

Addie Smith: Okay, so we're all here for the Legislative Committee meeting with a committee of three, two members is in fact a quorum. So, we're going to begin our official proceedings and stick with the agenda. So, today is really going to be about sort of setting the stage for what the role of this committee is going to be, and more generally making some recommendations to the larger commission about sort of advocacy and the role of spokesperson. So, that's what we're going to talk about today, and we're going to kick off with a conversation around directives because it's been brought to my attention that it's not customary to have a charter for the OPDC, but it's rather customary to have directives. So, in Eric's absence, since he is not feeling well, Lisa, do you want to start us off on a conversation about the directives of this sub?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, thank you. For the record, Lisa Taylor, government relations manager. I'm going to go ahead and just share my screen of a memo that Director Kampfe sent over to Chair Nash back on the 1st. And that was really the creation of the Legislative Committee. Great. Can you guys see the memo?

Addie Smith: I can. Yes.

Lisa Taylor: Okay, great. And in addition, can you not see my Zoom screen? Because that was a...

Addie Smith: Correct. I can just see it. We've got it right this time.

Lisa Taylor: Great. Okay. So, as you can see, this memo was sent on the 1st, and it appoints members to the Legislative Subcommittee. That's Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Buckley, and Commissioner Lininger, and then Senator Prozanski, who's a non-voting member. And this memo also outlined some general directives for the committee to review and provide feedback around and recommendations of the commission's report due to the Legislature; review Senate Bill 337 from 2023 and ORS Chapter 151 and recommended legislative changes to assist the commission in its work; three is suggest substantive law changes that could aid in the work of the commission when appropriate; and four is to help shepherd legislative concepts through the legislative process. So, this is kind of just our very broad directives of this subcommittee. And from there, kind of based on these things is where we've set out kind of the policy discussions that I think is next on the agenda.

Addie Smith: Great. I think that makes a lot of sense. So, I think where we're going to start, and Lisa, you can correct me wherever, is with a conversation around some more formal policy recommendations around the policies we get involved in. And then we're also going to talk about sort of who is and isn't spokespeople, recognizing sort of Chair Nash's... Although we're going to use first names, I'm going to work on that as well. Directives, we're going to take up report review at our next meeting because we don't actually have a report coming for a while, so we have a little bit of time on

that. But with POPs on the horizon, we wanted to talk a little bit more about budget and advocacy first. I think this subcommittee is very excited about all the report reviewing we're going to get to do, so I don't want people to think that we've forgotten, but Lisa and I decided to hold off on that conversation until next time. So, why don't we start, Lisa, with the conversation around sort of the what policies we're going to recommend the commission weigh in on or not weigh in on? Does that feel okay to you?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, yeah, that's great. And in writing the policies, I think we've come across another issue with just language of that we're going to be talking about policies that the committee should consider about legislative policies that the commission might get involved in. [Laughter]

Addie Smith: Exactly.

Lisa Taylor: I will try and make it clear.

Addie Smith: Very meta.

Lisa Taylor: But please, yeah, let me know. So, we've got two policies that I think we need to talk about today. The first one is kind of about legislative roles, which is more of who talks to the Legislature and who represents OPDC. And then the second one is advocacy and the review process of legislation. So, that's when does OPDC get involved, and how does the commission take a stance on a policy or a piece of legislation? Do you want me to start with either... Do you have a preference?

Addie Smith: I suppose sort of who's going to speak...

[Crosstalk 00:04:49]

Lisa Taylor: Mm-hmm.

Addie Smith: ...going to be easier. So, maybe we tackle that one first.

Lisa Taylor: Okay. Great.

Addie Smith: I don't think it's particularly controversial, but I could be wrong, and I'm open to all kinds of robust conversation on any of these topics.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah. And I think for both of these, these are briefings on the agenda here, so this really means we're having a discussion about it. We can eventually take these policies to the full commission, and it'll be up to this committee of whether they want to approve these policies with edits or approve just maybe us going back and

editing them and then taking them to the commission or if you want another Legislative Committee to finalize these before taking them to the full commission.

