



Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, Governor

Citizens' Initiative Review Commission

P.O. Box 9156

Portland, Oregon 97207-9156

Phone: (503) 508-0886

E-Mail: info@circommission.org

Web Site: www.Oregon.gov/CIRC

WHO: Citizens' Initiative Review Commission

WHEN: Monday, June 16, 2014– 1:00 P.M.

WHERE: College of Urban & Public Affairs
Portland State University
506 S.W. Mill Street, Room 511
Portland, OR 97201

What is the purpose of the meeting?

The purpose of the meeting is to conduct regular commission business. Please use appropriate language, manners, and protocols when conducting commission business. A copy of the agenda is printed with this notice. Please visit <http://www.oregon.gov/CIRC/meetings.shtml> for current meeting information.

Is the public allowed to attend the meeting?

Yes. Members of the public are invited and encouraged to be in attendance at all commission meetings. All public audience members are asked to sign-in on the attendance roster prior to the meeting. Comments may be heard under public comment at the end of the meeting. Please wait to be recognized by the Chairperson prior to commenting.

What if the board/council enters into executive session?

Prior to entering into executive session the commission chairperson will announce the nature of and the authority for holding executive session, at which time all audience members are asked to leave the room with the exception of news media and designated staff. Executive session would be held according to ORS 192.660.

No final actions or final decisions will be made in executive session. The commission will return to open session before taking any final action or making any final decisions.

Who do I contact if I have questions or need special accommodations?

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours before the meeting. For questions or requests call 503-508-0886. All members are asked to please give at least 24-hour notice if they are unable to attend the meeting so arrangements may be made.



Citizens' Initiative Review Commission
Commission Meeting



1:00 p.m., Monday, June 16, 2014
College of Urban & Public Affairs
Portland State University
506 S.W. Mill St., Room 511
Portland, OR 97201

- **Call to order**
- **Approval of minutes from March 10 CIRC Commission meeting**
- **Proposed rule re daily compensation for panelists**
- **Financial update and Sufficiency of Funds**
- **Preparation for Initiative Selection**
- **Compensation for Commissioners**



Citizens' Initiative Review Commission
Commission Meeting



9:00 a.m., Monday, March 10, 2014
College of Urban & Public Affairs
Portland State University
506 S.W. Mill St., Room 750A
Portland, OR 97201

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jerry Hudson, Chair
James Huffman, Vice-Chair
Ann Bakkensen
Robin Gumpert
Kay Ogden
Marion Sharp

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Daniel Esqueda
Mary Forst

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT PRESENT:

Tony Iaccarino, Administrative Coordinator

GUESTS PRESENT:

Sarah Giles
Roslyn Owen
Wendy Willis

Call to Order

Jerry Hudson, Chair, called the meeting of the Citizens' Initiative Review Commission (CIRC) to order at 9:02 a.m., Monday, March 10, 2014, at the College of Urban & Public Affairs, Portland State University, 506 S.W. Mill Street, Room 750A, Portland. Roll was called.

Approval of Minutes from Rules Hearing January 29, 2013

Marion Sharp made a motion to approve the minutes from the CIRC Rulemaking Hearing on January 29, 2013 meeting. Ann Bakkensen seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Approval of Minutes from CIRC Meeting January 30, 2014

Bakkensen made a motion to approve the minutes from the CIRC Meeting on January 30, 2014. Jim Huffman seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Review of 2013-15 Work Plan

Hudson presented a revised work plan for 2013-15, which included the following changes: (1) adding a brief meeting in mid-June 2014 to review sufficiency of funds, pursuant to ORS 250.149, to carry out duties of CIR Commission and to pay for statements to be printed in Voters' Pamphlet; (2) adding adoption of temporary rule regarding CIR panelist daily stipends as per SB 1544 for early July 2014 meeting; (3) adding adoption of permanent rule regarding CIR panelist daily stipends at mid-November 2014 meeting.

Ann Bakkensen made a motion to approve the revised work plan as recommended. Kay Ogden seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Financial Update

Hudson provided a financial update regarding revenues and expenditures for the 2013-2015 biennium as of March 6, 2014. He noted a current balance of \$20,999, reflecting no additional revenues since the last update on January 27, 2014, with expenditures since that time amounting to \$69 in banking fees.

