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Ed: Hello and welcome to “Our American States,” a podcast from the National Conference of State Legislatures. This podcast is all about legislatures: the people in them, the policies, process and politics that shape them. I’m your host, Ed Smith.

“We brought activists and survivors and family members of those who could not speak for themselves alongside of conservatives, Democrats, lawmakers, attorneys to say: What is the bill that is uniquely Colorado, but that we know will move this issue forward?”

“And the tragic death and I think completely avoidable death of Breonna Taylor, it also involved reaching out to her family, to that community, talking with community leaders in places where policing is a really serious matter.”

Ed: Those were the voices of Representative Leslie Herod, a Democrat from Colorado, and Senator Whitney Westerfield, a Republican from Kentucky. Both are guests on the podcast.

The death of George Floyd in Minneapolis in May 2020 sparked a cascade of state legislation affecting policing policy. There were more than 3,000 bills that were considered in legislatures, and more than 400 were signed into law.

Herod discusses legislation she sponsored shortly after Floyd’s death that was one of the first pieces of legislation enacted in the nation. She also talks about how the death of Elijah McClain in Colorado galvanized efforts to pass the law.

Senator Whitney Westerfield is a leader in criminal justice issues in Kentucky where the death of Breonna Taylor helped spur action around no-knock warrants. He discusses how bringing all the parties together is critical to good legislation.

But first up is Amber Widgery, who tracks a number of criminal justice issues for NCSL. Amber talks about the trends in legislation, the bipartisan nature of the efforts in many places, and the surprising fact that legislatures are addressing policies that affect law enforcement at the local...
level. She’s also putting together a session on this topic for NCSL’s Legislative Summit Nov. 3-5 in Tampa, Florida.

Here’s our discussion.

Amber, welcome to the podcast.

Amber: Thank you so much for having me, Ed. It’s good to see you again.
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Ed: I’m speaking later in the show with Representative Herod and Senator Westerfield about their legislation affecting law enforcement policy. And as we know, it was the death of George Floyd in May 2020 that was the catalyst for these efforts.

But before we get into how legislatures have responded, I want to ask you about something you told me earlier, but I think may have been lost to a lot of people. As I understand it, state legislatures enacting laws to regulate local law enforcement organizations is really unprecedented. This is new territory in large measure for legislators. Can you talk a little about that?

Amber: Law enforcement in this country is largely a function of local government. There are about 18,000 law enforcement agencies across our country. Each state has a primary law enforcement agency that ranges in size from being a couple hundred officers to several thousand officers.

However, the vast majority of law enforcement agencies exist at the local level. They are your local city police department or your county sheriffs. So, in terms of policy and creating regulations for officers within your state, a lot of that is sort of delegated to the local level. And oftentimes, things like use of force policies are written and adopted by local law enforcement agencies themselves.

What’s interesting about legislative actions that have recently been coming up is now states are taking a larger role in law enforcement accountability or law enforcement policy more broadly. Beyond that local level regulation that I talked about, sort of the self-regulation, those policies that law enforcement agencies are trained to that are put in place, there’s also some measure of oversight from federal courts. But, again, not a lot of detail there; sort of just that basic constitutional threshold.

And so, states creating policy in this area are really working to ensure that as you drive across a state from city to county, from end of the state to the other end of the state, that you have a similar experience and a similar standard for law enforcement across the state as opposed to having different policies and different regulations as you go from community to community.
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Ed: I think that’s good context to have as we get into discussing the actual legislation. So, what sorts of measures have legislatures considered?
Amber: We’ve seen quite a surge of legislation across states. We’ve seen more than 3,000 new proposed pieces of legislation and now in September of 2021, we’ve seen more than 400 bills be enacted since May of 2020. That’s pretty significant in terms of volume of legislation that’s been considered. But I think it’s also really interesting to note the amounts and times of topics state legislatures are addressing as well.

Some of those early pieces of legislation really happened pretty quickly. States like Iowa passed legislation in a matter of days, or Colorado same thing, days and weeks. Real, incredible, bipartisan efforts to get early response legislation across the finish line.

Iowa was notable for having unanimous approval of that first bill in late 2020. So, things like that just don’t happen in legislatures. You’ve been around legislatures for a long time, Ed, and legislation passing through both chambers and being signed by the governor in a matter of 48 hours is kind of unprecedented. And that was the situation in Iowa.

