

Minutes - Washington County Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) Meeting

7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Tuesday, March 15, 2016

CCI Members and CPO Leaders attending: Bruce Bartlett (CPO 1), Lars Wahlstrom (CPO 10), Dick Smith (CPO 10), Gary Virgin (CPO 10-alternate), Paul Johnson (CPO 15), Stan Houseman (CPO 3), Jim Long (CPO 4M), Ray Eck (CPO 6), Rex Nere (CPO 6), Liles Garcia (CPO 6-alternate), Marty Moyer (CPO 7), Mary Manseau (CPO 7)

Speakers: Sia Lindstrom, Philip Bransford, Washington County Administrative Office

Guests attending: Barbara Rhodes (CPO 9-inactive)

CPO Program Staff: Dan Schauer, OSU Extension Service

1. Welcome, introductions, minutes

Chair Jim Long opened the meeting at 7 pm and self-introductions were made. Liles Garcia motioned to approve the February minutes as written. Dick Smith seconded. All 10 voting members were in favor.

2. CPO transition planning update from County Administrative Office

Philip Bransford, Communications Officer, opened by saying that he and Sia Lindstrom, Sr. Deputy County Administrator, will cover the CPO transition progress made so far by Washington County and take questions and comments. They provided copies of the 1-page "Major Suggestions of the Transition Team" from the Jan. 6 Community Participation Transition Planning Process Final Report.

Philip and Sia invited the CCI members in attendance who served on the Transition Planning Team (TPT) to briefly share their thoughts. Mary Manseau brought up staffing for the current CPO staff. Is there work being done on the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) so OSU CPO staff can transfer to County positions without going through interviews? Sia replied yes, that is being done. Oregon statute allows a transfer of employees from an IGA.

Sia turned to the March 1 memo from County Administrator Bob Davis to the TPT, which presented the County Administrative Office (CAO) responses to the transition report's consideration of staffing models. Sia and Philip distributed copies and walked through the memo briefly for those people at the table tonight who hadn't familiarized themselves with it.

(The memo was distributed through the County's Transition email update list, and it was discussed in a March 1 public meeting of the TPT. Link to memo: http://www.co.washington.or.us/CPO/upload/CAO_Memo_Recommendation_Regarding_Staffing.pdf. Link to all Transition Planning process materials <http://www.co.washington.or.us/cpo/transition.cfm>.)

Sia noted that the memo discusses the County's recommendation that locating the CPO program staff with CAO is intended to address the need for program neutrality, which would be an issue if the program were staffed in a County Department, such as Land Use and Transportation.

Staffing level will be increased by 1.0 FTE to add a new program manager. To keep the program full and healthy, and explore and add new program areas or alignment, it needs an administrator. Patrick Proden, the Oregon State University Extension Service's regional administrator with responsibility over

all the Extension activities in Washington and Multnomah counties, worked up to .25 FTE of his time on CPO Program at different junctions, and his hours were not compensated by the County's CPO funds.

A major part of the TPT debate, Sia said, was the staffing model. It was a lively debate with no clear consensus. Staff received that, did research, and approached Portland State University, Pacific University, and Vision Action Network. All showed interest in partnering on some aspect of the program, but not in administering it.

Sia asked for questions and comments.

Gary Virgin: He is pleased with the location of the program within CAO. That avoids placing it in a department where it could be lost.

Lars Wahlstrom asked for a picture of CAO's staffing at present. Sia replied: CAO is very small. It's 13 staff people. The Administrator, Bob Davis, is appointed by the Board and is the organization's head. There are two Assistant Administrators, Don Bohn and Rob Massar. Two deputies – her and Kirby Johnson, who oversees Public Safety and Justice. Philip and Julie McCloud form the Communications team. Ana Noyola, a clerk/recorder, and Executive Assistant Angie Aguilar serve the Board. Janet Wells and Barbara Hejtmanek complete the administrative assistant team. Those four staff members are the ones who ratify the Board's orders, archive materials, and perform the duties that are supportive of Board processes and administrative functions. CAO includes the government affairs staff, Jim McCauley and Jonathan Schlueter.

Sia and Philip noted that County Counsel and Human Resources (within the County's Support Services department) are separate County units from CAO.

