

**Charter Review Commission (CRC) Regular Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, June 9, 2021**

**1. Call to Order – 4:05 pm**

**2. Roll Call:**

In attendance: Patty, Paul, Janet, Kevin, Anne Marie, Maureen, Bill, Dave A, Sharon, Tom, David D, Tony, Liz, Dick, Bob, Olivia (Absent: Jane, Kyle)

Members of the Public, Randy Gaylord, Christine Minney, Minor Lile, Milene Henley, Cindy C, Linnea Anderson, Kelley Unger

**3. Approve minutes:** Approved as amended\* with one abstention (Janet)

\*Dave made a comment not reflected in the minutes. He will send this language to Sharon to add to the June 3 minutes.

**4. Updates from Committees on amendments and recommendations:**

Initiative & Referendum Committee - Patty:

She sent language to Megan, not bullet points. Megan is working on it.

3 Amendments: 1) Reducing the number of signatures, s) to remove financial requirement, and 3) to regulate signature gatherers.

Elected v. Appointed Committee - Maureen:

Amendment re Term Limits – sent fact sheet to Megan and Kevin – sent issue, recommendation, language for the amendment, still putting together a list of bullet points. Hoping it will be on the 2021 ballot – the perfect thing for the voters for a chance to have to read and act on.

Process Committee – Bob:

He filled out the fact sheets with title, issue, amendment, recommendation and findings for: 1) Preamble, 2) CRC budget & provisions, and 3) Declaration of Community Values, with all the language. He sent all this to Megan last weekend.

Climate & Environment Committee - Anne Marie:

She sent the changed draft amendments for the C&E Commissioner to Megan this afternoon. Additional language for the fact sheet will go to Megan this evening.

Justice & Equity Committee – Note: Jane and Kyle were absent from this meeting. Megan said they're working on the fact sheet. She believes she has the final documentation on the amendment from them. **She needs the boiled down version for the fact sheet. She has the Tribal acknowledgment but doesn't have the fact sheet language for that yet.**

**Ranked Choice Voting: Sharon will do the language for RCV.**

**Megan needs a condensed version for the fact sheet for the C&E Commissioner.** Please be mindful of using correct terminology - Findings are the supporting information for the amendments.

**Paul and Maureen will get Megan the Public Advocate amendment and fact sheet language.**

Tourism – Megan has it more or less – still working on the fact sheet for that. She's got what she needs for it.

Elections Observations – Megan doesn't have it – **Tony will send it to her.**

**Megan doesn't have the Law & Justice language.**

**Bob will send Megan the Declaration of Community Values language after this meeting.**

Fact Sheets, for the general public, will be on the county website - talking points: This is the problem, this is why we need to act on it, and this is the solution we proposed.

Kevin: Randy and Amy would rather have more info now so they can get working on it, even things we may put off to next year. What we're getting from Megan is very close to a finished product. We can send items to Randy individually – we don't need to wait to have everything together.

**Megan will send the language back to the subcommittees and then Kevin will send it on to Randy.**

Megan: **Be super careful not to miss an edit in our final documents. Kevin and Olivia need to keep a file of what the final version is that goes to the Prosecuting Attorney's office – we need to be really clean about the documents.**

Randy doesn't need findings or bullet points - only the Charter amendment.

Olivia: **Save Documents with the date on them - that's the easiest way to keep track of the edits.**

## **5. Discussion of timing of remaining CRC work:**

Kevin: Wants to finish up in the next week-and-a-half to two weeks.

Discussion about revisiting decision to distribute amendments over two ballots (2021 & 2022), including:

- Kevin: The Executive Committee made recommendations for timeline that were adopted by full CRC for which amendments would be on the 2021 and which would be on the 2022 ballot. Do we want to take another crack at this, and try to further reduce the number of amendments we're putting forward?
- Patty: Would now like to see everything go on the ballot this year - thinks the public can handle 11 amendments. Mail-in ballots provide people with a lot of time to look them over.
- Bob put the amendments into groups that seem related - came up with 5 groups of amendments. Putting budget aside, only 4 groups. Asked some friends how many ballot measures they thought they could vote on – everyone said “one”.
- Kevin: Doesn't believe these can all be combined. Grouping them will produce voter fatigue. A lot of people don't vote down the ballot. Wouldn't support 11 amendments on one ballot.
- Maureen thought Public Advocate was going to be a recommendation – revisit that.
- Kevin: Executive Committee could take a second crack at this to reduce the number of amendments –some amendments might become recommendations, might drop one or two amendments.
- Tom: Each proposition has to be limited to a certain subject – wants to hear from Bob and Bill as to whether or not they're combinable.

- Bill: The issue is subject matter. Those things could be packaged if done well. Worth looking at the others for common denominators. Ultimately, Randy has to advise us on how to package this.
- Randy: Possible that all items could be assembled in one as Bob and Bill have stated. This is not going to take a long period of time – just wants to see the language and how many sections are amended.
- Liz & David: If we combine them, we run the risk of losing on more amendments.
- Kevin: Many amendments fail because of voter fatigue.
- Megan: Wants to see us do the same thing with the recommendations – take overlapping issues and group them together to simplify them for the SJCC – get them down to maybe 7.
- Bob: Agrees with David & Liz’s observation, but the reverse may also be true.