So, those kinds of actions are really notable. The special sessions that we saw in late 2020 to address law enforcement at a time when our nation was also addressing a global pandemic, the priority that legislatures put on this issue—that’s what I think is really notable.

But in terms of other things that states have accomplished, we’ve really seen some pretty expansive legislation coming out of a number of states in the last year and a half.

**TM: 06:34**

Ed: It’s mind-boggling that 400 pieces of legislation have passed in that period of time on any topic. And given how many there were, maybe it’s unfair to ask you to identify a couple of trends, but I’ll ask you anyhow.

Amber: I would say the topline trend is accountability and we’ve seen a number of things that contribute to that, things like putting in place statewide standards for use of force, really focusing on independent investigation and oversight mechanisms that exist at the state level instead of at that local level, and providing state resources for training and things that include....

One example is a duty to intervene, so ensuring that officers are holding one another accountable as well. So, I think accountability is really that topline trend.

And then I think the other really notable trend is really just states taking on a bigger role in the area of law enforcement policy and states creating statewide standards in a number of policy areas, so that there’s uniformity across any given state.

Those are the two things that I think are the most notable about what states have been doing in the last year and a half.

**TM: 07:47**

Ed: Before I move on to talk about their work with Representative Herod and Senator Westerfield, tell our listeners about resources NCBL has to help inform lawmakers and the public who are interested in learning more about this topic.
Amber: Absolutely, thanks for asking that question, Ed. We have two resources that I think are probably the most helpful for the public or our members as well. The first is our legislation database and this is where we've been tracking those 3,000 plus introduced bills since May of 2020. Any bill that's been introduced since that time is being tracked in that database. You can search it, you can keyword, you can search it by state or by a list of topics that NCSL staff has identified as being key trends.

The second resource that I would highlight is our NCSL statutory law enforcement database, and what this is, is really a state of the state. It's a snapshot of state law as it existed in 2020. So, it really sets a baseline of where states were in 2020, and then you can use it in conjunction with the legislation database to see where some of those changes, more dramatic changes have occurred.

And I would be remiss if I didn’t thank Arnold Ventures for their support of those two just fantastic resources.

Ed: Thanks, Amber, for that legislative background. Now we’re going to talk with two legislators who moved legislation through their chambers to make changes in policing policy. I'll be back after this with our first legislator, Representative Leslie Herod of Colorado.
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NCSL’s Legislative Summit is back. Connect with your colleagues November 3rd through 5th in sunny Tampa, Florida to gain unique insights and practical knowledge and drive results for your state. Register today at www.ncsl.org.

Ed: I’m back with Representative Leslie Herod of Colorado. Representative, welcome to the podcast.

Rep H: Thanks for having me.

TM: 09:57

Ed: Representative Herod, Colorado was one of the first states to enact legislation following the death of George Floyd and the events that followed across the nation. Can you give us a sense of what that legislation sought to accomplish and if you’ve seen any changes yet?

Rep H: The intent for the bill was to ensure that we were holding law enforcement accountable when they do harm in our communities, and for decades, generations, we just have seen that it’s gotten worse; the issue has gotten worse. More and more people of color, low-income folks and just everyday people have died at the hands of law enforcement for no reason, and that’s when that needed to be changed.

For us, we had an issue here in Colorado with the murder of Elijah McClain, a very high-profile situation that only became high profile after the murder of George Floyd. And when we started to look and realize how we’re impacted right in our own yards and backyards, we knew we had to do something about it.
And that's why we brought the bill forward. It has a lot of different elements, but together all those elements I think made our system more accountable.

**TM: 11:01**

Ed: Your legislation, SB 217, passed with bipartisan support in Colorado. Can you describe your approach to getting everyone, including lawmakers, stakeholders, law enforcement, and external groups to the table, particularly around an issue many see as partisan?

Rep H: Absolutely. It is a partisan issue, but it also is just a very guttural reaction issue. Do you believe that there have been unjust murders of people in our community at the hands of law enforcement or not? And what we found was that, while some of the conversations were partisan, that belief and value was across the board.

While folks might love their own law enforcement in their communities, they also realize that there is injustice, there is racial bias, and that we needed to do something to address it. And so, we brought everyone to the table including those who were directly impacted by police violence. We brought activists and survivors and family members of those who could not speak for themselves, alongside of conservatives, Democrats, lawmakers, attorneys, to say: What is the bill that is uniquely Colorado, but that we know will move this issue forward?