Ray Eck brought up the point that the last TPT meeting talked quite a bit about neutrality. He asked if the new administrator for the program will be neutral. Sia replied that the person will be a County employee, and as far as she knows at this point there will be an internal and external hiring process.

Stan Houseman asked if CPO volunteers will continue to have the same access to CPO Coordinators as has been available in the OSU fold. His only concern about it being in-house in the County is that there not be a diminishing of the effort, over time, in the level of service the program has seen over 40 years. He's seen reorganizations in large companies. Accessibility of volunteers to coordinators is important.

Sia replied to Stan that her office doesn't have any vision that access will change. Part of the rationale to offer County positions to the current staff is to keep stability and access to staff you have. Rather than thinking of diminishing service, the flip side is integration with other participation mechanisms at the County, which was a strong message from the TPT. Also, there was a message from TPT to not have two parallel systems, so that CPO is integrated. Augmentation rather than diminishing is one of the things to continue to talk about going forward, because there's more on the table with regards to the TPT recommendations.

Stan replied that the context of his issue is that he wants the program to grow, as a "value add" to the County. Staff growth will be to serve accessibility. Sia replied that the TPT plan is aspirational about the future. In the near-term, a lot of patience is required e.g. moving the website and doing the staffing change. It will take a lot of work for a few months.

Jim Long introduced a list of the areas of his concerns that have not been addressed in the process to date. Jim quickly spoke of these items:

1. SLAPP suits (Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation) – will CPOs be covered legally?
2. PI Day was yesterday (3.14.16) and Jim is in favor of public involvement. Will there be more meeting spaces available to us? Just a question – he doesn't expect an answer for a while.
3. Having higher education serve the program will change, and Jim will miss that because it was unique. The IGA (Intergovernmental Agreement between the County and OSU) provided a chance to review major program elements. Sia said she agrees, this is important.
4. Budget, including social media, marketing. When do you want input on that from us, what are the deadlines? Sia said tonight she will cover these next steps.
5. Not necessary now to answer, but Jim would like a discussion on accountability – was it that OSU was not accountable? How would County administrative staff be more accountable?

Liles Garcia commented that those should be future meeting topics. Sia said that she can address a couple of these now. Stan, Sia, and Jim briefly commented about how they saw Quake Up, and Mary said she favors having next steps be addressed at future meetings.

Marty Moyer's comment: Recalling the Boundary Change Task Force meetings and the stance of cities to CPOs. We'll have to work on that. One city manager (in the Boundary Change Task Force) thought we were strictly a county program. You had some city people on the TPT, which was wise. They can bring their city colleagues along. But a concern is that cities will still see that it's a county program, in the county office.

Ray: Staff is small and you're gaining us, the volunteers. A new group may be created, a CPAC (the TPT's suggestion for a new, appointed advisory body on community participation). And there are the cities, as Marty brought up. How are you going to deal with all this and not have it balloon?

Sia: That is part of the due diligence Board wants staff to do before they adopt any of the TPT suggestions. But one of the reasons we want a full-time program manager is the immediate need for more capacity to start taking on and vetting more things on the list.

Philip added: If the Board wanted to stand up a new committee like a CPAC, the new administrator would support it. Not as a CPAC member but as a staff support resource, like Joe Hertzberg did for TPT. Sia said there are more than 30 appointed advisory bodies with the County. This would be another one – if the Board decides to stand it up, and we don't know that yet.

Mary pointed to Commissioner Terry's latest comments at worksession (Commissioner Terry expressed that he was not yet satisfied with the amount of change in the transition, to date). She doesn't know if other Commissioners share that sentiment, but it's a concern. The other is the CPAC. Her view is that they are concerned about adding another layer. A lot of discussion will happen. They won't just accept all the recommendations.

