

# Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources

**MEMO:** Agenda Item #4

**DATE:** April 23, 2020

**SUBJECT:** Discussion and Action: 2021 ENRTF Recommendation process due to COVID/Stay at Home

---

## Background

Given current directives that legislative members and staff operate and work remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic and the Governor's Stay at Home order, we want to make contingency plans for the LCCMR's 2021 ENRTF recommendation process. Below are options for each component of the decision-making process followed by two optional rough schedules for discussion.

### a. Meeting arrangements

LCCMR can be prepared to implement remote meeting technologies if needed. So far, it appears as if Zoom for the meeting combined with Facebook Live or House/Senate streaming to broadcast is working well for committees. LCC has secured a Zoom pro license that LCCMR is able to use.

If in person meetings are possible, we can be prepared to accommodate this along with a conference call-in option.

### b. Presentation options

- i. *Same as last year:* 126 presentations, 15 minute back to back for 5 days (including other business)
- ii. *Shorter presentations:* 10 minute back to back
- iii. *Fewer presentations:* 100 presentations
- iv. *No presentations*

If remote: suggest scheduling presentations in multiple 3-4 hour blocks (perhaps some in the morning; some in the afternoon) over a longer number of days.

Sample time slot and number of presentation scenarios:

Time	# Presentations	Minutes	Hours	Hours Per Day	Days
10	120	1200	20	7.5	2.7
10	100	1000	17	7.5	2.2
10	80	800	13	7.5	1.8
15	120	1800	30	7.5	4.0
15	100	1500	25	7.5	3.3
15	80	1200	20	7.5	2.7

### c. Presentation Selection options:

- i. *Same as last year:* members meet to select. All that were picked by at least 6 members were invited + everybody picked an additional proposal to invite
- ii. *Cumulative selections and time-slot based:* Presentation selections are based on members cumulative selections and the number of slots available with flexibility given to staff to address ties
- iii. *Co-chairs* choose

If ii or iii above, does the full commission need to vote on final presentation selections?

### d. Allocation decisions

## Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources

- i. *Same as last year:* members submit scores for each proposal that presented. Staff prepares mean and median calculations but uses median for making decisions. Members meet to decide which proposals to be recommended and determine allocation amounts through day-long process and negotiation.
- ii. *Score and calculation-based:* request member scores in advance as well as allocation amount. Draft package is prepared based on median scores and the allocation amount determined by those scoring median and above. Members meet to review and vote.
- iii. *Co-chairs* determine draft package for member review and vote

### e. Schedule

- i. Two different scenarios would be possible to finish process as soon as possible
- ii. One or the other would need to be identified. Options within each scenario could be determined by polling. The dates receiving the most “votes” would be selected.

Step/Meeting	Scenario 1 options	Scenario 2 options
Member proposal evaluations	Early to mid-June	Mid- to late June
FY 22 Presentation and FY 21 work plan approval meeting	7/1	7/7-7/9; Pick one
Presentations meetings (spread over 2 weeks):	7/20-24; pick 3* 7/27-31; pick 3*	7/27-31; pick 3* 8/3-7 but not 5th (LSOHC); pick 3*
Allocation meeting	8/11-14; pick 1	8/18-20; pick 1

\*depends on number of time slots the members choose under item b.

### Action

Motion to pursue the following for each step:

- b. Presentations: X number of presentations, X time slots, and X number of days with flex to staff to accommodate ties
- c. Presentation selection decisions:
- d. Allocation/Recommendation decisions:
- e. Schedule: Scenario X with a poll to determine availability of most members for options within that scenario