Addie Smith: Let's hope it's not that last one. We'll leave room for wherever we land.

Lisa Taylor: Okay. Let me go ahead and share our legislation review process.

Addie Smith: While it's coming up, what the writing essentially is going to share that Lisa and I have been batting back and forth is the role of OPDC. There's always sort of an open question because of sort of what do we weigh in on and what don't we weigh in on? Do we weigh in on just the budget? Do we weigh in on substantive pieces of criminal, juvenile, or civil commitment law? And how do we then take positions? So, what the document essentially outlines is a more formal policy that says we will always weigh in on any legislation that is about the provision of public defense in Oregon. The structure, the system, the payment models, all of those pieces, that is an appropriate role. We will also always weigh in on the budget for public defense in the state. That is an appropriate role.

Then it sort of says with regard to substantive pieces of criminal law, etc., we will by default only weigh in to the extent that it will affect the public defense system or the public defense budget – so it sort of ties back to those two things that it really makes sense we should do – unless for some reason the board finds that substantive legislation to rise to a level that requires us to weigh in, at which point it would have to come through this Legislative Committee that would make a recommendation to the full commission – sorry, not board, but commission – and then by majority vote, the full commission could choose to sort of weigh in. But the default would be a strong preference to not weigh in on anything substantive for the time being. I think it's fair to say we have our work cut out for us with regard to just the system of public defense and the budget. And so making that really clear, I think our goal that Lisa and I talked a lot about was that will help the partners that we work with also understand our role.

Because historically, there's been sort of this question of will OPDC weigh in on substantive pieces of law, and if so, how? And there's been a smattering of informal and formal decisions around that. So, the idea is to make it really clear that the answer is most of the time going to be no. And if you think the answer should be yes, you're going to have to make a really good case to us about why we should go against our general policy. I'm seeing some nods, Tom, so I feel like this sounds like it's in line with what you were thinking. I'm hoping it doesn't feel too out of the blue.

Tom Lininger: No, that makes a lot of sense. I don't think we were appointed to give advice on the criminalization or decriminalization of X, except to the extent that it causes a great rise in demand for public defender services. I also think not only does that make

sense from the standpoint of just restraint and clarifying our role, but I think it would be impolitic for us to start weighing in on various bills if we haven't fixed the public defender system. I think people would be frustrated that we are allowing our mission to creep. So, I like everything you said.

Addie Smith: Great. I'm glad to hear that. It sounds like you and I are really on the same page about this. And to the extent that as you review sort of what we've written up in this briefing and it doesn't reflect that, that is just an error, not on purpose. But I think it sort of captures, my hope is the language captures what you and I are sort of both saying feels like the right direction for us to head, and I think having it in writing will be helpful. So, I'll give you just a minute to skim. And we'll certainly get this sent out if it hasn't already come in. I haven't checked my email since we started the meeting.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, it hasn't been sent out. I'm sorry, I...

[Crosstalk 00:09:30]

Addie Smith: Okay. You can't quadruple task all at once?

Lisa Taylor: [Laughter] Mona is on vacation, which is well deserved, but oh, man, she runs so many things around here. But yeah, that's kind of what we're doing with the background is trying to establish why we need policies around government relations and what our goals here are. And then just talking a little bit about where the agency is right now, and I think a big part of this conversation is expectation setting and recognizing where the agency and the commission is today. Again, this is a policy and hopefully this... Well, I don't know if hopefully is the goal, but eventually this might change. Maybe we will have a bigger role in policy discussions on substantive issues.

But right now, I mean, our government relations team is me. Us. We really need to kind of focus in on what we're doing. And it's not just my team. Our budget shop is limited, and we're really trying to get to what's in our remediation report of really getting a stable baseline before we're kind of growing from there. But again, we did want to recognize that some things may arise to the level where we need to get engaged, and Senate Bill 337 gives us that ability, right? The commission's able to advocate for not just a budget, but also policy with a majority vote. So, we also just kind of wanted to establish when and how people can get engaged. Director Kampfe, did you have something to add or were you just popping on screen?

