This document is a summary of the history and current activities of Washington County’s Citizen Participation Organizations (CPOs). It is intended to provide background for current discussions about the purpose and scope of CPOs, and to set CPOs within the context of other Washington County citizen participation mechanisms.

History of CPO Requirements and Scope

CPOs are part of a range of citizen involvement opportunities provided by the County. They fulfill two needs: they meet State requirements for citizen participation in land use planning, and they meet requirements set by the Board of Commissioners. The changing requirements in both areas are summarized below.

State Requirements for Citizen Participation in Land Use Planning:

The State of Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goal 1, adopted in 1974, defines the basic requirements for state and local citizen participation in land use planning. Goal 1 requires that cities and counties, “…develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process” (OAR 660-015-000(1)). It sets requirements in six areas: citizen involvement, communication, citizen influence, technical information, feedback mechanisms, and financial support; it also provides guidelines for implementation in each of these areas.

Washington County affirms Goal 1 language in its Charter (Section 105. “Citizen Involvement Ordinance”) and codifies it in its Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, Policy 2 (“Citizen Involvement”) in the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and the Community Development Code’s Article 107 (“Planning Participants”) define the mechanisms for citizen involvement in land use planning via, among other methods, Citizen Participation Organizations and the Committee for Citizen Involvement.

Washington County’s Citizen Participation Requirements:

CPOs were established in Washington County by Board action on February 19, 1974, and the CCI was added in 1975 to meet Goal 1 requirements. The original purpose of the CPO program was, “To provide a structure to facilitate effective citizen involvement in the environmental, social, economic, and esthetic development of their community.” In discussing the reasons for developing the program, the original staff report stated that, “Not all citizens desire to be continuously involved in the planning process, but rather, desire a structure in which they can enter the system on issues of particular interest to them.” Since then, the Board has refined its requirements for Citizen Participation Organizations via three Resolution & Orders (1980, 1986, and 2001) and two Minute Orders (both in 1996).

In 1980 (R&O 80-108), the Board re-affirmed the County’s commitment to Citizen Participation Organizations and the CCI, and refined their purpose, scope, structure, and related issues. CPOs continued to be defined within the context of LUT’s Comprehensive Framework Plan, but they
were also to be available as a “citizen base for other activities which affect the lives of citizens of
the county.” The R&O stated that formal recognition of the CPOs would be reviewed annually
by the Board based on established criteria (e.g., bylaws, officers, recorded minutes, at least one
membership meeting annually). An addendum stated that the CPO coordinator would support
only those CPOs considered to be active, and that citizen coordination activities outside active
CPO areas would be the responsibility of Washington County.

In 1986 (R&O 86-58), the Board affirmed that the scope of CPOs was to include all matters
affecting livability, and re-affirmed CPOs’ ability to provide advice and consultation directly to
the Board. They also provided the first comprehensive Policy & Implementation document for
citizen participation. The document included a note that the County will review recognition of
the CPOs every two years.

R&O 86-58 also created provisions to recognize neighborhood associations that would “…work
within and be a substructure to the Citizen Participation Organization program.” It dictated
that they must comply with neighborhood organization requirements in the Community
Development Code (CDC 107-8). The CDC defines neighborhood organizations as, “…a
citizen’s group representing a small defined area of the County with specific interest in County
activities affecting their area and to provide standing for the group in a specific land use
matter.” The CDC requires that the boundaries be defined by Board R&O, and states that it
must represent 60% of the registered voters within its boundaries and have at least 50 members.
To date, the Board has not utilized the neighborhood association/organization mechanism.

In 1995, the County Administrative Office convened a 20-member Task Force to develop
recommendations for improved citizen involvement in Washington County. The Task Force
recommended twenty-five strategies to the Board, which were approved on June 27, 1995. The
strategies focused in three areas: all county citizen involvement activities, CCI activities, and
CPO activities. The strategies addressed a broad range of issues including coordination with
cities, CCI and CPO role in education/leadership training, the ability of each CPO to determine
its scope beyond land use and transportation issues, and criteria for boundary change
considerations. These strategies, together with the 1986 Policy and Implementation
document, still stand today as the most recent and comprehensive guidance from the Board
about CPOs. The full list of strategies is in Attachment A.

