

kdonham

From: "Hal Cloer" <hcloer@jeffnet.org>
To: <kdonham@prodigy.net>; <normary@grrtech.com>; <ingrich2@aol.com>;
 <rogers4290@aol.com>; <jeanmilgram@earthlink.net>; <drjohnw@earthlink.net>;
 <jarvis@cyberpc.com>; <ksquared@cdsnet.net>; <nevison@Ashlandhome.net>;
 <kaaren@mind.net>; <d&achirgwin@mighty.net>; <bill.thorndike@medfab.com>;
 <ahrutter@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2003 5:13 PM
Subject: Signatures Required —

Hi All:

At yesterday's committee meeting I agreed to check with the County Clerk's Office to get the number of total votes cast in the county at the last gubernatorial election: It's 71,218.

Running an Initiative

Kathy Beckett said we'd need 6% of that number of verified signatures to qualify an amendment to the county charter--such as a measure to require a periodic charter review process. That would be 4,274 verified signatures; with a 20% cushion, 5,129 would have to be collected. So if the BOC preferred not to put such a measure before the voters, that sets the task the 2 Leagues might be taking on. *

Should there be established a charter review committee charged with recommending charter amendments, and should the BOC decide not to put recommended amendments before the public for approval, and should the Leagues wish to do so, Junkin thought multiple measures would be "charter revision", rather than "charter amendment", and that the number of signatures required would be the same as required to establish a home rule charter, 4% of the total votes in the last gubernatorial election--currently 2849 verified signatures, about 3,500 collected. (He may or may not be right; 5,129 might be required).

Jean felt that committee action could be to seek the change she thought those at the consensus meeting most wanted: expanding the BOC from 3 to 5. However, when that alternative was put to vote (there were only 5 of the committee present, Eileen, Jean, Kathleen, Ruth and me), it was defeated 3:2--with those in the majority pointing out that our committee had never voted to support such an action.

The committee decided that the two Leagues merit an update at the October meeting concerning the work of the action committee. The main point to make is that the committee believes that the best strategy, for trying to implement the various changes in the county charter on which the Leagues reached consensus, is to seek a charter revision (rather than attempting to implement the desired changes thru an amending process, which would require qualifying 3-4 separate initiatives).

Charter Revision

Kathleen is to contact Burke Raymond to see if he can attend the meeting (I somehow had thought the meeting was scheduled for the 17th, and

he had earlier said he could attend at that time). Burke would be asked to comment about the various issues associated with a League attempt at getting the county charter amended to require a periodic review process, either thru the BOC's initiative or, failing that, thru the League's initiative--as well as general observations about probable outcomes if the committee gets to the stage of revising the charter.

While I think it's OK to update the two Leagues on present committee thinking, and I gather the LWVRV board is trying to decide whether to withdraw continued support of any further work by the action committee (terminating the committee), the only interest I have in such a meeting is focused on getting Burke's insights on possibly seeking a charter revision--and I think those insights would be important enough to schedule the joint meeting for whatever time that Burke can be present.

Regards, Hal.

Hal Cloer
815 Creek Stone Way
Ashland, OR 97520
(541) 482-8364