Kevin: Two things to consider:

1. Legal question: Once we try to group some of these, get Randy’s legal opinion – can we group them?
2. Political question: Do we want to group them – will we more likely gain or lose by grouping them?

- Dick: We already decided by vote that the 3 Initiative & Referendum amendments will be groups together. We would need a new vote to reconsider that.
- Kevin: Bob’s suggested combining the introductory ones would get us to 9, but not down to 5 or 6.
- Dick: Those three are probably a real possibility. The two that Bob put together are a possibility. But doesn’t think so with the other groupings Bob suggested.
- Olivia: We’re operating on a motion passed by the CRC that we’re going with two ballots. We need to clarify before the Executive Committee spends more time on this.
- Dick: Disagrees with Olivia. Happy to engage in another Executive Committee meeting.
- Kevin: Executive Committee could see what could be condensed and then consider if some could be dropped. Then come back with those recommendations to the full CRC. That would dictate whether one or two years.

- Bill: Until we have final form, we will not know the legal limits of the extent to which we can package the amendments. We need to know that before the Executive Committee can determine the political boundaries.
- Sharon: Should we at this point discuss the situation we are now faced with about risking trying to put amendments on the 2022 ballot?
- Patty: If we can hone some of these, we shouldn't push it to 2022.
- Paul agrees with Patty – wants to take this back to the Executive Committee.

Kevin now thinks we should just do one ballot.

## **6. New Business:**

Randy explained why he changed his advice to the CRC regarding splitting the amendments over two years/ballots.

Discussion, including:

- Bob: Who decides when this CRC has made its final recommendations?
- Randy: This CRC submits its final recommendations. We should be prepared to answer any questions about that from the SJCC.
- Bob: Could we not make it clear when submitting these to the SJCC that we're submitting a first batch and may before Dec. 31 submit a second batch, which would be our final recommendations. How would that not work?
- Randy: Good argument and doesn't disagree. Just trying to guide us in a way that is safe and predictable.
- Kevin: Randy's memo didn't tell us we can't do this – suggested taking a more conservative approach. There is a risk in doing what we planned on doing with two ballots.
- Randy: The SJCC is asking for a reasonable amount of time in order to consider what it is we're setting forth. Has to do with what their process involves. They like to touch things more than once – it's part of their ordinance and procedures. So don't submit things on the last day when a SJCC member is absent.
- Randy: Timeline between submittal to SJCC and to Auditor is not specified in the Charter. That's why he's using the words "reasonable amount of time". The CRC should have a resolution that we all sign either approving or

rejecting, like they did in 2012. That is what is received by the SJCC, and then it acts by its own resolution to deliver to the Auditor.

- Kevin: In 2012, the SJCC did not do a resolution from the SJCC. They just passed along the CRC's resolution, as far as he can tell.
- Maureen: The word in the Charter says the Charter Review files a document with the SJCC, in the form of a resolution.
- Randy: Agrees – that is the action of the CRC. The SJCC receives it and has a reasonable amount of time to deliver that to the Auditor.
- Dick: SJCC cannot alter amend or do anything to what the CRC does. All they do is transmit it to the Auditor. There's nothing in the Charter about a resolution from the SJCC.
- Randy: The SJCC does take a vote – they must take a vote. Other Charters usually have an additional step.

Motion by Paul to reconsider the May 27 vote. Kevin said that motion is out of order - suggested the Exec Comm look at this and come back with a recommendation. Having that process take place first will be helpful. So make this decision after hearing those recommendations next Wednesday. Paul withdrew the motion.

**New motion by Paul**, seconded by Bill, that we allow the Exec Comm to meet again and then to put forward its recommendations to the full CRC.

Discussion:

- Liz: In favor of moving this off to the Exec Comm – baffled by the lack of clarity on the process. If it's not in our Charter, even though it's out there in other Charters, then that would be the work of another CRC to add it? Why do we need to abide by regulations that aren't in our Charter? What are the SJCC voting on? Hard to vote on a motion not understanding what the regulations are.
- Kevin will try to summarize before we call the question.
- Tony: We are totally confused. Motion done last time did not say anything except to allow the Exec Comm to look at the possibilities of doing more than one ballot. We have not done part of our job – if there's a problem in the system the way it is now – why didn't we look at that to recommend clarity and cleaning it up? Not clear what we're voting for if it's not clear at the end of the day what's going to happen.

- Bob: Paul’s motion said “for determination” – the Exec Comm won’t be determining anything, only making a recommendation to the full CRC.
- Dick: Called the question to refer this to the Exec Comm to be brought back to the full CRC next week.
- Kevin: There are still hands up. Explained the history of why we’re going through this now.
- Dave A: Reasonable to put forward the idea that we create a slate of recommendations to change the Charter to be voted up or down.

Paul’s motion (see above) seconded by Bill:

**Vote:** 15 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (Tony)

**Motion carried.**

Paul thanked the Exec Comm for doing an outstanding job.

**Executive Committee to meet at 10am tomorrow (Thursday).**

7. Open for Public Comment: No public comments.

Randy: When a group meets and makes a decision, it takes a vote of a group – that’s why the SJCC makes a decision, even if it’s not discretionary.

ADJOURNMENT – Adjourned at 6:07 pm

Sharon Abreu  
CRC Member

*Minutes were approved by consensus at the June 16, 2021 Regular Meeting*