



Citizens' Initiative Review Commission
Commission Meeting

◆◆◆
July 14, 2016

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present

Ernie Estes
Debby Southworth
Bob Russell
Robin Harkless
John Rakowitz
Kay Ogden
Molly Keating

Administrative Support Present

Sarah Giles, Administrative Coordinator
Wendy Willis, Policy Consensus Initiative Executive Director

Public Present

Robin Teeter, Healthy Democracy
Jacob Foose, Healthy Democracy
Jessie Conover, Healthy Democracy
Pat McCormick
Rebecca Tweed
Courtney Graham
Daven Rosenfeld

Call to Order

Chair Ernie Estes called the meeting to order at 1:00pm., Thursday, July 14, 2016, at the College of Urban & Public Affairs, Portland State University, 506 S.W. Mill Street, Room 710, Portland. Roll was called. One new Commissioner, former CIR moderator Molly Keating, introduced herself. Keating is filling out the remainder of Mary Forst's term, which expires in May 2017.

Approval of Minutes from Commission Meeting June 7, 2016

Chair Estes asked for any comments or corrections on the minutes. Estes notes that John Rakowitz's name was listed twice as present. Bob Russell moved to approve the minutes with that correction and Debby Southworth seconded the motion. All members voted to approve the minutes.

Initiative Selection for 2016 CIR

Estes noted that there was funding for one CIR for 2016 and directed Commissioners' attention to the criteria that they should consider in selecting a ballot initiative: the fiscal impact of an initiative and whether the initiative amends the Oregon Constitution. Commissioners engaged in a discussion on the criteria and CIR potential for each

of the six ballot initiatives that had submitted signatures to the Secretary of State's Office. Estes asked Commissioners to vote on which of the six would be their top three for consideration. Commissioners voted in favor of Initiatives 28, 65, and 67 as their top three for consideration.

Commissioners then engaged in a discussion about which of the three would be most appropriate for putting before a panel of citizens for the CIR. Commissioners discussed which a CIR process would provide the most benefit to voters. Russell moved that Initiatives 28 and 65 be considered as two final choices. Rakowitz seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted in favor. Commissioners then discussed the fiscal impact of both measures. Commissioners voted 4-3 in favor of Initiative 28 as the primary selection with Initiative 65 as the alternative selection should circumstances require it. Estes noted that Initiative 28 had qualified to the ballot.

Independent Experts Selection

Estes reminded the Commission that the Independent Experts Sub-Committee would be meeting on July 18 and any Commissioners were welcome to attend whether on the Sub-Committee or not. The Commission would be holding a public meeting for the Sub-Committee meeting.

Public Comment Period

No members of the public had a comment.

Other Business

Healthy Democracy's Robin Teeter notified the Commission that the 24 panelists plus alternates had been selected and HD would be conducting an online engagement with those who were not selected to ask them to identify one question about the measure to feed into the in-person panel. This new approach would create a larger sample of input from the public and allow for qualitative comparison with the in-person panel's questions. It would also allow for an opportunity for the in-person panel to loop back around and to describe how they engaged with the online group's question. The group Consider.It, which used to conduct a living voters' guide online in Washington state, will be providing the online engagement platform.

Estes adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:00pm.