Lars asked if this (CCI and CPAC, two bodies) relates to the TPT's caution against not making two separate program tracks. Philip said no. There is recognition that we have a renowned program that has lasted four decades, with great support. The intent here is, before we do anything else, keep that running as best as we can. That has been echoed by the Board. The Transition team recognizes the tremendous change as a community since the 1970s when the program was put in motion - population growth, enrichment of our diversity including ethnic, racial, and younger people moving in. Even since the program was last reshaped in the 1990s (a CPO staff position was added, and by 2001 some CPO

boundaries changed), the community is different. As you recognize that dynamic, try to address it as one community involvement program that doesn't keep any part of itself at arms length. It's all considered an entry point to government, so that people who don't attend meetings frequently have just as much legitimacy and respect shown to them by government as those who participate in meetings.

Mary saw that a lot of TPT members didn't understand what the program is, and that the focus is on land use. E.g. there are a lot of people worrying about youth and substance abuse, or accessing other services. She has concerns about expanding this program to meet the needs of everyone in the community. It can be done but she doesn't know that it can be done on the backs of volunteers.

Lars: In RROMAC (Rural Road Operations and Maintenance Advisory Committee) they are volunteers, and they deal with LUT and the department's staff. Everything is handled right there, on that topic.

Liles: Mary was outlining a real broad range of services and needs, more than land use and the others we address, right? Mary: Absolutely. There seems to be a real need in the community. An ombudsman was mentioned – people come to the County with a question, and there's a person who directs them to where they need to go. But there are a lot of unmet needs, and she's not sure if the CPO Program is necessarily for all those needs.

Sia – This is the delicate balance we have to find with this. TPT was very clear they didn't want a two-track, separate parallel program. There is a need for the geographic-based program, and it has been successful for 40 years. At the same time, new mechanisms for engagement, e.g. communities of identity or interest rather than geography. Digital tools. There is not a one-size-fits all anymore. How should the geographic program be maintained and address these other things, and make sure that each is still whole and healthy, and touching enough that they can feed each other.

Philip – Marketing is part of this. Over 500 people participated in the TPT survey. A lot of them said they are not interested in sitting at a bricks and mortar facility and going to the two-hour evening meeting. They want to do more online surveys.

Mary – An online survey is beyond her population. Philip – True, but there's an untapped access point for public engagement. It may not be at the robust point of people that come to meetings, and people who sit on committees and appointed bodies. What if there was an ongoing digital program, connected to what's going on in this program and not silo'ed? It's an aspirational hope.

Dan Schauer mentioned the dilemma staff constantly goes through in deciding what kind of information to disseminate. He passed out a sample of the type of information that could be distributed in addition to land use, covering a range of community development and social services.

Stan spoke about his views on the scope of the program. Government transparency and responsiveness are key needs.

Mary commented that online surveys not necessarily equating with the outcome of better educated citizens. Also, the program needs more capacity to take on deeper issues (such as Noise regulations) and encourage citizens to take part, but there is not enough marketing or support to take them in. And the message to people is that they have to take on the responsibility and do things themselves.

Bruce Bartlett noted, on CPAC, it's not defined as just one or more population-specific subcommittees. There are a number of functions in the CPO Program that also exist in other appointed advisory boards and commissions. Extrapolating those out into one high-functioning group would be of great advantage to all programs.

When Bruce was at the Enhanced Sheriff's Patrol District advisory committee this month, he asked Sheriff Garrett if he would be interested in a countywide advisory body focused on participation. Bruce said the Sheriff replied no, because they get replies from volunteers to their advertisements for open positions on the existing advisory groups. And people in the room showed they were proud for that, but someone pointed out that the only people they get love law enforcement and are white.

Bruce said he will advocate for the roles of marketing, ombudsman, information technology, and other functions that need a home to be put together in one group to provide a lot of synergy.

At 8 pm, Jim thanked Sia and Philip for coming and sharing their time. Sia summarized the next steps:

The IGA is currently being amended and that will go to the Board for approval as soon as we can get it ready. This involves legal and contracts review on County and OSU, two big bureaucracies. To Jim's question, this IGA amendment is much smaller and shorter than the longer versions that have previously been enacted annually. The largest part of it is about transfer of staff. And that is just until the end of June. Anticipates it going to the Board in a month.