One of the most contentious debates really happened around the qualified immunity provision, which we’re seeing of course play out in states across the nation and at the federal level. But in Colorado, we had Republicans come to the table and conservative organizations like the Cato Institute come to the table and say qualified immunity is a shield that does not need to be there.

If someone does wrong and acts outside the scope of their duty, they should be held accountable for that. And so, because we had such cross-spectrum support and stakeholders, I believe that’s why we were able to move the bill forward.

But additionally, all of those players were... and excuse me, law enforcement of course as well... but all of those players were also involved in every negotiation. So, we had very contentious negotiations, but having folks in the room, having the conversations together, understanding where compromises need to be made and where they don’t, and where values need to be really upheld was how we were able to keep our coalition of folks together and, in the end, have bipartisan support and co-sponsorship.

**TM: 13:26**

Ed: Now, that legislation is from the previous legislative session in Colorado, but this discussion has continued into the 2021 legislative session. Can you tell us a bit about what new bills and topics came up this session?

Rep H: I think that a lot of us who were really at the center of those negotiations, and myself included, realized that one bill was not going to be enough, that when we’re looking at police accountability, we really need to look at issues across the state, and there will likely be subsequent measures to address those issues.
While we wanted to get as much done as we possibly could in one bill, and I believe we did, that did not mean that we had a silver bullet, that no longer were law enforcement going to harm folks in our communities and no longer were they not going to be held to account.

And so, this session we looked at expanding our qualified immunity provisions, that of course eliminate qualified immunity to not only local law enforcement, but to the state patrol. And we also looked at our use of force standards and, of course, the use of ketamine, which was ultimately the drug that killed Elijah McClain, and make sure that all of those players also have accountability mechanisms.

We also put in whistleblower protections because what we saw was that our duty to intervene provisions really did have an impact on folks coming forward and reporting things that their colleagues did that were wrong. We wanted to make sure that those folks were protected as well – the ones who are really doing the right thing, making sure that they didn’t have retaliation against them. So, we put that in our bill too.

And so, we’ve moved forward with a lot of different provisions that, again, I think have a huge impact on the State of Colorado. The work still isn’t done. We will continue that work and I think because we have a foundation of supporters, we’re able to continue to have these conversations.

TM: 15:12

Ed: Well, you mentioned the Elijah McClain case, which those of us in Colorado are quite aware of. As you mentioned, McClain had an encounter with police in Aurora, Colorado and then was injected with ketamine by paramedics, and died shortly after.

In just the last few days, law enforcement officers and paramedics involved in the case were indicted. What are your thoughts on this latest development?

Rep H: I think that the attorney general did the right thing. There were many provisions in our bills, both 217 of last year and 1250 and 1251 of this year, that really did relate to the Elijah McClain case directly. Sheneen McClain, Elijah’s mother, has really been my partner in this work and been the moral compass, quite frankly, of the work that we’re doing here in Colorado, just to make sure that we’re not making some kind of statement for our egos, but really working to ensure that no mother will have to go through what she had to go through.

I’m very pleased. There was no way at the beginning of this that we thought this would happen, that there would be indictments. In fact, it was made clear by the DA at the time, who is no longer in that position, that there were not going to be any indictments, that there was going to be no further investigation.

And, instead, this attorney general who was working with me on law enforcement accountability said: Not only will we bring indictments against the officers, but we’re also going to bring indictments against the paramedics because ketamine in Colorado is now considered a use of force. And I think that’s real progress.
But additionally, he said it wasn’t just about those officers and their wrongdoing. If you remember, the protests around Elijah McClain’s murder started to really heat up during the Summer of Reckoning. What we saw was how the protesters were treated by the Aurora police department when they were having a peaceful violin protest.

And so, what we also saw was the attorney general restating and reaffirming his commitment to the pattern of practice investigation of the Aurora police department, saying that they are still under investigation as an entire department by the State of Colorado. And if their policies don’t change, they will be sued.

So, again, we’re seeing the impact of our legislation, not only in the direct legislation’s impact provision by provision, but also in the feeling of elected officials and community members stepping up and saying: no, this officer needs to be held accountable; this person needs to be held accountable for what’s happened in our communities, and we will no longer accept folks to wear the shield and the badge who don’t deserve it.

Our goal is to make sure that those in our communities who are sworn in to serve and protect are actually fit to do so.

