call us at (206) 625-1300 or (800) 933-6772 or submit your question online at [mrsc.org](http://mrsc.org)

Ask MRSC

# LENDING A HAND

## Offering Public Employees PTO to Volunteer

BY FLANNARY COLLINS, MRSC MANAGING ATTORNEY

Many people find fulfillment in volunteering but struggle to balance it with work and personal responsibilities like family time and errands. Volunteering can benefit a person's life by improving physical and mental health, providing a sense of purpose, and increasing positive social interaction. Local governments can support employee volunteerism by adopting a carefully crafted policy offering paid time off (PTO) for employee participation in designated volunteer programs and events. This article will look at what an agency should consider before setting up such a program.

### WOULD A PAID DAY OFF FOR VOLUNTEERING BE CONSIDERED A GIFT OF PUBLIC FUNDS?

When employees are given compensation for something out of the ordinary, like PTO to participate in a volunteer event, the prohibition on the gift of public funds must be considered. Under this prohibition, a local government cannot bestow a gift or lend money, property, or the entity's credit to a private party, except for the necessary support of the poor and infirm. In determining whether an unlawful gift has been made, courts look to 1) whether the funds are being expended to carry out a fundamental purpose of the government; or 2) whether there is "donative intent" and adequate consideration for the transfer.

An employee's compensation package is not considered a gift of public funds, as the local government is, of course, receiving something in return: the employee's labor. As part of that compensation package, local governments can provide perks such as wellness incentives, employee recognition programs, longevity awards, and, yes, PTO to volunteer. Perks like these can be a win-win for the employee and the local government; they can improve an employee's physical and mental health and provide a sense of personal worth and community belonging – all of which can make a happier local government employee.

What about the potential "gift" to the receiving entity of the volunteer time? One way to address this is to allow the employee to volunteer only at those entities that support the poor or infirm. Another option is for the agency to focus its paid volunteer time off on nonprofits that operate in the local community or greater region, which would serve the municipal purpose of investment in the community or region in which the agency operates.

### STRUCTURING THE LEAVE: LESSONS FROM KING AND KITSAP COUNTY

In terms of how to structure the leave, one option is to allow employees to use accrued sick leave for volunteering. Both King County and Kitsap County use this approach. *King County Code, Title 3, Sec. 3.12.225* allows employees to use up to three days of sick leave each calendar year to perform volunteer services at a local school or at a nonprofit organization as long as it appears on the approved list for the employee giving program.

Kitsap County has crafted a slightly narrower policy in *Personnel Policies, Appendix R: Employee Volunteer Activities*. This policy allows employees to use two days of accumulated sick leave to volunteer in either their child's (or grandchild's) school or in a nonprofit organization that provides services to Kitsap County residents.



Another option is to identify this leave specifically as a community service day or as volunteer time off. Examples of this approach include:

- Maple Valley, Washington, which provides one paid 'community service day' to its employees per year.
- Mooresville, North Carolina, which provides up to 16 hours of volunteer time off to volunteer at schools, nonprofits, and charities within the state.
- Aurora, Colorado, which provides up to eight paid volunteer hours each year.
- Fairfax County, Virginia, which provides up to 16 hours of volunteer leave to participate in volunteer activities and initiatives that support neighborhoods in which the employees live and work.

### POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Regardless of what the leave is called, local governments that choose to give employees PTO to participate in volunteer activities must adopt clear policies outlining program parameters. Here are some tips.

**Keep the policy content- and viewpoint-neutral:** When creating a paid volunteer leave program, the government employer can adopt restrictions on the

types of nonprofits for which the employee can volunteer their services, as long as it does so in a neutral way that doesn't run afoul of the First Amendment (For this, be sure to have your agency's attorney review the policy language).

Kitsap County has developed a neutral policy by allowing volunteering at nonprofits that provide "services to Kitsap County residents," without favoring any specific type of nonprofit. Using these types of content- and viewpoint-neutral terms to describe eligible volunteer activities can help avoid claims of discrimination under the First Amendment.

**Consider restricting certain activities:** Another policy consideration is to prohibit volunteering for political activities or campaigning. Under RCW 42.17A.555, local government employees cannot use public facilities to support or oppose campaigns or ballot measures. The law includes the "use of employees of the office or agency during working hours" in its definition of "public facilities." Therefore, providing employees with a paid day off from work to volunteer for a political campaign or to support a ballot measure would be contrary to RCW 42.17A.555. For example, King County specifically restricts employees from political activities and campaigning.

**Make the program optional:** Finally, some employees may not have the capacity, desire, or ability to volunteer. Therefore, the policy should be clear that volunteer time off is an optional employee benefit and employees are not required to participate.

### CONCLUSION

Local governments can offer their employees paid volunteer leave after adopting carefully drafted policies vetted by legal counsel that identify how to properly use that paid time. While employee utilization of these policies is optional, they may nonetheless foster a sense of goodwill toward the employer and provide personal value to the employee, as well as provide support to community organizations.



Flannary Collins, Managing Attorney, writes on a wide range of issues including the Open Public Meetings Act, ethics, and personnel issues, Public Records Act and public records management, disclosure, and case law. [fcollins@mrsc.org](mailto:fcollins@mrsc.org)

# Battery Energy Storage Systems – Coming Soon to Your Community?

Demand for electricity as an energy source is increasing throughout the U.S., and with it, the promise of a more carbon-neutral future. But the demand for ever more electricity has had some unanticipated impacts, including the emergence of battery energy storage systems (often referred to as BESS).

BESS facilities are increasingly being used by energy companies to help store electricity and release it on demand. As BESS' popularity increases, there will be a corresponding increase in the need to find sites upon which to locate new facilities. In fact, several BESS facilities have been proposed in different parts of Washington State even though this relatively new type of land use may not be adequately addressed in local zoning codes. As a result, local governments need to be prepared when a BESS application is submitted at their permit counter.