Jessica Kampfe: I had my camera off because I was eating lunch. So, I was popping on screen. I did want to note that because of our name change, the whole agency is the Oregon Public Defense Commission.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, sorry.

Jessica Kampfe: So, I think it's helpful to say, like... I don't know. If the policy is meant to cover the entire agency, when the agency will weigh in and when the agency won't weigh in. And I think using the Oregon Public Defense Commission makes a lot of sense. To the extent that you're making a differentiation between the work that commissioners do during their commission meetings and the work that the agency does, when you're looking at a commissioner instead of the commission is [Distortion 00:11:58].

Addie Smith: What are your thoughts on that, Jessie, in terms of sort of how broad this policy should be? I mean, I think the hope is to set the stage both for the commission members and the agency, but also I'm open to you saying we're overstepping.

Jessica Kampfe: I actually think there should be alignment. Like, I think the reason that the Legislature gave us the same name is to break down that artificial divide between the commission and the agency and have us all working together. So, I would like for it to be for comprehensive direction. But I see here at some points that the agency recommends that the commission focus on advocacy. Like there's just some language pieces in there that I think [Distortion 00:12:46] make sure we're being clear about who's covered by the policy.

Addie Smith: So, just to state the obvious, it sounds like if we do some language cleanup in this document, you're really comfortable with this policy sort of overarching between the commission and the agency itself in terms of this is what we weigh in on for sure, these are the things we don't weigh in on, absent a majority vote by the commission about that.

Jessica Kampfe: I think that's right. I have a question about, let's say a legislator asks the agency to be part of a report [Phonetic 00:13:22] on something. Would the agency need to come inside of our commission and ask for a majority vote to participate in that work?

Addie Smith: I mean, the way I would read it would be that the agency could participate in the workgroup, but the information and the positions the agency could take would be limited to sort of, like, this is how it affects the budget, this is how it affects the public defense system. And Lisa wouldn't be able to say sort of just like Tom was saying. But policy-wise, we think decrim or crim or whatever you want to say is a great idea. It would have to be limited to the role delineated here on those pieces. I do think though you bring up a good point, which is if this is going to affect both the commission and the agency, here we have to weigh in on something substantively. It has to be recommended by the Legislative Committee. I wonder if we want to add "and sort of the government affairs staff." So, when it comes to the commission, it's both this committee of commissioners that says thumbs up, and it's your staff that

are also recommending, or at least getting the opportunity to weigh in on whether the commission votes for it or not. So, we're getting both perspectives.

Jessica Kampfe: I agree.

Addie Smith: If you want to scroll up a little, that might help [Distortion 00:14:43] hasn't gotten to see the section I'm sort of referencing.

Jessica Kampfe: It would be helpful to have the expertise from both sections.

Addie Smith: So, I think that very [Inaudible 00:14:56] paragraph.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah.

Addie Smith: Exactly.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah. And I would just add I'm not sure if... Because, right, the staff of the commission take direction from the commission. So, I don't know if it would be appropriate for the government relations manager to have, I know it's not a vote, but be able to give a deciding opinion. I think it would definitely be important to have them weigh in and be able to give advice. But I think ultimately it is a commission vote. Even if I were to say, "I think that's a terrible political decision," I don't think I should ever be in a position where I would have the power to prevent the commission from advocating.

Addie Smith: Yeah. I think the verbs we want use here are review and recommendation from this subcommittee, and review and input from government affairs staff, or whatever you want to sort of label your department. That captures that we want to hear from you. We want to know what you're saying. It's required at least to listen to you, even if we decide to throw your solid advice to the wind and move forward anyway.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah.

Addie Smith: And then I think Jesse, in response to yours, Lisa and I offline can tighten up the language here to make it clear that this is an umbrella policy for the agency and the commissioners, for lack of a...