(TM: 17:51)

Ed: As you suggested, this discussion about law enforcement accountability is continuing across the country. Where is that conversation going in the Colorado legislature?

Rep H: Well, like I said, the work continues. I think every time we look at one of these cases, open the hood as they say, we see that there is more wrong underneath the surface than we anticipated. There will be more work. Right. We know that we need to look at how special investigations happen in the first place. Why did it take two years for the indictments to come down?

Our special investigations process is flawed. Why does law enforcement get to police the police? That is a system that is continuing to perpetuate lack of accountability. And so, what are we doing to address that?

Right now, as I said, we have an attorney general who really values this work, but maybe the next one won’t. And so, what are the structures that we’re going to put in place to ensure that there is accountability when that’s a theory.

And there is so much more. I mean, we found in the Elijah McClain case that the coroner was having conversation with the law enforcement officers, with the department, before coming down with their determination about Elijah McClain’s cause of death. It’s just so ingrained, and the work must continue.

We also have to do more work to ensure that we have mental health first responders across the state, not just police responding to things that are not criminal issues. Elijah McClain was not even suspected of a crime. So, if we had someone different responding, I think we would have a very different situation.
And so, there’s a lot more work to do when we’re reimaging what public safety actually looks like, and we realize it’s much broader than just looking at the police, but really looking at community response, community infrastructure and community supports.

TM: 19:38

Ed: Before we wrap up, I wonder if there’s anything you’ve learned from this experience you’d like to share with your colleagues across the country.

Rep H: Nothing worth winning is easy, that’s for sure. This was a hard-fought victory for the community, for Elijah’s family, and I think for the State of Colorado. But it took everything we had to get these bills passed. Nothing happens that is going to make that kind of impact without sacrifice of all the players, and real commitment to change.

And I think it’s also really important that we put our biases aside, including my own bias of my Republican or former law enforcement colleagues, to say: What do you think we should be doing in this area? Because I do think we all share that value of making sure that law enforcement is held accountable, making sure that we only have officers in the community who we respect and trust. What can we do to get there? And I think that’s going to take ideas from all sides of the conversation.

Ed: Representative, thanks so much for sharing your experience and perspective on this important issue. Take care.

I’ll be back right after this short break with Senator Whitney Westerfield of Kentucky.

MUSIC and Male VO

Get a head start on your workday with NCSL Today, a roundup of the day’s most important state headlines delivered to your inbox. It’s just one of several NCSL newsletters that focus on the latest trends in public policy. Subscribe to NCSL Today or any newsletter by going to the news tab at ncsl.org and selecting e-newsletters. Be the first to know the latest on public policy news and subscribe to NCSL Today, today.

Ed: I’m back with Senator Whitney Westerfield of Kentucky. Senator, welcome to the podcast.

Sen W: Thanks for having me on, Ed. I appreciate it.

TM: 21:29

Ed: Senator, Kentucky was one of several states where law enforcement actions made headlines last summer. In your state, of course, much of the focus was on the death of Breonna Taylor. You’re a leader in Kentucky and criminal justice issues and I wonder what you thought was the best way to respond.

Sen W: I think the best way to respond to any sort of legislative issue is to talk to the people who are on the frontline of where this policy is going to... as they say, where the rubber meets the road.
In this case, talk to people in law enforcement. Talk to the folks that are involved in the tragic death and I think completely avoidable death of Breonna Taylor. It also involves reaching out to her family, to that community, talking with community leaders in places where policing is a really serious matter, where it’s on their minds a lot. Get their feedback. Understand where they’re coming from.

One of the best things you can do is try to put yourself in the shoes of those folks involved and help shape the best compromised solution in the middle. Most of the time, the work that you do is where there aren’t any really easy, bright-line rules that you can create. You’ve got to find something in the middle, and the only way you can do that and be informed is to talk to the people that are in that.

Talk to the communities most affected by policing, or that might be impacted by the policing reforms you’re considering in this particular case. We had a bill on search warrants and the execution particularly of no-knock search warrants because that’s what resulted in Miss Taylor’s death. And it took a conversation from a lot of folks. I think that’s the best way to do it.

If you go in there just because you’re convinced that you’ve got the best idea and you’ve got the solution because you’ve got all the experience, whatever, you are walking headlong into in many instances a really big policy mess with blinders on willfully. And I think that’s dereliction of your duty.

**TM: 23:21**

**Ed:** The Kentucky legislature did enact a few bills addressing law enforcement policy in the last year. Can you walk us through the key things those bills did?