## DESCRIPTION OF BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEMS (BESS)

In simple terms, a BESS uses large batteries to store electrical energy generated at one point in time and then discharge it later when needed. The City of Sumner defines BESS as:

[a] facility consisting of any combination of electrochemical storage batteries, battery chargers, controls, power conditioning systems and/or associated electrical equipment, including transmission lines, whether assembled together or separately, capable of storing at least 200 megawatt hours of electrical energy in order to supply energy at a future time to the electrical grid of a public utility provider(s).

The City of Arlington's BESS code provisions includes the following description:

Batteries are a unique class of energy storage system infrastructure. Because the basic unit is a small cell or pouch, a BESS is modular in nature and can be configured in virtually any size. Additionally, a BESS has relatively limited infrastructure requirements, needing a concrete pad to sit on and a connection to the electric grid. These two factors – modularity and limited infrastructure needs – mean that a BESS can be built virtually anywhere, including in close proximity to existing commercial and residential uses.

Larger than the batteries typically used in consumer goods and automobiles, as well as those used in individual charging stations for electric vehicles (EVs), an individual BESS unit (which contains several individual battery cells) is still fairly compact in size. Several BESS units will typically be grouped together in a container (sometimes referred to as a control enclosure) that measures around 10 feet wide, 10 feet high, and 30 feet long. Only one or two BESS containers may be needed to store electricity created by a small energy generator.

Individual BESS containers are often combined together on a single site to provide more storage capacity. Large-scale BESS facilities are sometimes referred to as battery farms, which are typically located near major producers of electricity, such as large solar farms or windmill installations.

## BENEFITS AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS

BESS is viewed as one component of the state's approach to clean energy, as these facilities can store electricity created intermittently by clean energy generators, such as solar panels. While solar panels produce ample energy during the day, peak electricity demand often occurs in the evening and the surplus energy gener-

ated during daylight hours is wasted. Solar panels combined with BESS allow an operator to store excess power and release it during peak demand times. BESS can also provide backup power to a facility in the event of an emergency, with less noise and without the harmful greenhouse gas emissions caused by diesel generators.

Regarding potential impacts, battery storage systems (particularly those using lithium-ion technology), can present potential safety risks, such as fire hazards and thermal runaway events. It should be noted, however, that national fire and electrical standards have been recently updated to address those risks. Aesthetics and noise are also among the list of impacts. Local regulations can mandate safety standards for the design, installation, and operation of BESS and reference the appropriate national and state standards.

## WHERE A BESS FACILITY CAN BE LOCATED

There are examples of BESS sites in Washington that range from one BESS container to large BESS battery farms. The modular nature of BESS means they can be sited in a wide variety of locations, based both on facility size and functionality of their associated primary use. For example, BESS that act as storage for solar panels will be located in close proximity to the panels – and the size of the energy generating facility will determine the corresponding number of BESS facilities needed. However, a BESS used as a back-up power generator for a single site will typically occupy a much smaller footprint.

Larger BESS installations will almost always be located outside to help address any heat build-up generated with clusters of BESS containers. Local zoning maps and codes can also influence where BESS facilities are allowed to be located, as well as requiring compliance with applicable performance standards.

## CONCLUSION

Given the benefits of BESS to our state's energy future, it is very likely that Washington will see a growing number of these facilities being constructed throughout our state. Local governments can play an important role by adopting proper standards and procedures to ensure that public safety, environmental protection, and other community concerns are adequately addressed.



Steve Butler, Planning & Policy Manager, has been involved in most aspects of community planning for over 30 years, both in the public and private sectors. Steve writes about a variety of planning-related topics, such as short term rental regulations, approaches to affordable housing, local government zoning, specialized impact fees, and the Growth Management Act. [sbutler@mrsc.org](mailto:sbutler@mrsc.org)



SPECIAL THANKS to Our Premier Sponsors

INSLEE BEST

OGDEN MURPHY WALLACE ATTORNEYS

## Washington Trivia Answer

The last stoplight on I-90 was located in downtown North Bend. On October 13, 1978, a new section of Interstate 90 – which bypassed North Bend entirely – opened to traffic. North Bend is also home to Twedes Cafe, made famous by the television show *Twin Peaks*.



Municipal Research & Services Center of Washington  
 OFFICE 225 Tacoma Ave S., Tacoma, WA 98402  
 MAILING 1712 6th Ave, Suite 100, PMB 1330, Tacoma, WA 98405

Nonprofit  
 Organization  
 U.S. Postage  
**PAID**  
 Seattle, WA  
 Permit #45



# MRSC TRAINING

## Learning For Local Government Professionals and Elected Officials

MRSC offers convenient online and in-person training across a variety of broad topics including finance and budgeting, government performance, management, public works contracting, public records act compliance, and land use case law.

### UPCOMING TRAININGS

**Reclaim Your Time: Strategies for More Productive Meetings**  
 Tuesday, April 15 | 10 – 11:30 AM | Online

**Digging into Public Works Fundamentals (FREE)**  
 Wednesday, April 23 | 9 AM – 4:30 PM | Lacey  
 Thursday, May 22 | 8 AM – 3 PM | Richland  
 Thursday, May 29 | 8 AM – 3 PM | Sequim

**Personal Services (Procurement Series)**  
 Thursday, April 10 | 11 AM – 12 PM | Online

**Public Records Act Basics & More - Virtual Workshop**  
 Thursday, May 8 | 9 AM – 4 PM | Online

**LEARN MORE AND REGISTER AT [mrsc.org/training](https://mrsc.org/training)**