Minutes - Washington County Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) Meeting
Tuesday, January 19, 2015
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

CCI Members and CPO Leaders attending: Virginia Bruce (CPO 1), Bruce Bartlett (CPO 1) Gary Virgin (CPO 10), Lars Wahlstrom (CPO 10), Dick Smith (CPO 10), Paul Johnson (CPO 15), Stan Houseman (CPO 3), Kathy Stallkamp (CPO 4K), Jim Long (CPO 4M), Ray Eck (CPO 6), Kathie Koellmann (CPO 6), David Shettles (CPO 7), Marty Moyer (CPO 7), Pat Wolter (CPO 8)
Speakers: Sia Lindstrom and Philip Bransford, Washington County
Other Attendees: Glenna Dryden, Tom Black, Amanda
CPO Program Staff: Beth St. Amand, Dan Schauer, OSU Extension Service
_____

1. Welcome, Introductions, Minutes

Chair Jim Long opened the meeting at 7 pm, and welcomed the attendees, who then introduced themselves. He asked for comments on the minutes. There were no changes requested.

ACTION: Dick Smith moved that the CCI accept the minutes as written; Ray Eck seconded. 13-0-0; the motion passed.

Chair Long called for additional agenda items. Tom Black asked about having MTAC (Metro Technical Advisory Committee) updates. Meetings start in January; who is the representative, or if there isn't someone appointed, recommend someone? Kathy Stallkamp added that she didn't think the meetings had yet started.

2. CPO Transition Planning: Final Report and Update
Philip Bransford asked for TPT members or others to share their thoughts tonight on the January 12 Board meeting. He thanked the CCI and members for their input throughout the process, including group letters; individual emails and letters; attending TPT meetings, the public event, participating in the online survey (which had over 500 people participate) and CPO 10/13's two rural forums. Philip thanked the coordinators for their help with the event and push for the paper newsletter and data entry.

Sia identified the three TPT members as nominated by the CCI: Kathy Stallkamp, Bruce Bartlett and Jim Long. At the Board's meeting last week, three TPT members reported out including Kathy. Sia distributed the Executive Summary (2 pp.) from Solid Ground Consulting's report; the full report and community comment summary are online. She directed the group to page 2, "Major Suggestions of the Transition Team." The take-home messages she heard from the Board were some urgency to transition the CPO program due to the program's Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) end on June 30, take care of the program and staff, and provide more time to work on the TPT suggestions.

She led the group through each suggestion. See attachment for reference. Significant notes or discussion are noted below:

Item A, point 2. Those who were present on Jan. 12 observed they heard a desire for changing the name altogether; having an interim plan, but concern if staff leaves during that time; not uniformity among the commissioners. There was a comment during the CCI discussion about getting specifics from the current program: value, costs and budget.

Item B would create a new Board-appointed commission. Sia noted that the TPT spent time on communities to whom we could do a better job of reaching, and defining the difference between the CPAC and CCI. Marty Moyer noted that in her reading of the report, CPAC would not only be advisory to CCI/CPO, but to all the other advisory groups. Sia emphasized that it would not be "over", but "advisory to." Bruce noted all these advisory groups struggle with representation. Discussion here included duties (would it handle information technology (IT), recruitment, education, ombudsman?).

CCI members provided the following comments and feedback:
- It is important that citizens know how things work: the group could bring more people in and improve communication but not sure how it will function. Would it squelch ideas from other directions?
- The CPAC group would include feel-good ideas which do not work well with technical groups such as RROMAC; could be a role for CPAC, but not as an overseer between the commissioners and advisory boards that have a technical focus.
- There wasn't consensus or agreement on CPAC; everyone has a different idea of what this group would do. This group was not supposed to have oversight but be advisory and give input to commissioners on public involvement-related items.
- Appears duplicative. A lot of citizen involvement happens outside the CPO program.
- Like to have an overview of all the boards and commissions and what they do, and if they work with volunteers.
- No need to make another structure.
- Other groups not affiliated with CPOs – we are constrained to not take an advocacy position.
- If CPAC brings in diverse underrepresented groups, we've tried to do that – how will they have better success than we have?
- View CPAC in relation to Goal 1: if other groups' purpose is not the same, it dilutes what we're about.
- If there is a collection of common needs that exist — such as recruitment and promotion; marketing of County's volunteer opportunities; one-point-of-entry website; ombudsman – they could be grouped together into an Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