Review and Approval of Biennial Semi-Independent Agency Report

Hudson introduced the CIRC's draft report, drafted pursuant to ORS 182.472, which requires that not later than April 1 of each even-numbered year (i.e. 2014), each semi-independent state agency must submit a report to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Legislative Fiscal Office providing an audit or financial report for the preceding biennium (i.e. 2011-13) as well as additional information regarding agency activities. As the CIRC only became a semi-independent state agency on August 2013, Hudson noted that the CIRC consulted with staff from LFO to determine the appropriate, though necessarily limited, content for the CIRC's first semi-independent agency report.

Huffman moved that the report be approved with minor changes reflecting any decisions made at the March 10 meeting regarding program and administrative services contracts. Bakkensen seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Review of Approval of Administrative and Program Services Contracts

Hudson noted that he had submitted the draft contracts for program and administrative services to CIRC legal counsel and that minor revisions to clarify specific deliverable were made.

Robin Gumpert moved to approve as drafted the contract between CIRC and Healthy Democracy for program services. Bakkensen seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Gumpert moved to approve as drafted the contract between CIRC and the Policy Consensus Initiative (PCI) for administrative services. Sharp seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

The CIRC heard from Wendy Willis, executive director of PCI, who requested that since the CIRC will likely undergo a statutorily required financial review in Fall 2015, that PCI not be held responsible for

any administrative activities occurring *prior* to the anticipated start of its contract with the CIRC on March 17, 2014. Huffman moved that Hudson draft and sign a “transfer memo” to PCI to that effect, on behalf of the CIRC. Bakkensen seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Legislative Update

Hudson informed Commissioners that the Legislature had passed SB 1544, which allows a number of minor changes designed to improve the efficacy and reduce the cost of the CIR process, while also lifting the 2015 sunset on the CIRC. Key features of the bill include the following: (1) decreasing the number of former moderators on the CIRC from four to two; and increasing number of former panelists on CIRC from four to six; (2) changing CIR panelist daily stipends from an amount calculated using the average weekly wage to an amount established by the CIRC by rule; (3) changing the length of the CIR process from five consecutive days (minimum 25 hours) to anywhere from three to five consecutive days (minimum 24 hours); and (4) eliminating the 2015 sunset on the CIRC and CIR.

Review of Proposed Administrative Rules

Hudson led a discussion of the best ways to proceed with future rulemaking regarding CIR panelist daily stipends. Commissioners settled on a process that involved obtaining input from former CIR panelists and potentially gathering data resulting from an independent county-level CIR pilot to be conducted by Healthy Democracy in May 2014, with the goal of adopting a temporary rule in July 2014 in time for the convening of the CIR process.

Commissioners then discussed the issue of whether to create any new rules regarding how to select measures to be reviewed by citizen panels. Commissioners ultimately decided that no new criteria were necessary at this time, but that the CIRC would likely take up the issue in 2015, in time for the 2016 CIRs.

After discussing rulemaking requirements, Bakkensen moved that Sarah Giles, from PCI, be appointed to serve as the rules coordinator for the CIRC effective March 24, 2014. Ogden seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Prepared by: Tony Iaccarino, Administrative Coordinator

TO: CIR Commission

FROM: Ann Bakkensen, Marion Sharp (via email), Robin Gumpert and Tyrone Reitman (Healthy Democracy)

DATE: June 2, 2014

RE: Suggestions for Temporary Rule on Panelist Stipends

On May 5, 2014, three CIR Commissioners (Ann Bakkensen, Marion Sharp via email, and Robin Gumpert) and a representative from Healthy Democracy (Tyrone Reitman) met to discuss the results of the recent Jefferson County CIR pilot and suggest elements of a Temporary Rule on Panelist Stipends.

Currently in Oregon State Laws 2014 Chapter 72 Section 2

- (5) The commission shall, from moneys in the account established under ORS 182.470:
- (a) Compensate each elector for each day served on a panel in an amount [*calculated using the average weekly wage as defined in ORS 656.211*] **established by the commission by rule;**
 - (b) Reimburse each elector who serves on a panel for travel expenses in accordance with reimbursement policies determined by the commission by rule;

Previous CIR Panelist Compensation

- Panelists were compensated \$750 for their participation
- Panelists were reimbursed for mileage according to DAS reimbursement rates of roughly \$00.55 (totaling \$6,143 in 2010 and \$7,165 in 2012)

Below is a summary of the work group's discussion and suggested elements that the CIR Commission might wish to establish by temporary rule for the 2014 statewide CIRs:

Jefferson County pilot results

Healthy Democracy shared that the Jefferson County pilot went very well and that while he's still waiting for complete data from the evaluators, he feels that it was just as high quality and there was just as diverse a panel as with the previous statewide CIRs. . There was a slightly lower return in responses, but this may also be due to the time frame (only 3.5 weeks versus 8 weeks notice) and that the invitation letters were sent on Healthy Democracy instead of State of Oregon letterhead.

