

Responses to Questions for Chair Duyck where were not covered in May 23, 2017 CCI Meeting

What volunteer coverage is there for CPO, CCI?

What would we need to do to get (volunteer) coverage?

Community Engagement Program (CEP) staff reply: Work is being done by several members of County Administrative Office (CAO), including County Counsel, to delineate volunteer indemnification, SLAPP (Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation), and general volunteer rights. This is a preliminary look-expectations need to be kept in check about solutions and resources.

What is county doing to comply with Significant Natural Resources, planning, Goal 5?

Mike Dahlstrom reply: The County already “complies” – just not to some people’s levels of expectation – especially if it is in their backyard. Washington County was a principle writer of Goal 5 planning criteria along with Metro and DLCD. Suggest reframing this question to get to the crux of the concerns.

Public involvement plans – would Chair Duyck support a requirement to LUT?

Mike Dahlstrom reply: LUT must comply with Goal 1 in addition to Title VI (Civil Rights Act) requirements. They do that in a variety of ways, often to the minimum required standards though. Nothing in Goal 1 “requires” a public involvement plan. Again, suggest reframing this question.

Would Chair Duyck support CCI commenting on specific (public involvement?) policies?

Mike Dahlstrom reply: Is CCI really interested in doing this? If so, I would be all for creating the process to develop evaluation criteria. I personally see it as a key responsibility and would support them taking it on – in an informed and purposeful way.

A governance-type question. Some people in cities express a view of Urban Unincorporated Areas as “freeloaders”. How should these areas be governed?

Mike Dahlstrom reply: Virginia Bruce provided a good context for this discussion in her 2008 series: <F:\Shared\CPO Program\Handbook and Resource Guide\Bartlett-Bruce Urban Series>