Also in 1995, the Board approved a consultant contract to conduct a follow-up citizen review
process based on Task Force recommendations. The review process culminated in a plan that
addressed CPO role in planning, coordination, education, and outreach. The plan included a
recommendation to add a second FTE for CPO program coordination. The plan was approved
by the Board on September 26, 1995.

In 2001 (R&O 01-75 and Ordinance 572), the Board updated the CPO Boundary Map in
response to a letter from the CCI requesting multiple boundary changes; it was noted that the
map had not been updated since 1986. The Board also created a new process that would allow
CPOs to make recommendations to the Board to create new or alter existing CPO boundaries
without a lengthy ordinance process. A related staff memo stated that, “…more work is needed
to address the policy issues associated with the creation of new CPOs. Issues include the
development of criteria to guide the creation of CPOs, such as the appropriate size; the long-
term role of CPOs; and budgetary impacts associated with the creation of new CPOs.”
CPO Boundaries and Relationship to Cities

Several changes have occurred to CPO boundaries since the program was established in 1974:

- The Metzger Community Plan was completed in March of 1980, and the Bull Mountain Community Plan was adopted in 1983. In approximately 1985, CPO 4 was divided to create CPO 4M (Metzger) and CPO 4B (Bull Mountain).

- In December of 2000, the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) wrote a letter to the director of Land Use and Transportation requesting several boundary changes. The result was the creation of CPO 15 (Fern Hill/Blooming) and CPO 4K (King City). It also included a request that had originated from the City of Forest Grove (via a mayor-initiated task force) to divide their CPO from the City of Cornelius, which resulted in the division of CPO 12 into CPO 12F (Forest Grove) and CPO 12C (Cornelius). CPO 8 and CPO 9 were adjusted to respond to the new alignment for Evergreen Road, CPO 14 was adjusted to coincide with the school district boundary, and minor changes were made to CPO 1 and CPO 7 to avoid splitting a neighborhood. All changes were approved by the Board via Ordinance 572 and R&O 01-75.

- In 2003, the CCI requested a boundary change that would have created CPO 16 from an area within CPO 5 (Sherwood) to represent citizens in the Norwood area. An issue paper written by Planning Division staff dated March 14, 2003, provided background on the Board decision to deny this request. The report stated that more work was needed to address policy issues associated with the creation of new CPOs, and recommended that the area proposed for CPO 16 could function as a neighborhood association (as defined by R&O 86-58) or a sub-committee of CPO 5 in the meantime.

The functional relationship between the CPO Program and the various cities differs from city to city:

- **Beaverton**: The City has thirteen Neighborhood Association Committees (NACs) and a CCI. CPO 2 (Beaverton) is inactive, and instead the Beaverton NAC Program sends two representatives to serve on the CPO Program’s CCI Steering Committee to foster communication and coordination. City of Beaverton sends land development information to CPO Program leadership to ensure coordination with the surrounding CPOs.

- **Forest Grove**: CPO 12F (Forest Grove) is not currently active. The City supports its own CCI, which organizes their annual Town Hall Meeting.

- **Hillsboro**: CPO 9 (Hillsboro/Orenco) is active, and the City does not support or recognize its own neighborhood association structure. The City sends planning information to CPO Program staff for inclusion in the CPO 9 newsletter.

- **Tigard**: Tigard has created a CCI and is establishing a neighborhood network. CPO 4M (Metzger) and CPO 4B (Bull Mountain/Tigard) are active, and the City sends planning information to the CPO Program for inclusion in the CPO newsletters.
**Current CPO Activities**

The OSU CPO Program:
- Reaches over 11,000 households who have chosen to receive information about county and local government activities.
- Encourages engaged and empowered citizens to advise county and local government on issues of community livability through Citizen Participation Organizations.
- Offers residents and business operators the opportunity to experience leadership and to “learn by doing” the skills of meeting facilitation, agenda planning, group process, presenting testimony, and public policy development.
- Builds community leadership by serving as a stepping stone for citizens who choose to apply for appointment to public positions or campaign for elected offices.
- In partnership with citizen volunteers, consults with Washington County staff and Commissioners on public involvement strategies.

The CPO Program currently supports eleven active CPOs with electronic and mailed newsletters to over 11,000 residents and businesses. Active CPOs serve an area representing almost 80% of the County’s population. When combined with Beaverton’s Neighborhood Association Committees (NACs), this means that over 90% of the county’s population has access to an active citizen participation program.

An additional CPO in the Sherwood/Tualatin area (CPO 5) is in process of becoming active and will hold elections in October; although they are not yet meeting, they have a newsletter mailing list of 560. Another five CPOs are inactive, but almost 1,000 residents from those areas elect to receive a newsletter for non-active CPOs called “Citizen Involvement Quarterly.” Overall, 2.4% of the population in Washington County (excluding the area covered by Beaverton’s NAC Program) receives a newsletter from the CPO Program. See Attachment B for a summary of program statistics.

**Other Citizen Participation Mechanisms for Washington County**

Citizen involvement activities by the County both pre-date and go beyond the CPO Program. As a local government operating within a democratic system, the County organization itself is a product of a voter-approved Charter overseen by an elected governing body.

In addition, the County has maintained its commitment to both statutorily required citizen involvement processes as well as to those not required by law or rule, including:

**Public hearings and meetings**

The Board of County Commissioners and other committees that are part of the organization exercise their legislative and quasi-judicial authority in full compliance with Oregon public meetings laws. Citizens may be notified and attend these public meetings or view them over the Internet or government access cable TV. In the case of Regular Meetings of the Board of Commissioners, the Board’s Rules of Procedure outline several opportunities for communication with the public, including at the conclusion of the consent agenda and at the conclusion of all regular business. The Board’s Rules also provide for public testimony during public hearings required for ordinance adoption and quasi-judicial proceedings.
Town hall meetings and open houses

From time to time, the County will convene informal meetings, hearings and events to gather input and perspective from the public. The County tends to conduct town hall meetings and similar events to raise awareness and engage in dialog with citizens as part of major County initiatives. These events are typically convened during the evening, after normal working hours, in locations that are familiar to residents of each affected community and broadcast over government access cable TV.

Advisory committees and task forces

Almost 30 advisory committees and task forces are currently providing guidance and input to the County about various aspects of its operation and decision making. Each of these advisory groups is comprised in part or in total of lay citizens not otherwise associated with the County organization. Over 200 positions are currently reserved on these committees for citizen members. Although many of the advisory committees exist to satisfy state or federal requirements, several advisory groups have been created by the Board or departments to provide input to decision-makers, to open more formal avenues for communication with citizens and guide on-going operations. In many cases, citizens are appointed to advisory committees based on expertise they might have in a particular area of County service. Advisory committees are also created to conduct in-depth studies of particular initiatives or projects.

Additional public involvement activities may be occurring at the departmental level. A survey is in process to determine what other citizen involvement mechanisms are being utilized across the County organization.
ATTACHMENT A:  CPO Strategies Approved in 1995 (MO 95-271)

WASHINGTON COUNTY CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES
Final June 1, 1995

The strategic priorities listed here were developed by the Washington County Citizen Involvement Task Force after input from various citizens organizations. The priorities are presented to the Board of Commissioners for adoption.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO ALL COUNTY CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

County 1. Commit to on-going staff training in public involvement, mediation and facilitation skills. Provide staff training and education on how County citizen involvement programs function.

County 2. Practice outreach: provide information, gather feedback, and pursue involvement opportunities on issues of importance to the broad range of citizens at or near where they live, work, play and shop.

County 3. Provide and promote effective methods of information flow from citizens (whether members of formal organizations or not) to County departments and boards.

County 4. Use modern communications technologies to expand the number and type of opportunities for public information and involvement (e.g., fax, kiosks, applications on-line, etc.).

County 5. Encourage citizen participation: demonstrate to citizens that they can make a difference (e.g., ensure that information is easy to understand, complete and timely and is provided early in a decision-making process, structure meetings to be non-threatening and promote dialogue, encourage and acknowledge participation, and explain how citizen input was used in arriving at a final decision).

County 6. Encourage networking and communication between various projects, departments and agencies to make best use of citizen involvement responses. Encourage staff persons to become involved in community organizations, such as CPOs and non-profit organizations that deal with community issues.

County 7. Evaluate the effectiveness of the County’s citizen involvement programs annually and make enhancements as necessary, using meaningful measures of citizen involvement participation. Coordinate the development and use of evaluation tools based on the substantive concepts in the Citizen Involvement Evaluation Worksheet. However, the Worksheet needs to be simplified to be useful. Seek CCI input in conducting this annual evaluation.