Suggested Temporary Rule

Based on the results from Jefferson County, the Work Group suggests the following elements for a Temporary Rule on Panelist Stipends

- Panelist stipends: Daily stipend of \$100 for 3.5 days per CIR (basing the amount on recent relevant data from the Jefferson County pilot CIR and the flexibility to reduce number of days to 3.5). The CIRC would request that the evaluations for the statewide CIR include questions on the stipend to determine moving forward with a permanent rule in the fall.
- Travel: participants will be receive reimbursement for travel expenses (mileage, airfare, public transportation costs). Mileage could be set at \$00.14 per mile per the [IRS](#)

[standard mileage rates for miles driven in service of charitable organizations](#) [DAS's mileage for state mileage reimbursement is \\$00.56 per mile](#). The work group thought it would be worth testing out the charitable rate per the IRS and then again using the evaluation to determine setting the temp rule. The CIRC may need to check with legal counsel to make sure that CIRC as a semi-independent state agency does not have to follow DAS rules regarding travel reimbursements, since the CIRC is not a charitable organization. The cost of legal counsel, however, may outweigh the cost of simply reimbursing at the DAS rate (legal fees are roughly \$159/hour).

- Stipends and travel reimbursements would be issued separately in two checks.

Citizens' Initiative Review Commission

6/11/2014 2:05 PM

Register: US BANK Checking

From 12/01/2013 through 06/11/2014

Sorted by: Date, Type, Number/Ref

<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Payee</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Memo</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Deposit</u>	<u>Balance</u>
12/04/2013			DONATIONS:Individual Contr...	Deposit			3,518.64	3,518.64
01/13/2014			DONATIONS:Grants	Deposit			20,000.00	23,518.64
01/13/2014	1004	Safeguard Checks	B. CIR Commission Admin Ex...		60.27			23,458.37
01/30/2014	1001	DAS	D. Professional Services:State ...		1,249.00			22,209.37
01/30/2014	1002	DAS	D. Professional Services:State ...		18.77			22,190.60
01/30/2014	1003	OR Department of Justice	D. Professional Services:State ...		1,192.50			20,998.10
01/31/2014	Direct	US BANK	B. CIR Commission Admin Ex...		69.45			20,928.65
02/14/2014	Direct	US BANK	B. CIR Commission Admin Ex...		26.95			20,901.70
03/14/2014	Direct	US BANK	B. CIR Commission Admin Ex...		26.95			20,874.75
04/14/2014	Direct	US BANK	B. CIR Commission Admin Ex...		26.95			20,847.80
04/23/2014	1005	OR Department of Justice	D. Professional Services:State ...		1,033.50			19,814.30
05/14/2014	Direct	US BANK	B. CIR Commission Admin Ex...		26.95			19,787.35
05/29/2014	Direct	AT & T	E. Other	Telephone	37.34			19,750.01
06/11/2014			DONATIONS:Grants	Deposit			69,000.00	88,750.01

Current Day

Summary

CITIZENS INITIATIVE REVIEW COMMISSI

SinglePoint

Reported Activity as of 06/11/2014

Printed on 06/11/2014 at 3:52 PM CDT



Bank Name	US Bank Oregon
Account Number	153695265352
Account Name	CITIZENS INITIATIVE REVIEW COMMISSI
Opening Ledger	\$19,787.35
Interim Ledger	\$88,787.35
Collected + 1 Day	\$19,787.35
Interim Collected	\$19,787.35
One Day Float	\$0.00
2 Day Float	\$0.00
3 Day + Float	\$0.00
Total Credits	\$69,000.00
Number of Credits	1
Total Debits	\$0.00
Number of Debits	0



To: Jerry Hudson
The Oregon Citizens' Initiative
Fr: Tyrone Reitman
Healthy Democracy Oregon
Re: Donation to the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review Commission
Dt: 6/11/2014

Chair Hudson and Oregon CIR Commissioners,

On behalf of the Healthy Democracy Oregon Board of Directors, it is my pleasure to make a financial contribution of \$69,000 to the Oregon CIR Commission for the purpose of running two CIR's in 2014. In addition to this contribution to cover all necessary expenditures associated with the CIR this cycle, including the projected expenses for publishing the CIR Statements in the Voters Pamphlet, I would also like to convey that Healthy Democracy Oregon will be providing its own contracted services for running the CIR as an in-kind donation of approximately \$30,000 to the CIRC as well.