Budget: As part of the Budget proposal there will be a new organization unit dedicated to the community involvement effort. There will be three CPO staff positions plus a new administrator. Budget committee public meetings are coming up. As posted in the budget meetings notices:

- **11:30 a.m. May 10, Washington County Law Enforcement Training Room, 215 SW Adams Ave.** The committee will get its initial look at the budget. Public testimony will not be received at the meeting. http://www.co.washington.or.us/Support_Services/Finance/CountyBudget/upload/2016-05-10-BudgetCommitteeMeeting.pdf
- **8:30 a.m. May 19, Auditorium of the Charles D. Cameron Public Services Building, 155 N. First Ave.** Deliberation of the budget committees will take place. Public testimony will be taken, beginning at 10:30. http://www.co.washington.or.us/Support_Services/Finance/CountyBudget/upload/2016-05-19-BudgetCommitteeMeeting.pdf

Sia said the budget committee will make recommendations to the Board within a month after it finishes deliberating. If you have specific requests, it's helpful to do it sooner than later.

Program review with CCI: Sia said the IGA is about how staff time is used. She proposes an annual meeting to talk about CCI work priorities, and use that as a replacement process for the IGA.

Jim thanked Sia and Philip again, and they excused themselves.

3. CPO Roundtable and Emerging Issues

Representatives from seven CPOs raised issues and gave brief updates of CPO activities. An audio recording of the entire meeting is available to review this segment of about 15 minutes (beginning at 1:11:00 on the recording). For the file, contact Dan, 503-821-1123, dan.schauer@oregonstate.edu.

4. Announcements and Updates

CPO Coordinators: Dan provided suggestions for future CPO topics, which he will email out after the meeting.

Action: Mary asked if CCI would like the Code and Ordinance Subcommittee to meet and address the response to the CCI March 2nd letter in the LUT staff report for the 2016 Work Program. Jim and Mary

briefly discussed posting signage for applications, and the issue of requiring neighborhood meetings in residential land use districts across a street from commercial, industrial or institutional districts.

Mary said the subcommittee could come forward with a letter that can be presented to the Board on Tuesday. Liles said he would support that.

Jim motioned that the Code subcommittee put together a statement to the Board of Commissioners embracing signage, public notice, and citizen involvement as much as they can. Liles seconded.

Discussion took place between Dick Smith, Mary and Ray about the motion. Dan suggested the discussion may be getting away from the motion, or into philosophical ground about other parts of code or overall land use regulation. Marty, Jim, and Lars joined in to discuss different instances and examples of neighborhood meetings. Jim concluded by saying this is about signage, so we're looking at having our code committee take something to our Commissioners next week. Gary, Mary and Dick discussed how the Code Committee should address rural areas and what the applicable rules are there.

Jim called for a vote on the motion. It passed 9-1. For: Bartlett (CPO 1), Smith (CPO 10), Johnson (CPO 15), Houseman (CPO 3), Long (CPO 4M), Eck (CPO 6), Nere (CPO 6), Moyer (CPO 7), Manseau (CPO 7). Opposed: Wahlstrom (CPO 10).

5. Public Comments

Jim –Virginia Bruce (CPO 1), who was ill and couldn't make it tonight, passed on to him that she doesn't want CPO agendas dictated. He also reminded people that the CPO coordinators give suggestions on topics for meetings, but CPOs are not required to accept.

Barbara declined to give a public comment when offered.

Jim – Asked for further comments on the CPO budget. Lars, Gary, Ray, Stan, Liles and Marty spoke.

The next meeting of the CCI Steering Committee was announced: March 24, 3-5 pm.

Action: MTAC citizen representative

Ray called on Jim to hear his request for CCI to forward his name to County Commissioners as the Washington County citizen representative on the Metro Technical Advisory Committee, MTAC. Bruce is the current citizen representative, nominated by Commissioners and appointed by Metro. Bruce is willing to be the alternate, and he supports Ray. The current alternate is not attending due to scheduling conflicts, Bruce said.

Jim motioned that CCI recommend Ray Eck to County Commissioners for nomination to MTAC as Washington County citizen representative. Mary seconded. No discussion.

Vote: Unanimous in favor, 10-0. Alternates and non-member attendees were polled and they were also in support, 3-0.

Dan will forward the recommendation to Chair Duyck, who provides the nomination to MPAC (Metro Policy Advisory Committee).

Meeting adjourned by about 9:15.

Minutes by Dan Schauer