Executive Summary
Washington County provides a continuum of opportunities for the public to provide meaningful input to their County government. These venues for involvement – ranging from direct access to elected and appointed officials, to nearly 30 citizen advisory committees and boards, to town hall meetings, to polls and surveys – also include organizations comprised of residents living within specific geographic areas of the county.

The means for drawing the boundaries for these Citizen Participation Organizations (CPOs) is the focus of this report. Related issues about the purpose of the CPO program and its relationship to other jurisdictions and organizations are also discussed.

Two Options for Boundary Changes
Since the year 2001, Washington County has provided two means by which CPO boundaries may be changed:

1. By act of the Board of County Commissioners in the form of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, which is changed through the formal Land Use Ordinance process as a component of the Department of Land Use and Transportation’s annual work plan; or,
2. By approval of a proposal brought to the Board of County Commissioners by the Committee on Citizen Involvement (CCI), representing the leadership of all active CPOs, after review of the proposal by the affected CPOs.

The County has received several inquiries about changing CPO boundaries since establishing these two pathways, but no boundary change has emerged as a result. The current CPO boundaries have been unchanged since 2001.

Task Force Purpose
The most recent request for a CPO boundary change from the City of Tigard in September 2009, together with a report from County administrative staff based on informational interviews with staff from cities across the county, prompted the County to convene a Task Force with the following two purposes:

1. To develop consensus on criteria and a process under which cities could request changes to CPO boundaries; and,
2. To recommend a proposal to the County Administrative Office for consideration by the Board of Commissioners that could be fully supported by both the CCI and the cities within the county.

To achieve these two objectives, an eleven-member Task Force representing active citizens in the County’s citizen involvement program as well as staff members from several city governments met throughout 2011.
Recommendations
After extensive discussion, the Task Force developed tools to clarify how the existing process – particularly the option whereby staff and citizen participants in the citizen participation program itself – could accommodate a boundary change request from a city, special district or any resident of Washington County. Specifically, the Task Force recommended that:

1. **The County’s CPO program adopt guidelines and a flow chart to support the boundary change process defined in the County’s standing procedure for making boundary changes.**

In the course of discussing boundary changes, the Task Force also identified related issues. Specifically, the Task Force recommended that:

2. **The CCI create a mission statement for the CPO program that would be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for consideration.**
3. **This mission statement should clarify the CPO program’s role in providing citizen input to jurisdictions other than the County (e.g., cities, special districts, Metro, State of Oregon).**
4. **The relationship between a CPO and a city should be determined locally, through collaboration between a city and a CPO, as appropriate.**

Finally, the Task Force noted that a comprehensive look at the existing CPO boundaries would be beneficial at this time. Specifically, the Task Force recommended that:

5. **The CCI initiate an assessment of CPO boundaries, with support from the County, to analyze what, if any, boundary change updates are needed.**

Further context and analysis of the Task Force’s work and recommendations are provided in this report.
Background
As part of a countywide “Framework” planning process in the early 1970s, the land use planning arm of Washington County divided the entire county into roughly ten areas, both rural and urban. A land use planner was given a liaison role to each of these areas, then called “Community Planning Organizations,” for purposes of gaining citizen involvement in the planning process. In the urban unincorporated areas, boundaries were set so that each area was large enough to encompass multiple neighborhoods but small enough for the County’s existing planning staff to maintain a one-to-one “planner-to-CPO” ratio.

After state enactment of Senate Bill 100 in 1973 and the adoption of 14 statewide land use planning goals, the Washington County Board of Commissioners associated the existing County program with the state requirement for citizen involvement described in Goal 1. As part of this action, the Board approved the creation of the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) where the citizen leaders of each active CPO could convene and provide input to the County government (Minute Orders 74-84 and 74-217). By 1980, the Board had recognized 14 CPOs providing citizen involvement opportunities for residents in cities, urban unincorporated areas and rural areas (Resolution & Order 80-108). By 1986, “Citizen Participation Organization” had replaced the name “Community Planning Organization.” In terms of territory, each CPO was to encompass a large group of citizens “united by geographic location, and organized to work on matters affecting their community,” regardless of whether residents within a CPO lived “within an incorporated or unincorporated area” (Resolution & Order 86-58).

Boundary Changes to Date
Several changes have occurred to CPO boundaries since the program was established, but none since 2001. The following summarizes the known boundary changes made so far:

- The Metzger Community Plan was completed in March of 1980, and the Bull Mountain Community Plan was adopted in 1983. Soon after, CPO 4 was divided to create CPO 4M (Metzger) and CPO 4B (Bull Mountain).
- In December of 2000, the CCI requested that the County’s Department of Land Use and Transportation make several boundary changes. The result was the creation of CPO 15 (Fern Hill) and CPO 4K (King City). An additional CCI request, originating from the City of Forest Grove, resulted in the division of CPO 12 into CPO 12F (Forest Grove) and CPO 12C (Cornelius). CPO 8 (North Plains/Helvetia/Moutaindale) and CPO 9 (Hillsboro/Orenco) were adjusted to respond to the new alignment for Evergreen Road, CPO 14 (Banks/Buxton) was adjusted to coincide with the Banks School District boundary, and minor changes were made to CPO 1 (Cedar Hills/Cedar Mill) and CPO 7 (Sunset West/Rock Creek/Bethany) to avoid splitting a neighborhood.

This last set of changes was approved by the Board in 2001 as part of Resolution & Order 01-75 and Ordinance 572. At the time, it was noted that the CPO boundary map had not been updated since 1986.
Current Process
There are currently two means by which CPO boundaries can be changed. The first method is through a staff recommendation for consideration by the Board of Commissioners. Since their creation in the early 1970s, proposals for new CPO boundaries have been drawn and re-drawn by Washington County’s land use planning staff as part of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan submitted for approval by the Board.

The second method involves citizens within the CPO Program taking a proposal directly to the Board. The same Board action that last adjusted CPO boundaries, Resolution & Order 01-75, also gave rise to this citizen-driven process.

This second method, which may be used to create new CPOs or alter current boundaries, was codified as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

1. The proposed CPO boundaries shall be clearly identified on a map that shows streets and street names.
2. The proposed boundaries shall be reviewed at a regularly scheduled CPO meeting to allow open discussion of the proposal. If the proposal would change the boundaries of two or more CPOs, the proposal shall be considered at a regular meeting by each of the affected CPOs unless a joint meeting of all the affected CPOs is conducted.
3. The Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) shall then review the proposed CPO boundaries at a regularly scheduled meeting.
4. The CCI shall prepare a recommendation on the boundary proposal and notify the affected CPO(s).
5. The CCI shall then forward their recommendation to the County. The CCI shall submit a map that clearly indicates the proposed CPO boundary changes and a narrative that describes the reasons why the boundary changes are or are not needed and, if applicable, why the CCI’s recommendation differs from that proposed by the CPO(s).
6. The Board of County Commissioners shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed CPO boundaries and shall approve, modify or deny the request.
7. Following a Board decision, which modifies the CPO boundaries, the County will then prepare a new Citizen Participation Organization map and provide copies to the CCI, all active County CPOs, and all County departments. (Resolution & Order 01-75)

Task Force Formation
Although the possibility of changing CPO boundaries has been discussed since adoption of Resolution and Order 01-75, no such changes have been made. 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 echoed staff findings from 1986 that more work was needed to address policy issues associated with the creation of new CPOs. Instead of creating a new CPO, the report recommended that the
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area proposed for CPO 16 could function as a neighborhood association (as defined by Resolution & Order 86-58) or a sub-committee of CPO 5 in the meantime.

The City of Tigard requested in September of 2009 that the County Board of Commissioners consider CPO boundary changes to create a CPO that aligns with Tigard’s city limits. In its 2010 Work Plan, Washington County’s Department of Land Use & Transportation responded to Tigard’s request by recommending that consideration of CPO boundary changes be delayed until other projects had progressed, including a review of the citizen participation program by the County Administrative Office.

The Administrative Office’s report entitled “Cities and the CPO Program: An Administrative and Programmatic Review,” released in August 2010, highlighted policy implications that stemmed from information learned during interviews with city staff. A key finding was the need to look at the role of CPOs within city jurisdictions and re-examine the structural relationship between cities and the CPO Program.

Task Force Purpose
To address the issues and requests identified since the last adjustment to CPO boundaries in 2001, the County Administrative Office initiated a task force of CPO representatives and city staff initially charged with assessing whether a third process should be created for addressing boundary-change requests initiated by cities. The two goals of the Task Force were to develop consensus on criteria and a process under which cities could request changes to CPO boundaries, and to recommend a proposal to the County Administrative Office for consideration by the Board of Commissioners that could be fully supported by both the CCI and the cities.

Membership
Members of the Task Force included:
- CPO 4B -- Julie Russell
- CPO 4M -- John Frewing
- CPO 4M -- Jim Long
- CPO 7 -- Marty Moyer
- CPO 7 -- Mary Manseau
- CPO 9 -- Albert Stanfield
- CPO 4K -- Kathy Stallkamp
- City of Banks -- Jim Hough
- City of Beaverton -- Lani Parr
- City of Hillsboro -- Erik Jensen
- City of Tigard -- Liz Newton

Staff support to the Task Force was provided by:
- Margot Barnett and Linda Gray, citizen involvement faculty with Oregon State University’s Extension Service;
- Philip Bransford and Sia Lindstrom with the Washington County Administrative Office; and,
- Victoria Saager with Washington County’s Department of Land Use and Transportation.
Task Force Recommendations

Over the course of four meetings, the Task Force developed the following recommendations:

1. **Process for Boundary Changes** – The current process for initiating CPO boundary changes through a CCI recommendation is appropriate for handling external requests. A third process is not needed. However, the current process would benefit from further definition.

   ⇒ **The Task Force recommends the CPO Program adopt guidelines and a flow chart to support the boundary change process defined in the original Resolution and Order (R&O 01-75).**

2. **Create a Mission Statement for the CPO Program** – Multiple guidance documents have been produced over the years that reflect an evolving purpose and scope for the CPO Program. Creation of a mission statement would bring cohesion and clear direction for the CPO Program and the community about the CPO Program’s current purpose.

   ⇒ **The Task Force recommends the CCI create a mission statement for the CPO Program that would be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for consideration.**

3. **Clarification of the Role and Relationship between Other Jurisdictions and CPO Program** – The Task Force discussed the varied understanding of the CPO Program’s role for providing input to jurisdictions other than Washington County. For example, the CPO Program’s role in providing citizen input to cities is unclear.

   ⇒ **The Task Force recommends the mission statement for the CPO Program clarify the CPO Program’s role in providing citizen input to jurisdictions other than the County (e.g., cities, special districts, Metro, State). This mission statement should be shared with other jurisdictions for input as it is drafted.**

   ⇒ **The Task Force notes that the relationship between a CPO and a city should be determined locally, through collaboration between the city and the CPO, as appropriate. The Task Force further notes that it is beneficial to the citizen participation process for CPOs and local jurisdictions to work collaboratively.**

4. **Update to CPO Boundary Map** – There is a need to comprehensively assess current CPO boundaries countywide. The CPO boundary map was last updated in 2001.

   ⇒ **The Task Force recommends that the CCI initiate an assessment of CPO boundaries, with support from the County, to analyze what, if any, boundary change updates are needed.**

**Boundary Change Guidelines & Process Flow**

With respect to the first recommendation of the Task Force, the group identified the following decision-making guidelines and process flow chart. In keeping the existing procedure in Resolution & Order 01-75, these considerations and steps should be used to assess proposals to change CPO boundaries and/or create new CPOs. These considerations carry equal weight and are not listed in priority order, but are numbered for ease of reference.
Specifically, a CPO boundary change proposal shall address the following guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Lead Assessment Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Express Clear Purpose.</strong> How would the recommended boundary change strengthen citizen involvement in Washington County?</td>
<td>Affected CPOs/CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Continue County Connection.</strong> The proposal must demonstrate how opportunities for citizen involvement and connection with Washington County government will be maintained or enhanced. The proposal must also demonstrate how the re-configured CPOs’ connection with the CCI will be actively maintained.</td>
<td>Affected CPOs/CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Provide Citizen Involvement and/or Build Relationship with Multiple Jurisdictions.</strong> With assistance from staff, the proposal should list the various public agencies and governmental jurisdictions existing within the boundaries of new or affected CPOs. The proposal must speak to maintaining a venue where these multiple jurisdictions, agencies and organizations may engage Washington County citizens. The proposal must also indicate how relationships between new or affected CPOs and these jurisdictions would be built or strengthened over time. The proposal must address how the new or affected CPOs would work together with any existing citizen participation mechanisms.</td>
<td>Affected CPOs/CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Have Appropriate Size.</strong> The proposal must demonstrate how new or affected CPOs shall be sized to best serve the involved citizenry, maintain neighborhood cohesion and reinforce the existing sense of local community. The re-shaped territory of current or new CPOs shall be contiguous and not contain islands or holes. As much as possible, new or affected CPO boundaries shall follow and not cross jurisdictional boundaries, prominent land forms, major streets or highways or other physical features that are commonly thought to define geographic areas of Washington County. As these geographic or jurisdictional features may change from time to time, the proposal must address how new CPO boundaries will balance the need for both (a) boundary adjustments and (b) boundary stability.</td>
<td>Affected CPOs/CCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Be Feasible

In order to demonstrate the on-going sustainability of new or affected CPOs, the proposal must indicate that no fewer than 10 citizens residing within the new or adjusted CPO boundaries and living throughout the proposed territory shall be active participants of the new or affected CPOs. Among these 10, half must commit to taking a defined leadership role within the CPO. These leaders must commit to promoting dignity, respect and a welcoming attitude toward all involved citizens and staff. The proposal should take into account the need for sufficient staff support and resources, recognizing that Washington County and OSU Extension retain resource allocation authority for the County CPO program. If a new CPO is to be created as part of a boundary change proposal, draft by-laws for this new CPO are encouraged. (Boundary change proposals for existing CPOs do not need to meet this requirement for draft by-laws.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSU Extension/ Washington County CAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Task Force also produced the following step-by-step guidance for addressing boundary change requests. Staff at OSU Extension and Washington County will jointly develop maps, template forms and other documentation to support the effective functioning of the process.
Conclusion

Washington County’s approach to citizen involvement has attempted to provide meaningful ways for citizens to give input to their county government. Among the various means for this involvement are the County’s citizen involvement program and the community-by-community venue that Citizen Participation Organizations provide. As these communities have grown and changed, citizens and city governments have periodically requested that the County adjust CPO boundaries. The record shows that the County’s decisions to actually change boundaries have been infrequent yet comprehensive. This history also shows that a deeper understanding and clarity among all involved – citizens, city governments and special districts, and County and program staff – about what constitutes a desirable outcome with respect to CPO boundary changes has been needed for some time.

The work of the 2011 CPO Boundary Change Task Force was intended to provide this shared understanding and clarity. The product of the Task Force’s work is provided in this report in the form of agreed-to guidelines and explicit process steps for making boundary changes. Related issues and suggestions for future improvements to the County’s citizen involvement program were also identified by the Task Force have been summarized in this report.

Addenda

- Response from Countywide Managers Group (cities and special districts)
- Response from CPO Program’s Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI)
Addendum #1: Response from Countywide Managers Group (Cities and Special Districts)

County Administration staff, along with Task Force members Liz Newton (City of Tigard) and Jim Hough (City of Banks), presented the Task Force’s recommendations to the countywide managers group for feedback on January 25, 2012. Represented in the meeting were: cities of Beaverton, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, Banks, Sherwood, Tigard, and Tualatin; Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD); