



Citizens' Initiative Review Commission
Commission Meeting



11:00am, Monday, January 25th, 2016
College of Urban & Public Affairs
Portland State University
506 S.W. Mill St., Room 710
Portland, OR 97201

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Debby Southworth
Daniel Esqueda

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT PRESENT:

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

GUESTS PRESENT:

Lucy Greenfield, Healthy Democracy
Jessie Conover, Healthy Democracy
Christy Mason, Our Oregon

Call to Order

Jerry Hudson, Chair, called the meeting of the Citizens' Initiative Review Commission (CIRC) to order at 11:00 am., Monday, January 25th, 2016, at the College of Urban & Public Affairs, Portland State University, 506 S.W. Mill Street, Room 720, Portland. Roll was called.

Approval of Minutes from Commission Meeting December 7, 2015

Jessie Conover from Healthy Democracy requested to clarify a point from the minutes. On top of page 3, she suggested that the minutes read “The design team designed within the constraints proposed by Healthy Democracy and sought to determine whether a design of less than 5 days could be achieved while also improving quality.” Commissioners all agreed to approve this clarification.

Ann Bakkensen made a motion to approve the minutes from the CIRC Commission Meeting on December 7th, 2015. Ernie Estes seconded the motion. Commissioners voted unanimously to approve the motion. None opposed.

Commission discussion on CIR 3.0 Concept

Chair Jerry Hudson asked Conover to review the background, purpose and process for the CIR 3.0 concept. Conover explained that Healthy Democracy orientation was to draw on the past CIRs and research done to figure out what needs to be done in order to achieve a high quality CIR in less than 5 days. The design team set the 3.0 concept within the constraints of 3.75 days. Created a process that expands the process from 3.5 to 3.75 days. Doing so meant retooling the claims process (both the inputs and the process of editing those claims) so it is smoother and more manageable. The new design also integrates more subcommittee work. The new design also implements a research-based framework to improve the deliberation and statement quality. This framework is adapted from a model developed by a member of the research team. Those are directly reflected into the design as a framework on Day 2 and Day 3. Conover also went over the daily schedules of the 3.0 process. Other changes include:

- Change in the number of claims submitted by the advocacy campaigns from 15 to 7
- A lot of work in small groups
- Day 2 is focused on collecting information
- the design now includes a panel of “independent experts”, which are experts not affiliated with campaigns
- Day 3 is focused on evaluating information. This also includes initial statement drafting and increases the amount of time the advocates have to review drafts and provide feedback to the citizen panels. It also includes a fact-checking subcommittee which is intended to verify that facts are consistent with what was heard earlier in the process.
- Day 4 is focused on the work of the pro and con subcommittees, which are randomly assigned. The new design calls for them to create a paragraph statement rather than bullets using a template.

Ernie Estes asked for clarification on how the process accommodates combining statements. Conover stated that would occur on Day 3 but a clear mechanism for presenting the opportunity to combine statements is still needed.

Commissioners also discussed how the independent expert panels would work, particularly in whether it was advantageous to have the independent experts appear individually or together on a panel. Commissioners agreed that this would likely depend on the ballot measure itself and that giving the independent experts guidelines that they not talk about the measure itself but rather the background of the topic (such as national trends regarding that topic) would help to safeguard introducing any perception of bias. Healthy Democracy would ideally like to use Day 1 to provide independent information on a policy topic.

The Commission then discussed the criteria the legislation tasks the CIR to consider in balancing the panels. Past panels have achieved representation in the criteria listed as well as education level. Commissioners expressed concern about making sure that the panels represent the large group of voters now that the state has automatic voter registration, including an increase in previously underrepresented groups.

HD also shared the research team's responses to other questions the Commissioners had posed. Of particular note was that when the CIRs were held over weekends, there were more panelists who were employed outside the home but no other effects on other categories of representation. There was no comparative data on different levels of compensation though the Commission may want to know that in the future. The Commission discussed perhaps providing citizen panelists with the opportunity to waive compensation if they desire.

The Commissioners discussed the potential role for the CIRC to select independent experts with staff support. The Commission discussed potentially creating a rule to do so and perhaps allowing for Commissioners to recuse themselves if a selected measure relates to any of their backgrounds.

Commissioners decided to hold off making any decisions on components of the CIR 3.0 design until its March meeting. These include: length of the CIR process; number of panelists; selection of independent experts; and compensation for 2016.

The Commission asked staff to review the statutes and make a recommendation in March on whether and how to make any rules in regards to the CIRs.

Other Business

The Commission discussed the upcoming and current Commission positions, including two recommendations from the different party leadership in the Senate. The Commission discussed the possibility of rulemaking to allow members to serve temporarily until the Commission positions are re-filled with a specific time limit so the Commission could continue its business. Staff would present options at the March meeting.

Public Comment

There was no additional public comment made.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00p.m.

Prepared by: Sarah Giles, Administrative Coordinator