The funds, the \$69,000 deposited on 6/11/2014 and in-kind services of approximately \$30,000, are sufficient to run two 3.5 day statewide CIR's, similar to the highly successful CIR run independently by Healthy Democracy Oregon in Jackson County in April, 2014.

As with statewide CIRs run in 2010 and 2012, a full evaluation of the CIR process will be conducted by the independent research team headed by Dr. John Gastil and Dr. Katie Knobloch, and funded by the National Science Foundation. All details of this evaluation, along with moderator and panelist evaluations, will be made available to the CIR Commission to perform its own evaluation of the efficacy and utility of the CIR model. Thank you for your service.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Tyrone Reitman".

Tyrone Reitman
Executive Director
Healthy Democracy Oregon

	Statewide CIR 1	Statewide CIR 2	Total
CIR Event Expenses			
Panel Recruitment (list)	\$ 150		\$ 150
Panelist Mailing	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Moderator Fees	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,000
Event Rental	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 3,000
Event A/V charges	\$ 200	\$ 200	\$ 400
Event Misc. Expenses	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ 800
Catering	\$ 2,750	\$ 2,750	\$ 5,500
Panelists Lodging	\$ 6,600	\$ 6,600	\$ 13,200
Panelists Stipend	\$ 7,200	\$ 7,200	\$ 14,400
Panelist Travel	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000
Staff & Mod Lodging	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,000
Materials	\$ 250		\$ 250
Panelist Misc Exp (childcare)	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 200
CIR Statement	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	\$ 9,000
Project TOTALS	\$ 37,150	\$ 31,750	\$ 68,900

CIR Summaries

Initiative Title	Description	Constitutional/Statutory	Signatures reported (official)	Signatures claimed (unofficial, where available)	Media Coverage	Fiscal Impacts
Trap Free Oregon - POSTPONED UNTIL 2016	Bans use of traps for catching/killing wildlife, for either commercial or recreational purposes. Bans use of poison to kill mammals. Bans transaction of animals or animal body parts which have been caught via trap. Exempts use of traps and poison against common "pests" such as mice, rats, moles, ground squirrels, etc.	Statutory	POSTPONED UNTIL 2016		<p>June 2013 - Oregonlive: http://www.oregonlive.com/mapes/index.ssf/2013/06/sponsors_of_oregon_trapping_in.html</p> <p>Dec. 2013 - Mail Tribune: http://www.mailtribune.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20131226/NEWS/312260308</p>	Does not appear to have any
Stop Taxpayer Funding for Abortion	Prohibits state funds from being used to pay for abortions, except when federal law may require it or when it is medically necessary. Does not prohibit use of private funds to pay for an abortion.	Constitutional	not available	69,455	<p>Sept. 2013 - Politifact: http://www.politifact.com/oregon/statements/2013/sep/24/oregon-2014/does-oregon-health-plan-pay-about-4000-abortions-y/</p> <p>Sept. 2013 - Oregonlive: http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2013/09/anti-abortion_measure_could_wi.html</p> <p>Mar. 2014 - Oregonlive Opinion: http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2014/03/initiative_will_end_taxpayer_f.html</p> <p>Apr. 2014 - townhall.com: http://townhall.com/tipsheet/cortneyobrien/2014/04/16/oregon-prolifers-start-drivethru-pledge-to-stop-taxpayer-funding-of-abortion-n1825305</p> <p>June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos</p>	Minor. Oregon Health Plan would no longer pay for approximately 4,000 elective abortions per year for low-income women. State health monies unlikely to be impacted overall.
Right to Marry and Religious Protection Initiative - LIKELY WITHDRAWN	Strikes language in Article XV, Sec 5(a) which defines a marriage as a union between one man and one woman. Inserts language ensuring that two consenting adults may marry regardless of their gender, and that all legally valid marriages shall be treated equally under the law. Allows religious institutions to refuse to provide marriage services.	Constitutional	LIKELY WITHDRAWN	not available		Does not appear to have any