Lisa Taylor: And I think some of that language also comes into play on the second policy about, yeah.

Addie Smith: Great point. So, Lisa, process-wise, I just want to defer to your expertise. We're not today making a recommendation to the larger commission about adopting this because we have it labeled as a briefing. So, we'll get these edits, we'll circulate it to Tom and Peter and others. And then our goal will be at our next meeting to have a

much more brief conversation where we sort of pass this with a do-pass recommendation to the larger commission or whatever. Is that fair to say? Is that right?

Lisa Taylor: I think that's the right policy. Again, I think Eric would be the person to officially give that, but I believe those would be the right steps, and I think that would likely mean we're bringing this to the July full commission. I mean, we could sneak in another meeting before the 6th, but I'm not sure if everybody's calendars are going to allow that.

Addie Smith: [Inaudible 00:17:41].

Lisa Taylor: Yeah. Okay.

Addie Smith: If anything comes up that is causing anyone's hair to be on fire about weighing in on some policy we can revisit, but I think we're okay at this point.

Lisa Taylor: Okay, great. And also just as some information, this is largely in line with what we've been doing in government relations for OPDC. We haven't really been getting in, at least since I've been here, into the nitty gritty of policy and whether we support or oppose it. I think you can even see that in 4002, which is probably the largest advocacy we took. We were still testifying as neutral, and Chair Nash and Director Kampfe's testimony was all largely about the impact it's going to have fiscally and just in the number of people we're going to need. But they weren't making recommendations around the policy itself, whether or not it was positive or negative, it was really focused on public defense. And so I think this is an align with what we're doing already. I think it's just going to be really good to have it written down.

Addie Smith: I love a policy on policy, so I...

[Crosstalk 00:19:02]

Lisa Taylor: [Laughter] Great. Okay. Well, I'll go ahead and stop sharing this one, and I will pull up our second one. Sorry, I even tried to close a lot of tabs before this meeting, and it's still just way too many tabs. [Laughter] There we go. Okay.

Addie Smith: Do you want to explain it, or do you want me to? I feel like maybe I stepped on your toes on the last one.

Lisa Taylor: No, no, you did a great job last time. If you want to go on this one, it should be policy regarding governmental communication.

Addie Smith: Only because I'm going to make you talk the second half of the meeting. So, I'll cover this one and give you a break. This one should be really obvious. It just makes really clear who can talk to the Legislature in their official capacity. It's the same sort of background of we don't want 13 different messages, we don't want 13 different people. The easiest way to control that is sort of having one designated person, and if that person isn't available, having it clearly delineated who that's going to be. So, it's going to default to obviously the chair, and then the chair and...or I should say the chair and Jesse and the government relations manager all have authority without any other permission. And then anyone else either needs to be given permission in writing by the chair if they are a commissioner, or if they're staffed by Lisa or Jesse or whoever has those roles into the future. It says in writing...

Because if you noticed, a lot of the changes to the bylaws by the Governance Subcommittee, similar designations there were also done in writing. And I think we all know email is pretty much sufficient these days to be in writing, but that way there's no confusion and there's no awkward moments of, "Well, Jennifer called me and said I could." You can just have it in the email. Not that it would ever get to that. I think we have a lot of amazingly responsible commissioners, but in the off chance. And then of course, recognizing that there are going to be other conversations that are had by commissioners, just really clearly stating that if you're not the designated person, you need to say, "This is not in my official capacity. This is not the official sort of perspective of the board...or the commission," I'm sorry, I keep flip-flopping those, in order to keep things consistent. So, I'm open to any conversation on this. It seems sort of obvious to me, but I want to know, and I certainly don't want people to feel silenced, I guess.

Tom Lininger: I agree that it's obvious, and I think what I've read is well-written.

Addie Smith: Great. Boy, bonus point. Thanks, Tom.