- The advisory groups have evolved into 32. Maybe look at dividing them up: technical v. social issues; have professional staff identify needs that are lacking and how to satisfy those needs.
- What is the current method to market open positions? Philip responded that each board has a very specific scope and mission. Some are required by state law; others are identified by a department. Marketing is a board meeting announcement, media release (which includes CPO newsletters).
- Is there a comprehensive report on all boards and commissioners or community engagement? Staff responded that there is not.

Sia noted that Item C is about how to acknowledge other groups and how to create a communication link without imposing County restrictions. It is based on the PSU report, but needs more work. Related discussion in the CCI meeting included the ability of CPOs to take positions on land use, for example. Dan mentioned the recent issue with Our Oregon and balance of having both sides for an issue.

Under Item D: Sia said that there was a lot of conversation about how the CPO program works in and with cities and special districts, including creating a single point of entry for individuals to find out what they need for all jurisdictions in the area. Stan noted that the current website is not clear about how and when to engage.

E. Sia noted that younger generations have different expectations of how to work with their government.

Item F: What is the best staffing model? Should the CPO model continue to be contracted or internal? Sia said what she's heard that there needs to be a better cost-benefit analysis first; there might be a hybrid.

G. The single point of entry model is for an ombudsman.

Additional comments from those in attendance included the following:
- CPO Boundaries need to be addressed.
- The big CCI need previously was communication. Require IT help with that from the county first before getting other groups involved. Use NextDoor?
- Take exception to Item D: jurisdictions may say why do they need CPO? If not have a basic understanding of the program, how integrate into it? It's to work with the County, not fight it. Sia responded that there are pieces of 16 cities, and each jurisdiction works differently. Per County charter, County can't impose anything on the Cities – and wouldn't want to — and needs to figure out how to work together cooperatively.
- What is the ombudsman? Current CPO staff operates in this role. It has been important to have professional staff give you that support and information.
- Hired contractors may not provide continuity if you have to keep replacing them and renegotiate.

- Include Quake Up in list of supported activities; what is the role of the Candidates Forum?
- How best can we work with you as CCI?
- County budget and how that timing impacts an RFP process; can the budget be bumped up?

Sia then addressed next steps. The Board has asked for a plan to administratively transition the existing CPO Program; CAO staff will figure out timing, budget and staffing. The most immediate question is internal v. external staffing. The board will address this and have more conversation about the rest of the suggestions. They were clear that they wanted staff to do more work before they could consider these issues in more depth, possibly late February/March.

Chair Long asked how the CCI can help. Sia suggested that the CCI continue to be a sounding board, and that they come back with updates on how things are progressing, and get the CCI's thoughts and feedback. TPT will also act in that role. Sia and Philip agreed to have the CCI leave an open standing agenda for them starting in March/April.

The group thanked Sia and Philip.

3. CPO Coordinators Updates
• *Harold Haynes Awards presentation rescheduled to Dec. 15 here at the Public Services Building Cafeteria.* Commissioners Dick Schouten and Greg Malinowski and Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington have RSVPd; CCI business meeting afterward.

• *Peggy Harris, CPO 15 and 4-H, will receive an OSU Extension Cooperator award* Dec. 9 in Corvallis for all her work with CPO and 4-H. Robert suggested that Peggy be acknowledged locally during the Haynes award.

4. Review and Discuss Draft Work Program Letter
A CCI Subcommittee has been meeting to develop requests for the Washington County 2016 Annual Long Range Planning Work Program and distributed an updated letter. Kathie Koellmann noted it was substantially rewritten since last month. Henry commented that it is well written and the addendum provides significant background; this may be a forerunner to other letters such as the Transportation Futures Study.