CIR Summaries

Oregon Castle Doctrine Act	Institutes a "Castle Doctrine" wherein property owners/residents are not liable for injuries caused to intruders or trespassers. Violence enacted in a person's home or business is assumed to be self-defensive and reasonable, including use of deadly force. Exempts the placement of traps/devices which are placed in a home specifically for the purpose of injuring a person.	Statutory	not available	not available	<p>June 2014 - KATU (Poll Data): http://www.katu.com/politics/Exclusive-poll-Majority-holds-Kitzhaber-accountable-for-Cover-Oregon-failure-262818611.html</p> <p>June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos</p>	Does not appear to have any
Right to Vote Petition	Requires any local law which seeks to raise or institute a tax to be approved by a majority of participating voters in a local government (local government defined in ORS 174.116). Includes ordinances, acts, and resolutions. Exempts laws which would raise less than \$750,000 over three years immediately following enactment.	Statutory	not available	not available		Would impact state and local fiscal procedures, but not necessarily funding.
Oregon Cannabis Amendment	Except in cases where minors or public safety are endangered, existing state criminal and civil laws would no longer be applied to the private use and production of cannabis and cannabis products by individuals over 21 years of age. The state may enact regulations or laws related to the taxation, sale, possession, or production of cannabis.	Constitutional	32,617	not available	<p>June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos</p>	Does not appear to have any
Oregon Cannabis Tax Act	Establishes a state cannabis commission which will issue licenses for the production of cannabis for commercial purposes. Establishes a set of protocol for the cultivation, distribution, and sale of cannabis products, and vests authority over these protocol in the commission. Replaces and supersedes all laws and regulations pertaining to cannabis in the state, except for those governing the operation of a vehicle while intoxicated and the Oregon Medical Marijuana Act.	Statutory	19,464	not available	<p>June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos</p>	Yes. Creates protocol for allocating money from the sale of cannabis to the commission, the AG's office, the commission's contractors, and the state's general fund.
Natural Individual Rights Initiative	Amends Article I of the state constitution to state that natural individuals hold and may exercise more rights than "artificial individuals," including corporations, governments, and artificial intelligence. Specifically notes that natural individuals may exercise an inherent right to privacy.	Constitutional	not available	not available		Does not appear to have any

CIR Summaries

Labeling of genetically engineered food III	Requires that any agricultural food product or processed food for sale which has been grown or produced with genetically engineered materials be labeled as such. Outlines specific qualifications and exceptions, as well as enforcement protocol.	Statutory	not available	not available		Does not appear to have any
Labeling of Genetically Engineered Raw and Packaged Food	Very similar to the above initiative, but with more specific guidelines for how to label foods, and who is responsible for the labeling. This initiative is more recent than the previous one.	Statutory	31,334	Not releasing data, expecting to qualify		Minor. A court may allow prevailing plaintiffs in civil actions under this act to receive funds to cover attorney fees and other costs incurred during the process of prosecution.
Tom McCall Day	March 22 will be Tom McCall day in Oregon to commemorate the former governor.	Statutory	not available	not available		Does not appear to have any
Equal Rights Amendment	Article I of Oregon's constitution will be amended to include a new section, stating that neither the state nor any political subdivision within it may deny or abridge equal rights on the basis of gender. Legislature may enforce. Does not impact Sec. 20, which states that no law may privilege a certain citizen or group of citizens without privileging all the citizens equally.	Constitutional	168,008	not available	June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos	Does not appear to have any
Control, Regulation, and Taxation of Marijuana and Industrial Hemp Act of 2014	Allows OLCC to grant licenses to qualified individuals to produce, process, and sell cannabis and cannabis products. Establishes privilege tax on sale of marijuana, outlines protocol for dispensation of monies from this tax. These monies are directed to schools, mental health services, police, local administration, and the OHA.	Statutory	83,588	not available	Mar. 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/mapes/index.ssf/2014/03/oregon_marijuana_legalization_1.html May 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/mapes/index.ssf/2014/05/oregon_marijuana_measure_gets.html June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos June 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/mapes/index.ssf/2014/06/marijuana_legalization_peter_1.html	Establishes new tax system for cannabis sale, would increase state revenue depending on the number of sellers and volume of sales.
Unified Primary Elections Initiative	Alters state elections procedures so that all voters may vote in a single unified primary election in order to select the two favorite candidates to advance to the general election. Applies to partisan and nonpartisan offices. Voters in primary election may vote for multiple candidates.	Statutory	not available	not available	Oct. 2013: Willamette Week - http://www.wweek.com/portland/blog-30782-mark_frohnmayr_proposes_open_primary_initiative.html June 2014: BlueOregon - http://www.blueoregon.com/2014/06/should-oregon-change-how-we-conduct-primary-elections/ June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos	Does not appear to have any