Jessica Kampfe: Addie, I've heard a lot of enthusiasm among commissioners to want to help in this space and to be able to reach out to their legislators and do education and talk about OPDC. And so I'm wondering if there's a way to channel that enthusiasm and resource in a way that's helpful and gives people good direction for how they can make a difference, even if they are not the designated or delegated individual to speak on things.

Addie Smith: Do you have any solution-oriented ideas? I'm open to, I mean, I'm racking my brain. Because what I'm thinking is if we want to do any campaign type work, we would want to do a legislative training with talking points and handouts and really encourage people to all be on the same page. And I would feel like in those moments, an email could go out from the chair that simply says, "Everyone is open to speak to their legislator and the three surrounding legislators on the following talking points in the following way." But I don't know if that addresses, I think the



meeting you're speaking of, I was unfortunately not present for, although I'm excited that people are excited about legislative advocacy, obviously.

Jessica Kampfe: I think that's a really good solution that if the agency is thinking about a campaign around something that's going to be a big lift, that this provision that the chair has to delegate would allow the chair to have a process for when people are ready to be delegated in terms of some education and some talking points and then put some limitations on it. But I can see the path to do that within the structure.

Addie Smith: I wonder if one of the things we could add though, Lisa, and I'm just thinking out loud, same with you, Tom, to push back is one more sentence here in the sort of recommendation around not just who the communications come from, but something around it'll be through these individuals and based on talking points crafted by or based on messaging predetermined. I'm not drafting out loud very well right now, but there's a way that could add that to, Jessie, to make it really clear that sort of just because you're designated doesn't mean you can talk about any and everything you want in your official capacity. Of course, you can in your personal capacity, but that your sort of designation means that you've agreed to bring forward the message.

Jessica Kampfe: Yeah, something about scope of that conversation.

Addie Smith: Yeah, that's a good way to think about it. I think scope and if we can, I know this is a little bit of an area of growth for the agency and the commission, but not just what you're talking about, but the how it's being discussed, like the framing. I think that...

Lisa Taylor: Yeah.

[Crosstalk 00:25:07]

Addie Smith: ...as a thoughtful addition. Go ahead, Tom.

Tom Lininger: I wonder if there's a way to say that designation cells [Phonetic 00:25:13] specify the designee and also the scope of what the designee may discuss.

Addie Smith: I like that.

Lisa Taylor: Great, as delegated in writing. Okay, yeah, we can work on something to... I think that's a good place for that.

Addie Smith: I like how you described that, Tom. I think that makes a lot of sense and it's concise.

Jessica Kampfe: I don't know if we need to say it, maybe this was just in statute someplace, but we wouldn't be weighing in [Distortion 00:25:52].

Lisa Taylor: You're kind of breaking up. I didn't quite catch that.

Jessica Kampfe: Oh, sorry. We wouldn't ever be weighing in on candidates for office, like for or against. And I don't know if that needs to be...

[Crosstalk 00:26:07]

Addie Smith: Interesting.

Jessica Kampfe: ...that is something that's being said, but we don't need to put it in the policy.

Addie Smith: I don't know. I think it would go in the policy we just reviewed. I don't think it hurts to say.

Lisa Taylor: I think part of these policies is I need to connect up with DAS and see what their policies are like and what they kind of are using. I feel like that's such a basic part of being a state agency that it maybe doesn't need to be said, but I'm sure DAS would have a policy. I mean, I know that they have policies on political activities for state employees, and I would think they probably have something for commissioners and board members as well.

Addie Smith: I'd be interested only because I think we're a little bit unique in that there are not a ton of state agencies with governing boards. There are some, but there aren't a lot of us, and I can see how a candidate would reach out to a commissioner and want their endorsement, and so it might be helpful to have it written somewhere. I'm more worried about commissioners than staff only because I can see both commissioners aren't in this every day the same way staff are with that kind of government knowledge, and also from the political standpoint, commissioners would be a better get in terms of an endorsement.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, let me look into what DAS policies look like around that and see if we can just wholesale adopt something they have.