**Sen W:** There are three that come to mind. Two of them passed and one of them didn’t, and I think the right ones passed and the right one didn’t. I mention Senate Bill 4. In Kentucky, we have this--and other legislatures might do this too--but in the Senate and the House, we sort of make the top 10 bills big priority bills. So, we reserve those bill numbers for something significant.

Senate Bill 4, sponsored by the Senate President himself, Robert Stivers, was aimed at how you deploy the use of no-knock warrants and then put some additional restraints and controls in place – you can only do it during certain times of the day. It required an extra burden not on the standard of proof for the affiant, for the law enforcement officer or the witness who is filling out the affidavit to get a search warrant, but for the judge to be accountable, to make sure that they’ve clearly signed their name.

Some judges sign like doctors do. Let you know who it is. When we’re in Louisville – that’s where Breonna Taylor lived – we’ve got dozens of judges. It could be confusing exactly on whose authority a warrant was issued.

Require the use of body cams, require that medical professionals be on hand should something go wrong. So, it put extra burdens in place that I think make it more responsible when you carry out a no-knock search warrant.
We had another bill championed by a career law enforcement officer who is my vice chair of the judiciary committee, Senator Danny Carroll from Paducah, a lifelong career in law enforcement before he retired and went on to do other work. Senator Carroll put a bill together, again, that took a lot of the stakeholder voices involved from law enforcement officers that are actually still working, to training law enforcement officers, state and federal officials, and, in fact, talked to other states, to come up with this way to address a problem that we see in the law enforcement community.

We see it in the medical field. We see it as an attorney, Ed, in the legal field. When you have somebody in some profession that does something terrible in state A, and after they quietly manage to resign or retire or whatever without a bunch of hubbub in state A, they move to state B. The history of that bad action back in state A, or that habit, if state B is not aware of it, they can hire that person and end up bringing a lot of that same sort of bad action with them.

This bill is addressing that and calls for some additional protections to make sure that people, when they’re going from one place to the next, their credentials are what they purport them to be.

The last bill, I’m glad this one didn’t pass. I think it had a lot of constitutional issues. But it was a bill to address rioting. Because of Breonna Taylor, because of George Floyd, because of Ahmaud Arbery, like a lot of places around the country we had a lot of protests, peaceful protests, but we also had some riots, and we had some civil unrest and some illegal conduct.

There was a bill aimed at enhancing the rioting penalties and enhancing what constitutes rioting, and some ancillary conduct that is attached to rioting. Based on the concerns that we saw here in Kentucky and other places and based on what we heard reported was happening, that people were being brought in, to riot who weren’t native Kentuckians, but were coming here to create problems.

I appreciate the intent, but there were a lot of issues with that bill and, again, once you heard from the stakeholders involved and the various groups, even the ones who hate the bill, not just the ones who love it, you see those problems. You see constitutional issues and first amendment issues, so that bill... to be clear, it actually did pass the Senate; I voted against it, but it passed the Senate, made it to the House, and died there. I think it needs a lot more work.

Those are the three big ones. There were other issues and there were various versions of each of those bills. But my goodness, when you look at the incredible resources that NCSL has, they’ve got a bill tracker – if you’re listening to this and you’re a member of NCSL and you’re not taking advantage of their resources, you are just missing the boat bigtime.

They track all of these various subject matters including bills related to policing and law enforcement, and there were hundreds and hundreds of these bills filed nationwide. That’s an incredible resource to identify what could work, what might work, get ideas and brainstorm about what you could propose with your stakeholders and constituents back home. It’s a fantastic place to get started.

Ed: Well, thanks for that. NCSL does have incredible online resources, and being able to see what other states are doing is helpful.
Sen W: No question. Huge, vast amount of information that NCSL provides.

Ed: Now, I understand you were recently appointed to serve on a taskforce on search warrants in Kentucky. How do you see that work being beneficial to your work in the legislature?

Sen W: This is an interesting issue. A lot of times when you’re in legislative work, at least in my experience, you end up going in and exploring new and novel issues, things that have come up that you didn’t realize were a thing. I’ve worked on various bills and proposals that are issues now, but no one ever heard of the problem 10 or 15 years ago.