CIR Summaries

Open Primary Initiative	<p>Alters state elections procedures so that all voters may vote in a single unified primary election in order to select the two favorite candidates to advance to the general election. Applies to partisan and nonpartisan offices. Voters in primary election may vote for only one candidate. Establishes procedures for electing officials under various specific circumstances (such as vacancies, etc.)</p>	Statutory	not available	not available	<p>May 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2014/05/open_primaries_campaign_raises.html</p> <p>June 2014: BlueOregon - http://www.blueoregon.com/2014/06/should-oregon-change-how-we-conduct-primary-elections/</p> <p>June 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2014/06/open_primaries_campaign_picks.html</p> <p>June 2014: Portland Tribune - http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/223575-84349-voters-may-get-a-shot-at-pot-gmos</p>	Does not appear to have any
Alternative Driver License Referendum	<p>Allows state to issue "driver cards" to individuals who can not provide proof of legal residence in the United States, but who fulfill all other requirements of a licensed driver in Oregon.</p>	Statutory	not available	at least 70,000 (qualified)	<p>Oct. 2013 - Oregonlive: http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2013/10/oregon_driver_card_bill_headed.html</p> <p>Nov. 2013 - Bend Bulletin (opinion): http://www.bendbulletin.com/news/1276685-151/driver-cards-for-undocumented-dont-make-roads-safer</p> <p>May 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2014/05/may_day_oregonians_rally_to_su.html</p> <p>May 2014: Oregonlive - http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2014/05/driver_card_supporters_start_p.html</p>	Does not appear to have any

TO: CIR Commission

FROM: Ann Bakkensen, Marion Sharp, Robin Gumpert and Tony Iaccarino

DATE: January 15, 2013

RE: Information Regarding Advantages and Disadvantages of Various Ballot Measure Selection Criteria

On January 15, 2013, three CIR Commissioners (Ann Bakkensen, Marion Sharp and Robin Gumpert) and a representative from Healthy Democracy (Tony Iaccarino) met to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of additional criteria that the CIR Commission might wish to consider when selecting measures to be reviewed.

ORS 250.139(2) states the following: "In selecting a measure to be reviewed by a citizen panel, the commission shall consider the following criteria: (a) the fiscal impact of a measure; (b) whether the measure amends the Constitution; (c) the availability of funds to conduct reviews; and (d) any other criteria established by the commission by rule."

Below is a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of additional criteria that the CIR Commission might wish to establish by rule:

1. *Likelihood that the citizen initiative will qualify for the ballot, based on most recent data available from Secretary of State's office.*

PRO: To meet certain deadlines, the CIR Commission must select which initiatives to review *prior* to Secretary of State's deadline for certifying which initiatives qualify for the ballot, creating some uncertainty whether the selected initiative will indeed qualify. Fortunately, reliable data often exists from SOS to assist with making informed decision. Worth making this criterion explicit.

CON: Criterion perhaps implicit, therefore not worthy of including as administrative rule.

2. *Voter uncertainty, based upon an initial voter survey.*

PRO: Worth evaluating measures for which large percentages of voters are confused or uncertain. Recommended by Evaluation Report to the Oregon State Legislature on the 2010 CIRs. Might be determined any time voters respond "not sure" when asked how they might vote after hearing prospective ballot title.

CON: Same evaluation report notes that some initiatives might elicit clear expression of voter certainty yet have an underlying complexity, warranting rigorous analysis by citizen panel. Cost of survey.

3. *Issue complexity.*

PRO: Some measures have underlying complexity (e.g. technical or legal aspects difficult to grasp, deep values tradeoffs) warranting rigorous analysis by citizen panel. Recommended by Evaluation Report to the Oregon State Legislature on the 2010 CIRs.

CON: Potential difficulty of objectively determining which measures are complex. Potentially puts CIR Commission in position of determining which issues are complex, adding element of subjectivity to CIR Commission deliberations.