Addie Smith: Great.

Lisa Taylor: Okay. Well, those were the two policies we had to discuss. Are there any future policies that maybe you want to get on the radar that we might need to start talking about?

Addie Smith: I think we probably want to have something about the reports, right?

Lisa Taylor: Mm-hmm, okay.

Addie Smith: How is this subcommittee going to review those, and then how is this subcommittee going to hand those off I think makes a lot of sense.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, and we can talk more about that during our timeline conversation a little bit later. Okay, anything else on these policies, or can I move on to our...

Addie Smith: Tom, are there any other policies you've been thinking we might need to have that haven't dawned on Lisa and I who have been working in a vacuum?

Tom Lininger: I haven't thought of any, but I will keep an open mind and see if we benefit from other policies. Thanks for asking.

Addie Smith: Yeah, great. Perfect.

Lisa Taylor: Great. So, our next agenda item is a briefing on the OPDC budget and POP listening session. We've been working to try and get a listening session, open house, whatever you'd want to call it, to just kind of go over with our provider community what the OPDC budget process looks like and the POP development kind of timelines. This would be similar to last commission meeting. You all received an overview of the budget process. It would start with a condensed version of that presentation, and then it would really just be mainly a listening session. So, in talking to Eric, this actually wouldn't even be an official meeting, so we don't have to worry about quorum and things like that. However, we will be treating it similar to an official meeting. We'll be making it a live event, and then we'll also be recording it and putting it online so people can view it.

But really, our goal here is to get feedback from the provider community about what they'd like to see in OPDC's budget and kind of compile all of that public information or public comment into a report for the commission for their June meeting. We have been having some scheduling conflicts. You all are very busy people, so finding a time that works for everyone has not gone super well. I'd really like to recommend that we hold this on the 28th, just because timing-wise, I think that works best. It's right before Legislative Days, but it also would give us time before the 6th, which is when the commission materials are due for the June commission meeting.

So, we would hold our open house on the 28th, and then we'd hold public comment open for probably a following week until the 4th, and that would give us a few days to compile all that public comment into a summary. I think it will likely include just sort of a tally of the top comments that were made and maybe a narrative around that. And I think that this briefing was really just an opportunity to let you all know that we would be hosting that and see if there's any objections to keeping it on the 28th, even though that might not be ideal for all members.

Addie Smith: I think the background on this is that the provider community has reached out and asked that we create a forum for more engagement around budget stuff, and so this is a first attempt to find a good venue for that. And it's an opportunity to use sort of the Legislative Subcommittee, since POPs and budgets are going to be part of what we do, as an opportunity to create that forum for listening. And I think the hope is continuing to improve communication in both directions with the provider community while also recognizing that sort of at our larger commission meetings, although we often and will always have public testimony, that we can start to funnel some of that testimony into these other venues so that there's more engagement and people's time is being used in meaningful ways, both providers and commissioners. So those commissioners who are going to build expertise in this area get more of a chance to interact with the folks who have spent a lot of time thinking about this. Is that fair to say, Lisa?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, absolutely.

Addie Smith: And I think, just not to be a stickler for words, but we should come up with what we want to call this.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah.

Addie Smith: We've called it like seven different things, open house, listening session. I'm not sure. I think I want to be sure that we're calling it something that really signals to our provider community that we're interested in their input and that we want to create space for them to have some of this dialogue. And I think what we've talked a little bit about, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that this is not going to be the commission sort of defending itself. It's going to be the commission saying, "This is where we're at. Now that you have a sense of where we're at, we're just going to sit back and really take in a lot of the information and then take that to the larger commission as we make decisions." Is that...?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, and I think listening session's probably the correct term for this. Initially, we host office hours sometimes and we were thinking about doing it then, but I think because it really truly is a listening session. In fact, that's what makes it not a commission meeting because you guys aren't engaging. I think listening session is the term, but...

Addie Smith: Great.

Tom Lininger: What...

Addie Smith: Go ahead, Tom.

