

Admin.

May 22, 1998

Memorandum 98-7**Meeting Schedule Considerations**

The Commission's schedule of meetings for the remainder of 1998 is set out below.

June 1998	Sacramento
June 4 (Thu.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
July 1998	San Diego
July 10 (Fri.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
August 1998	No Meeting
September 1998	Sacramento
Sept. 10 (Thu.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
October 1998	Sacramento
Oct. 8 (Thu.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
November 1998	Sacramento
Nov. 9 (Mon.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
December 1998	Los Angeles
Dec. 11 (Fri.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm

At the November 1997 meeting, the Commission requested the staff to prepare for Commission consideration a discussion of the possibility of replacing the monthly one-day meeting schedule with a bimonthly two-day meeting schedule. The staff has deferred this matter in anticipation of the imminent appointment of new Commission members. However, we now believe it is more important to establish a revised meeting schedule, if any, than to wait any longer for new appointments. This will enable Commissioners and others to plan ahead.

Over the years the Commission has adopted various meeting patterns, including bimonthly two-day meetings. There are advantages and disadvantages to each pattern. For example, monthly meetings allow more Commissioner continuity on study topics, while two-day meetings add flexibility in scheduling to accommodate consultants and other interested persons. The main

considerations — Commissioner attendance, staff work, and costs — don't seem to be affected much by the particular schedule. The statistics on Commissioner attendance show about the same attendance and quorum numbers for one-day as for two-day meetings. The staff has sufficient flexibility to accomplish the work under either pattern. Increased transportation costs for one-day meetings are offset by increased hotel and meal expenses for two-day meetings.

A two-day bimonthly meeting schedule may actually make a fair amount of sense with the Commission's current workload. A number of our active topics involve a great deal of staff work and relatively little Commission work — e.g., processing great volumes of statutory material for the Environment Code or for trial court unification. Our monthly meetings have tended recently to be a little light on substantive issues for the Commission. A two-day meeting schedule would provide flexibility to cut the meeting down to a day-and-a-half, or even one day, depending on the material ready for consideration by the Commission at the meeting.

One problem with a bimonthly meeting schedule is the need for Commission action on issues in the Commission's legislative program. We would handle this by using our standard procedure of consulting with the Chairperson and/or Vice Chairperson during the interim between meetings, with the opportunity for Commission review at the next succeeding meeting. Also, under the Open Meeting Law, we now have the option of holding a meeting by telephone conference, should there be a critical issue on the legislative program that requires immediate Commission review and decision. (In any event, we are now at the point in the current legislative cycle that it will not be a problem this year.)

If the Commission is interested in a two-day bimonthly meeting schedule for the remainder of 1998, the staff suggests the following (taking into account holidays, legislative schedules, staff vacations, and weather):

June 1998	Sacramento
June 4 (Thu.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
July 1998	San Diego
July 10 (Fri.)	9:00 am – 5:00 pm
August 1998	No Meeting
September 1998	San Francisco
Sept. 10 (Thu.)	10:00 am – 5:00 pm
Sept. 11 (Fri.)	9:00 am – 4:00 pm

October 1998

No Meeting

November 1998

Los Angeles

Nov. 19 (Thu.)

10:00 am – 5:00 pm

Nov. 20 (Fri.)

9:00 am – 4:00 pm

December 1998

No Meeting

We need to hold a July meeting in anticipation of a number of time-critical events, including wrapping up our report to the Governor and Legislature on Proposition 220 implementation (assuming enactment). However, **it would be preferable to delay the July meeting until July 20 (Mon.), 21 (Tues.), or 22 (Wed.),** if possible. This would allow interested parties, particularly those who have not previously seen our drafts, more time to review the massive Proposition 220 implementing legislation and respond before the meeting. The later date would also facilitate staff preparation of the Environment Code tentative recommendation and the Uniform Principal and Income Act workshop results for Commission consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathaniel Sterling
Executive Secretary