June 19, 2019 OAE Commission Meeting:

Attendees:

* Courtney Helstein
* Daniel Lewkow (by phone)
* Tom Simpson
* Amy Ruiz
* Amy Sample Ward
* Ricardo Lujan
* Serin Bussell
* Norman Turrill
* Sabra Purifoy

Agenda:

* Introduction of new Commission member, Sabra Purifoy
* Housekeeping: parking stamp, bus vouchers
  + Approve minutes from May?
    - Incomplete sentence, first paragraph of tech update ends incompletely. Passed unanimously as corrected.
  + Commission members liked having times for each agenda item on agenda so they know how much time they have for each topic.
  + SmartPark passes distributed to Commissioners who parked. They cover 3 hours. Five were distributed.
  + Question: Is it possible to get vouchers or something for Parking Kitty?
  + Bus passes also available to Commissioners. None were distributed.
  + While appointing the new Commissioner, the Council also passed initial terms for all Commissioners. Terms were approved as follows:
    - 4 years: Norman Turrill, Amy Ruiz, Amy Sample Ward, Daniel Lewkow, Ricardo Lujan
    - 2 years: Courtney Helstein, Serin Bussell, Tom Simpson, Sabra Purifoy
* Program updates
  + Implementation update:
    - Amendments passed. Still need to discuss in-kind amendment.
    - Rulemaking: Rules passed and are in effect. Need to an adjustment to language access rule.
    - We are ready for July 1 implementation: candidates can file Notice of Intent, get trained, and starting raising matchable contributions for certification.
  + Press update:
    - PRR from Gordon at Oregonian hasn’t led to an article yet
  + Technology update:
    - Some delays on the front end development of Module 1 of 8. Other parts of the build are on-time and some are early. We’ve added two full time front end developers to catch up.
* Forms feedback:
  + Notice of Intent: Add “to Participate” to document title, divide form into sections, add document title to the footer with version and date, change W-2 to W-9, and other technical edits.
  + Paper Attestation Form: remove opt in to match. If that isn’t possible, perhaps an opt out box to the right side so people don’t accidentally check it without reading it. change name of document to donor form to be more accessible. The intent is to bring people into the process, which this will help. Write technical form name in footer with version and publication date, and other technical edits.
  + Remit envelope Attestation Form reviewed.
  + Digital attestation discussion:
    - Strong consensus on digital attestation being allowed. Concern that the return rate of paper attestation for online contributions will be 10% of significantly less. This will seriously reduce the percent of eligible contributions that will be matched. Campaigns will have to track down contributors, which will waste time and resources, to get a higher return rate.
    - Requiring paper attestation for online contributions doesn’t serve intent of getting other people into process
    - If the Commissioner needs further discussion on this topic, Amy Ruiz and Ricardo Lujan will meet with her.
* Postcards feedback: Remove the “congratulations.” Instead of “Dear Neighbor,” extend the sticker to include the name in mail merge to increase the number of people who actually read it. Adjust the purpose of the program so it doesn’t assume the intent of the donor. And other technical edits.
* Postcard process: Is returning the validation postcard filled out enough for us to validate the contributions as matchable? Yes. Validation post card is very similar to the attestation form. Not requiring sending back an additional document will enable the program to be more inclusive without sacrificing security.
* Feedback on program logo options:
  + Like rose motif. Do not like hands motif. If flag motif, maybe just an actual section of the City flag instead of an abstraction, though any of those would look bad in greyscale.
  + Some like red rose, some think red and green looks Christmassy.
  + Rotate rose a bit so the word “open” is not early up-side-down.
  + How will it look in greyscale?
  + Have a version with the program name to the side rather than around the rose.
* Discussion on language accessibility rule and in-kind contributions amendment
  + Language accessibility background:
    - Proposal:
      * Change rule to apply only to events where a candidate is not accommodated.
      * Seek funding from Council to create guide and small fund to help sponsors defray the cost of language services, not just for candidates but for members of the public as well.
      * Work with Council on vague language.
    - Still worried that it puts the burden on participating candidates.
    - Can accept if candidate is sponsoring the event. Not if merely invited.
    - Without the rule, candidates can choose not to participate. Allow the press to shame inaccessible events.
    - Next steps: set up meetings with Commissioners Fish and Eudaly to get their thoughts and find common ground.
  + In-kind amendment: plan to discuss at the next meeting with a representative from the groups that negotiated the in-kind amendment provision.
    - Note: PCUN doesn’t org in city elections, so it is unclear how changes this provision would affect PCUN’s work.
    - The Commission would like to see some research from recent elections on what groups spent in-kind on City elections.
    - Also consider outreach to NARAL and Planned Parenthood.
* Discussion of vendor selection/cost/timing on video explainer for program
  + OAEC recommended a short video to explain the program.
  + We talked to a couple of recommended vendors and the $5,000 and less target is hard but doable for one.
  + Another cost to budget in is captioning and translations for captions. Everyone says it is wildly expensive, but it isn’t: $5/minute for English, $0.40-0.80 per word for translation and for proofreading translations for top four languages. Then another charge for adding each language as a caption option (less than $5/minute each). So a 90 second video might run us $300 total for captioning in English + top 4 languages.
  + What is the ideal timing for the video? As soon as candidates are trying to raise funds.
  + Thoughts on Bridgeliner as vendor?
    - $5k expensive for 30-90 seconds. AR hired a video guy, and a lengthy video is $5k. Did in LA for $2k for 45 seconds. ASW will email vendor recs to us.
    - Had a lot of success on short video compared to mailers, etc. Great for social. Shorter is more postable.
    - NE coalition of neighbors did video on on changing form of government. They might have a good vendor.