Tom Lininger: Sorry to interrupt. What time did you have in mind for the 28th?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, we were thinking of having it during the lunch hour, so 12:00 to 1:00, just because we've heard from providers that the lunch hour is usually the best time for them to be able to make something. And we could also invite all of the commission to this listening session. So, anyone who can join, even if they're just jumping on for a bit, would be able to listen in.

Tom Lininger: Lisa, am I correct that this scheduling on May 28th eliminates the need to save those other dates that you talked about in our prior email exchange?

Lisa Taylor: Yes. Mm-hmm. Yeah, you can release the other dates. It was today and then this listening session was the other one we were trying to schedule.

Tom Lininger: So, I don't think Senator Prozanski's available at this time. Is that okay?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, that's correct. I think that's okay. Again, it's because it's a listening session and we're trying to make it pretty broad, and we're also going to be summarizing all this for the full commission.

Addie Smith: And I think, I mean, to state the obvious, is moving forward as we move towards other budget cycles, we'll do a better job of getting these on the calendar or notice and making them part of our regular practice before everyone schedules. I think that's the goal is that sort of before sessions and before budget deadlines, we're going to have these regularly scheduled listening sessions to gather this information and create a forum.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, I think that's very true. I also think that kind of ties into our calendar discussion, which is next, because I think a lot of what government relations and probably the agency as a whole is trying to work on is setting cadences and making things more predictable, which I believe ties into this scheduling. So, I'm going to share my screen. Is there anything else about the listening session or...? Okay, move on, okay. I'm going to go ahead and share my screen of this legislative calendar, and I want to kind of talk through the legislative calendar and then how it relates to the reports and LFO deadlines that we're working with.

So, this is a calendar that has all of the legislative events and Legislative Days, and then in green, we've added budget deadlines. Sorry about all the acronyms. This is more of an internal document that we thought we'd share to kind of give you guys a sense of the moving pieces and work that's going on here. So, I'm going to work backwards from May Legislative Days, which is coming up in the end of May here. So, in Legislative Days, we have a series of reports that are due that you all approved, and we have to work backwards from Legislative Days based on our LFO deadlines. So, you'll see that for May Legislative Days, LFO deadlines, Legislative Fiscal Office deadlines, we had to turn in our letter of intent to the Legislative Fiscal

Office back on the 22nd. And these are just letters saying, "Hey, we plan to submit the following requests or the following reports for the upcoming Legislative Days." And then the following week, your actual letter is due, and that has the details of what you're requesting.

And so because we have to work back to these deadlines, that means we actually have to come to the meeting prior to this deadline for approval of those E Board asks and reports. So, this means that we're submitting reports to the Legislature to be heard at the end of May that are being approved April 17th. And because of posting deadlines, the very last day we can get that in is actually April 10th. My goal is always to have it in two weeks prior, but the posting deadline is a week prior to that commission meeting. So, you can kind of see the backup that this creates for some of our legislative reports.

And this is also why we're working really hard to make sure the commission gets a briefing on a subject one month, and then the next month they're coming back to vote on it. So, there's time in between to get public comment, to have discussions about it, to think about it, things like that. And that's really not possible with legislative reports because if we were to do that, reports would already be due for the next quarter. So, I think this will work into the policy that we'll make around reports and how we get them. But I thought it was important to just kind of show some of these deadlines that are happening.

We have September Legislative Days, which again, if we work backwards, this actually works a little bit better because the letters are due August 26th, and we have a commission meeting on the 21st. So, we're getting a little bit closer to that, where the commission will be able to approve reports that we're turning in the following Monday. But then we get into things like we have September Legislative Days, and then we have December Legislative Days. But because of the holidays and things that happen around this time, letters are actually due November 4th for December Legislative Days.

So, going backwards, that means that they're going to need to be turned in October 2nd, or at the latest the 9th for reports that are being heard in December. And that is two weeks after September Legislative Days. So, you see how we can kind of get these backups going on. And I think having policies about review processes will help. I think our report system is also getting better as we go forward, and people kind of get used to the cadence of these reports being due.

