



Citizens' Initiative Review Commission
Commission Meeting



11:00am, Monday, December 7th, 2015

Teleconference Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Daniel Esqueda
Debby Southworth

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT PRESENT:

Sarah Giles, Administrative Coordinator
Roslyn Owen, Financial Coordinator
Wendy Willis, Executive Director, Kitchen Table Democracy (formerly PCI)

GUESTS PRESENT:

Lucy Greenfield, Healthy Democracy
Jessie Conover, Health Democracy

Call to Order

Jerry Hudson, Chair, called the meeting of the Citizens' Initiative Review Commission (CIRC) to order at 11:00 am., Monday, December 7, 2015, over teleconference. Roll was called.

Approval of Minutes from Commission Meeting September 28, 2015

Mary Forst made a correction in the last paragraph, noting April rather than June and clarified that a November executive session brown bag did not occur as had been discussed at the September meeting due

to timing of Healthy Democracy's CIR 3.0 concept. Forst moved to then approve the minutes. Ann Bakkensen seconded and all Commissioners voted in favor of the minutes as corrected.

Financial Update

Roslyn Owen, Financial Coordinator for the Commission, provided a brief financial update. Wendy Willis also reminded the Commission that the Policy Consensus Initiative, which is under contract to provide administrative support to the Commission, has changed its name to Kitchen Table Democracy, so payments from the Commission for administrative support are being made to Kitchen Table Democracy on a quarterly basis under the two year contract. Forst requested that Commission meetings continue to be held in person as the first option with teleconference as a second option for those who are unable to join.

Initial Review of Healthy Democracy 3.0 Concept Design

Jessie Conover from Healthy Democracy (HD) provided a brief overview of HD's review of the CIR process. HD's Board reviewed and approved the final design. She highlighted key features of the design: a 3.75 day process, prioritizing high quality info with a Day 1 introduction and panel of independent experts, reducing the number of claims, and the opportunity for panelists to create new claims with a template to guide them. No clear consensus emerged from the design review work on making a change to the vote count. HD's Board was considering looking at this further but was not currently recommending a vote count change. The design also does not address any changes in the number of panelists of compensation.

The Commission engaged HD in Q and A on the new design. HD explained that the reasons for reviewing and re-designing the process was to respond to suggestions from the research team on improvements and to continue to strive to make the process as strong and impartial as possible.

Administrative Coordinator Sarah Giles suggested using a meeting in winter 2016 to focus entirely on the design and eliminate one of the fall 2016 meetings. The Commission agreed to hold an additional meeting in winter 2016 to focus entirely on the new design and areas where the Commissioner might play a role ahead of the 2016 CIRs. In addition, Commissioners would formulate additional questions they would like the research team to provide information on ahead of that meeting. HD would coordinate providing the questions to the research team and the answers back to the Commission. A deadline for those questions would be set once the fall 2016 meeting date was selected. Mary Forst and Robin Gumpert volunteered to work with HD to formulate an agenda that would guide the Commission's discussion of the process design.

The Commission continues to have questions about how the length of time and number of panelists affects the panel's diversity. Marion Sharpe stated she wanted to make sure the CIRs were representing all the voices in the state and were utilizing the mechanisms available to ensure an equitable, fair gathering of all those voices.

Ann Bakkensen asked how the process design team arrived at 3.75 days as the Oregon confab seemed to indicate longer CIRs but fewer of them. Conover explained that the design team wanted to test out the 3.75 days and learn from that to modify for subsequent CIRs. Ernie Estes also noted his concern with the panelists' ability to raise new issues and how to accommodate that in the new process design.

Commissioners also discussed what role the Commission would need to play with the new design. HD pointed out that the new design does ask the CIRC to play a bigger role in selecting who would make up a panel of independent experts. A guiding question for the winter 2016 meeting would be what additional recommendations or rules does the CIRC need to make in order to carry out the 2016 CIRs.

Approval of CIRC Final Recommendation from 2014 CIRs

Commissioners reviewed the draft language for findings and recommendations from the 2014 CIRs per ORS 250.143. Robin Gumpert moved to approve the language. Kay Ogden seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted to approve it. The findings and recommendations would be posted by December 31, 2015 on the CIRC website (http://www.oregon.gov/circ/Pages/Initiative-Review.aspx#Initiative_Review_Evaluations_and_CIRC_Recommendations).

Public Comment Period

There was no public comment.

Other Business

No additional business was discussed.