County 8. Promote the broadest possible community perspective by networking and enhancing working relationships with CPOs, the CCI, non-profit community-based organizations, schools, churches, other governments, businesses and others to identify and act on public concerns and priorities.
County 9. Provide and maintain enhanced levels of funding, resources and overall coordination for the County’s many public information and involvement efforts to promote consistency and opportunities for dialogue.

County 10. Coordinate and, when possible, integrate the County’s citizen involvement and public information actions with other efforts within the county and in the metropolitan region.

County 11. Promote dignity and respect for everyone involved in the citizen involvement activities.

County 12. Commit to on-going funding of citizen involvement programs with the understanding that an enhanced program will require enhanced funding.

**RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO CCI ACTIVITIES**

CCI 1. Develop an agreement with the Board of Commissioners to include appropriate roles for County and cities’ CCI in assisting the Board to comply with Goal 1 requirements.
   - Develop an effective county-wide citizen involvement plan;
   - Assist in implementing the citizen involvement plan; and
   - Evaluation of the results of the county-wide citizen involvement plan.

CCI 2. Develop an agreement with the Board of Commissioners to identify appropriate roles for County and cities’ CCI or other entities in advising the County on all citizen involvement processes on an on-going basis.

CCI 3. Continue the CCI functions of providing training, education, leadership building and other services to CPOs.

CCI 4. Assist, encourage and facilitate efforts of CPOs to carry out their responsibilities related to CPO boundary changes and other strategic priorities.

CCI 5. Promote dignity and respect for everyone involved in citizen involvement activities.

**RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO CPO ACTIVITIES**

CPO 1. Initiate a process to reorganize CPO boundaries where appropriate to best promote sense of local community. The reorganization should consider many factors, including but not limited to:
   - The role of cities in the County;
   - The function of existing community facilities such as schools and churches; and
   - Existing neighborhood associations.

(Note: the specific method of accomplishing this boundary reorganization is not yet addressed. One idea to explore would be to leave current CPO boundaries at approximately their same size and create within them smaller, more locally based organizations.)

CPO 2. Increase staff resources funded by the County through OSU or some other organization for training, logistics, information, analysis and projects.
CPO 3. Increase resources for publicizing CPO program and encourage participation.

CPO 4. Promote coordination between County CPOs and citizen organizations within cities.

CPO 5. Establish a code of conduct for CPO meetings (treat all members and guests with dignity and respect, encourage the expression of alternative points of view, encourage broad-based participation, etc.).

CPO 6. Provide the option to each CPO to broaden its scope to community issues in addition to land use and transportation.

CPO 7. In establishing guidelines affecting CPO activities, the County should provide sufficient flexibility for CPOs to execute their responsibilities.

CPO 8. Promote dignity and respect for everyone involved in citizen involvement activities.
### ATTACHMENT B: CPO Statistics through July 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cedar Hills, Cedar Mill</td>
<td>8,616</td>
<td>45,048</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/Beaverton</td>
<td>Beaverton NACs</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>64,542</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West Slope, Raleigh Hills, Garden Home</td>
<td>3,998</td>
<td>22,756</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Bull Mountain, Tigard</td>
<td>8,843</td>
<td>36,674</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>King City and vicinity</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>10,186</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4M</td>
<td>Metzger</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>33,334</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (in transition)</td>
<td>Sherwood, Tualatin</td>
<td>25,423</td>
<td>38,320</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reedville, Cooper Mt, Aloha</td>
<td>18,387</td>
<td>80,305</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sunset West, Rock Creek, Bethany</td>
<td>13,696</td>
<td>61,325</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North Plains, Helvetia, Mountaindale</td>
<td>90,181</td>
<td>8,477</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hillsboro, Orenco</td>
<td>23,799</td>
<td>66,293</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scholls, Chehalem Mt, Bald Peak, River Rd</td>
<td>58,717</td>
<td>10,045</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (inactive)</td>
<td>Gaston, Cherry Grove, Laurelwood</td>
<td>93,104</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12C (inactive)</td>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>9,749</td>
<td>11,653</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12F (inactive)</td>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>11,219</td>
<td>19,258</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (inactive)</td>
<td>Roy, Gales Creek, Verboort</td>
<td>97,297</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (inactive)</td>
<td>Banks, Buxton, Manning, Timber</td>
<td>96,437</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fern Hill</td>
<td>23,189</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>601,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>524,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active CPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>601,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>524,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2000 Census plus 3%. Source: LUT Planning/S Kelley