Addie Smith: So, one thing we might say looking at this and thinking out loud, especially based on the kerfuffles we've been bumping up against with regard to people's schedules, is I think even without the report policy in place, we should schedule the legislative meetings you're going to need for these document reviews based on the timeline that you have now. Like through...

Lisa Taylor: Mm-hmm.

Addie Smith: ...I don't want to say a year from now, but at least eight months from now, I think we're better off to get them held on people's calendars. I can't speak for other folks' calendars, but I know the sooner you get on my calendar, the more permanent you become because then you're there and I won't schedule things. So, the longer we wait, the harder it is to be. So, I think we should really look out eight months and hold this subcommittee's time now, so we're not a wild card amongst all of these other wild cards for you.

Lisa Taylor: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I think that that'd be great. So, if the August meeting needs to approve reports, we need to post those reports by the 14th. Having a Legislative Committee this first full week of August would be helpful.

Addie Smith: Exactly.

Lisa Taylor: Yeah. Okay. Why don't I work on those dates and when Mona returns, she can help me get some invites out and coordinate calendars.

Addie Smith: That sounds perfect. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Lisa Taylor: Great. And this can also lead into our conversations about having these regular listening sessions or other stakeholder engagement processes.

Addie Smith: Yeah, because you're going to know those timelines. You're really on top of them. So, same thing, let's start to hold some of those well in advance for our membership and then help our...for those ones to help our providers know well in advance. I think that's really smart.

Lisa Taylor: Great. Okay. Well, that is my briefing on the calendar, unless anybody has any other questions or wants to see other dates. Okay.

Addie Smith: Great. So, that's sort of all that we have for this meeting is to set the stage. I will say if it's okay with you, Lisa, I want to share that one of the things Lisa has done is, turns out DAS has a style guide, so we're working on some of the pieces that have come up. So, there's a style guide we're going to be working with. Lisa's been putting together some templates and we've talked about, and we'll sort of present this at our next meeting, but just so everyone knows that the feedback has been received, sort of an internal review and proofreading process also. So that hopefully by the time it even gets to this subcommittee, reports will feel like they're in pretty good shape, but then we'll be that last line of defense before Susan gets her hands on them and tells us everything that's wrong. I'm just teasing. I wish I had her attention to detail, I wish...

[Crosstalk 00:43:54]

Addie Smith: ...but I can't. So, I'm not going to be the one that's helpful on that stuff. So, we're setting systems in place to take the pressure off of Lisa and give ample time for things to come to us in a form that we can be comfortable with. And it's also my hope that sort of having us go through them will make things at the commission meetings go much more quickly because I'm hopeful that the commissioners who have agreed to have us on the subcommittee will trust us for the most part. Not that they have to, or that we don't want to be questioned, but that it will streamline the process a little bit on some of those reports.

Because I know one of the things that I feel like is a difficult tension is right now, there's a lot of important work that needs to be done and the reports are required. And I'm worried that sort of the report writing is taking time away from doing some of the work that we need to be doing, both as a commission and as the staff. So, that's something that I'm trying to be mindful of and think a lot about. Tom, did we miss anything or is there anything you want to be sure to see on the next agenda?

Tom Lininger: No, this was a great way to set the table. Thank you for your leadership. Thanks to everyone else. The meeting went well.

Addie Smith: And we get to end early, which is always such a joy.

[Laughter]

Addie Smith: Does that sound okay to you, Lisa, if we adjourn? Did we get everything?

Lisa Taylor: Yeah, that sounds great. We did the whole agenda. Thank you so much.

Addie Smith: We'll finalize those documents. We'll get them circulated so people can read them before the next meeting when we take action on that. We'll come back to talk about reports, and we'll see everyone who's available at the listening session next week.

Lisa Taylor: Yes. Okay, great.

Addie Smith: Super.

Lisa Taylor: Thank you all.