4. *Social impact.*

PRO: By focusing on current criteria, which privilege selecting measures with significant *fiscal* impact, Commission likely unable to select measures with significant *social* impact (e.g. relating to death penalty, gay marriage, abortion, gun laws, etc.) where the electorate might be divided based on competing social values.

CON: Potential difficulty of objectively determining which measures have significant social impact. Adding such a criteria perhaps not a high priority, as some measures with significant social impact will likely appear as *constitutional* measures, and the current criteria allow Commission to consider constitutional measures for review. Social impact criteria possibly too narrow and really should be subsumed under a broader criterion relating to issue complexity.

5. *Legal impact.*

PRO: By focusing on current criteria, which privileges measures with significant *fiscal* impact, Commission likely unable to select measures with significant *legal* impact. Recommended by Evaluation Report to the Oregon State Legislature on the 2010 CIRs.

CON: Potential difficulty of objectively determining which measures will have significant legal impact. Adding such a criteria perhaps not a high priority, as some measures with significant legal impact will likely appear as *constitutional* measures, and the current criteria allow Commission to consider constitutional measures for review. Legal impact criteria might be too narrow and really ought to be subsumed under a broader criterion relating to issue complexity.

6. *Voter preference, based upon an initial voter survey.*

PRO: Allows voters themselves to suggest which measures should be reviewed.

CON: Prior to campaign season, CIR Commissioners likely to have deeper awareness of initiatives for which CIR would be most useful.

7. *Random selection, once a pool of possible measures meeting basic criteria has been identified.*

PRO: Simplifies process for deciding on a final set of measures to be reviewed, once a pool of possible measures meeting basic criteria has been identified.

CON: Leaves to chance a process that might yield better results either through a decision-process involving consensus, weighted voting, or score sheet.

We also concluded that any voter survey used by the CIR Commission might have the additional benefit of raising voter awareness about the CIR process.

Regardless of which criteria, if any, the CIR Commission might choose to add (via administrative rule), we believe there would be some value in developing a template/score sheet to lend additional rigor to the ballot measure selection process. CIR Commissioners might also be encouraged to use such a template/score sheet, either as individuals or in subcommittee, in the period leading up to the meeting where final decision will be made regarding ballot measure selection.

STATE OF OREGON

TRAVEL EXPENSE DETAIL SHEET

Department of Administrative Services



1. Name of Employee		2. Agency		3. Period (Month and Year)	
4. Official Station		5. Division, Work Unit, PCA		6. Regular Schedule Work Shift <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other to	
7. Unrepresented <input type="checkbox"/> Management Service <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Service <input type="checkbox"/> Board/Commission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Volunteer <input type="checkbox"/> Bargaining Unit Name <input type="checkbox"/>		Other <input type="checkbox"/>			

Home Address:

Employee ID

8. Date	9. Time of Departure	10. Time of Arrival	11. Description	12. Per Diem/ Full Day	Individual Meal			13. Lodging (Less Tax)	14. Total Meals and Lodging
					Breakfast 25%	Lunch 25%	Dinner 50%		
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
15. Totals					-	-	-	-	-

16. (Office Use Only)			17. Date	18. Miscellaneous Expenses Fares, Private Mileage, Room Tax, Telephone, Baggage, Other	19. Total PVM Miles	20. Commute Miles	21. Reimbursed PVM Miles	22. Rate per Mile	23. Amount
PCA	OBJ	Amount							
							0.0	0.55	-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
									-
Totals		-					24. Section Total		-

25. I did did not X accept travel awards as a result of, or associated with this state business trip. Completion of this block is mandatory. Travel expense reimbursement claims will not be processed if this block is left blank. Travel awards included, but may not be limited to , airline frequent flyer miles and hotel or car rental frequent customer awards.

26. REASON FOR TRAVEL: (Be specific.)	27. Grand Total Amount	\$	-
	28. Travel Advance Amount	\$	-
	29. Amount Due Employee/State	\$	-
	30. Received Training	Conducted Training	

I certify that all reimbursements claimed reflect actual duty required expenses or allowances entitled; that no part thereof has been heretofore claimed or will be claimed from any other source.	31. Signature of Board Member	32. Title	Date
I certify that the above claimed expenses are authorized duty required expenses. Funds for payment of this claim are available in the approved budget for the period covered and have been allotted for expenditure.	33. Approved By	34. Title	Date