Search warrants have been around for a long time. There’s a lot of refreshing that’s been involved in this taskforce. In fact, we’re recording this on Monday the 13th; we’ve got our next meeting on the 14th. This group is meeting to address not just the nuts and bolts of executing search warrants. Everybody in the group is either in law enforcement, is an attorney or a judge, or had experience in multiple places in that group. So, they’re all familiar with probable cause and the necessary steps to get a search warrant, the mechanics of it and some of the nuts and bolts and how it differs from one locality to the next, frankly from one judge to the next.

It’s incredibly helpful to make sure the process is smooth so that justice is properly served. We want to make sure that every warrant that’s issued is based on a genuine finding of probable cause, that there’s been a proper affidavit, that the system reflects the right information.

We’ve also explored the use of e-warrants, electronic warrants. We’ve had e-warrants in Kentucky for about a decade, but search warrants still aren’t part of that. There are a lot of different aspects to it, but the interesting thing is it’s hearing about something we all thought we knew pretty well going in.

I hope that the taskforce results in some actionable legislative goals that we can work on come January.

Ed: Well, it’s interesting you say this was sort of a reeducation effort for people who are pretty familiar with search warrants. I’ve read a lot of things and heard people talk a lot about search warrants who don’t seem to understand them.

Sen W: I don’t know about you, Ed. I see nothing but subject matter experts in my Twitter feed all day every day.

Ed: Policing policy is a topic on the table in many legislatures. A key focus of NCSL, of course, is sharing information. So, what advice do you have for your colleagues across the nation who are looking to work in this area?
Sen W: The two things that come to mind immediately: talk to law enforcement. And in some places, that might be really easy to do. In other places, it might be really politically challenging to talk to law enforcement.

Depending on where you stand in Kentucky, including law enforcement would be a no-duh sort of thing. In other places in Kentucky, if you include law enforcement, it’s a sign to some of your constituents that you’ve already sold out, that you’re talking to the bad guys.

But you have to talk to law enforcement, and I think on the whole you’re going to find folks that agree with a lot of the problems. I mean, they’re on the front lines. They live it and breathe it; their families live and breathe it every day. They can give an incredible perspective on what’s working and what’s not working and where improvement can be made, and changes can be made.

And then talk to that other side. Talk to the communities that are affected by policing. That might mean a rural community; it might mean an urban community; it might mean an African American community; it might not. Talk to those folks and do what every legislator ought to do, and I can do better – go in with an open mind.

We all have our ideas about what we think is right and what we think might work. But we have to recognize that we’re not all going to be subject matter experts on everything that comes across our desks. If you’re working on policing, talk to those folks that are most impacted by it: the communities that are being policed and the people doing the policing themselves.

And, again, I wouldn’t be afraid to look at other states and look at how their different areas of their states do it: rural versus urban, big city versus country is what I mean.

You’ve got to be willing to talk to those folks and hear what they’ve got to say. Just because you don’t always agree on things doesn’t mean it’s not a worthwhile conversation and that you can’t walk away having been better informed about the policy you’re drafting.

TM: 32:22

Ed: That certainly sounds like good advice. Thank you for that. As we wrap up, I wonder if you have any other thoughts you want to share about working in this policy area.

Sen W: How I ended that last question really is the best way: to keep an open mind. You’ve got your own sense of right and wrong and what you’re willing to do and accept, I guess. But you’ve got to be willing to hear what the other side is, whatever the other side is for you. The other side for you might be law enforcement. The other side for you might be the communities being policed, whether they’re Black communities, White communities, Hispanic communities, Asian communities.

Whatever it is, you’ve got to be willing to hear from that other side and synthesize all that information. And then, again, and I can’t stress this enough – I promise you all did not ask me to do this, and this is not the reason I’m on the podcast – check out NCSL’s resources from other states. Look at what they’ve done.
If you think your state looks a lot like state Y or state X, go look. You can see every bill on this subject matter and a ton of other subjects and see what they’ve done. And then I wouldn’t be bashful to reach out to those legislators.

One of the best things about NCSL and being a member and being active is the folks you get to meet at other places. I’ve got connections with legislators from Maine to California now because of NCSL and the various meetings and groups and sessions and just cold calls and cold emails to legislators from other jurisdictions just to see, you know, you passed this. This is your bill. Can you tell me what worked? Can you tell me what didn’t work?

I mean, as a state legislator, you’ve got an immense amount of opportunity to do a lot of good and to be really well-informed, and that’s what I encourage folks to do.

Ed: Senator, thank you for taking the time to discuss this important work. Take care.
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