Chair Long asked if CCI wants to do anything with the issues named in the first paragraph. Mary responded that the committee decided to focus on just one issue, and to continue meeting throughout the year to submit other issues from this list. She suggested the CCI could provide guidance on the next project. She noted that when the Work Program is released, it is important for this group to be ready to comment. Kathie

said that more supporting data might increase effectiveness; the subcommittee decided to meet quarterly and do a more exhaustive treatment on a particular issue. Henry supported moving ahead with additional issues. Ray said there should have been follow up from the Steering Committee letter from February and a subcommittee; many of these things have been lingering since 2004. He thanked Mary and Kathie for their work.

Lars asked for more explanation on the letter's content. Mary said that this is an urban issue – it needs to have code to minimize infill impacts on established neighborhoods. Virginia Bruce said there are some questions about density requirements; infill standards are extremely important for the future and are more than compatibility. Gary noted that infill may be codified, but not the way you may want it. There was discussion about who sets code direction.

ACTION: Mary moved that the CCI approve the letter as drafted, including the addendum. Ray seconded. Vote was 9-2 (Wahlstrom, Smith), 1 abstention – P. Johnson. (*Note: There were 12 voting members in attendance; Virginia Bruce arrived after the minutes vote*).

5. CPO Transition Planning Update
Chair Long announced that TPT member Kathy Stallkamp could not attend this evening due to a conflict with a board meeting of hers; she forwarded three points for sharing:

- Discussed the concept of having a singular community involvement program for the county, cities and special districts. This would involve cities and special district buy in and cooperation.
- Discussed program having county oversight versus another entity like a university. In-house gives accountability while external has more objectivity.
- Community involvement - online survey November 16th, Community event at PCC Willow Creek on December 1 from 3:00 - 8:00 pm.

Handouts were distributed including a "staff preferences" worksheet. The coordinators distributed this to the CCI to fill out; see Attachment 1 for results. There was some discussion about the survey and if the TPT had a chance to see the survey. Mary said they did but comments may not have been incorporated. Mary also said there was an extra meeting in October; several people weren't able to make it and a lot of work was done at that meeting.

Jim introduced the flow chart (architecture). In the center circle, there is a CIAB-Community Involvement Advisory Board (see handout in blue for definitions), which could be a new committee appointed by the Board of Commissioners. It would look at the whole scope of civic involvement in Washington County including all the County Advisory Boards. CICC-Community Involvement Coordinating Committee is the CCI

(green circle) with a name change. It would be comprised of representatives from CPOs, much the same as today.

Virginia asked about the September motion regarding producing a document to submit to the TPT. Jim responded that there was difficulty in producing a document. At this meeting, Steering committee members then summarized and provided additional materials that they had used in those discussions, including 2014 CCI ideas to improve the program, possible key program elements, and core practices in a successful civic engagement program, and concerns about staffing. Kathie noted that there was no consensus from the Steering Committee on this issue.

Dan Schauer then conducted real-time polling on three questions related to the current survey to stimulate discussion. Eighteen respondents participated in the poll. *Question 1 is verbatim from the TPT public survey, and Questions 2 and 3 are unique for the CCI.*

Question 1: Community groups should have the opportunity to work through a coordinating and/or advisory committee recognized by the Board of County Commissioners, but individuals and groups should continue to have direct access to the Board to bring issues forward as they see fit.

Q1 Response: Strongly Agree 65%, Somewhat Agree 24%, Not enough information to respond 12%

Question 2: What is your opinion of the Board Appointed Community Participation (sic) Advisory Committee?

Q2 Response: Support 6%, Needs Change 39%, Opposed 39%, Unsure-need more information 17%

Question 3: What is your opinion of the CPO Coordinating Committee?
(note: replaces CCI)

Q3 response: Support 11%, Needs Change 44%, Opposed 22%, Unsure-need more information 22%

Discussion ensued; the text below represents key points captured on the flip charts that informed the final summary and motions (below).

Areas of Concern:
- Staffing
- Architecture: What's missing? What needs to change?
- Autonomy
- CICC to be on the same level as the Board-appointed advisory bodies
- CPOs should not be designated as urban or rural on the chart

- CICC – role as implementer not advisory, not providing feedback (Question to the group from a member: Are you advisory now?)
- Today, Board agenda items designate CPO, but don't involve

CICC
- Advisory direct to BOC
- Insure two-way communication
- Not coordinating
- Retain advisory role

Questions raised:
- What are "population specific advisory boards"?
- Looks like the population specific advisory board on the chart requires the CICC to go through it
- County v. Contractor: is it either/or or a hybrid possible?
- Will this group (CIAB) oversee all 32 boards?
- CICC – do liaisons have votes?
- CICC – is name or function being replaced? (doesn't sound <u>advisory</u>)
- Autonomy = important. Self-selected representatives affect topics addressed. Self-selected bodies can feel more free to raise issues that county-appointed bodies might not be able to look at.
- How Board appointments affect structures and decisions
- Chart not clear on relationships – how will it function?

CIAB
- What is the structure and meeting schedule? How often would they meet yearly?
- Would it be an observer of, or direct, the CICC?
- Would it resolve disputes?
- RROMAC and URMDAC were cited as successful models of how appointed bodies can work well
- Would the CIAB be focused on communication with the Board, staff and public?
- Chart should be reorganized with citizens at the top

<u>The discussion resulted in three Actions:</u>

<u>ACTION 1:</u> Virginia moved sending the members of the CCI that are TPT representatives back to the next TPT meeting and redraw the diagram with the board as the center and recipient of the other groups. Lars seconded.

Discussion: Pat suggested the CCI provide a specific chart; this was accepted by Virginia as a friendly amendment. It was noted that a few of the TPT members were not in attendance. Further discussion included sending it to the commissioners; taking the circle out and moving the top blue circle down at the bottom and leave one blue and

green next to the Board; having the CIAB moved down. Virginia clarified that the CCI can vote on a motion to suggest something to the committee.

FINAL MOTION: That the CCI provide a specific chart to the TPT and redraw the diagram with the board as the center and recipient of the other groups. 12-0-0 with support of nonvoting members in attendance. The motion passed.

ACTION 2: Mary moved that the chart shows CCI in the same hierarchy as the appointed Boards and Commissions. Dick Smith seconded the motion. 9- 1 (Houseman), with 2 abstentions (Oberhelman and Johnson). Additional support from 1 nonvoting participant. The motion passed.

ACTION 3: Mary moved that the CCI-Steering Committee write a letter that reflects the wants/don't wants (the discussion **summary** captured on the flip charts; see below) to the TPT and copy the Board of Commissioners. It was seconded. 12-0-0 with support of 2 nonvoting participants and 1 guest. The motion passed.

FINAL SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION AS CAPTURED ON THE CHARTS; numbering does not reflect priority.

Specific concepts that the group supported as items that they want to see in the CICC/leadership group:
1. The leadership group broadly represents CPOs and provides a place for dialogue
2. There is two-way communication with the Board
3. It is advisory
4. There is parity with other advisory groups
5. Autonomy is important, and to be self-selected
6. It should be structured to interact with staff and the Board to gain the most benefit.
7. Retain the existing name or acronym (CCI)

Concepts the group did not support or want:
• Having a liaison filter between the CICC and the Board of Commissioners
• Having the CICC be subordinate to the CIAB
• Having community-initiated groups register

6. Public Comments
There were none for this meeting segment; public comments were incorporated throughout the meeting.

7. Meeting Evaluation and Close
Chair Long adjourned the meeting after 9 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Beth St. Amand

Attachment 1: Results from the "Staffing Preferences" Worksheet, tabulated following the meeting:

Staffing Preferences Matrix

Function	County	Contractor	Doesn't Matter	Staff Not Needed
Meeting arrangements	3	8	6	
Maintain contact lists	5	8	3	
Maintain public records	7	6	2	
Support and coaching for leaders	2	10	3	
Training for leaders and members	2	10	3	
Outreach and marketing plans	4	7	5	
Outreach and marketing implementation	5	7	4	1
Identify emerging issues of potential interest	2	9	4	2
Point of contact for the public	2	10	2	1
Print and online newsletters	7	7	2	
Maintain website	8	6	2	
Maintain electronic communication tools	8	6	2	
Report to BOCC on program accomplishments	4	10	3	
Maintain financial records	9	5	3	
Recruitment/appointment process for BOCC-appointed positions	5	8	2	
*Funding	2			
*Annual conference		1		
*Linkage with State Committee		1		
*Network w/ Multnomah & Clackamas citizen involvement leadership		1		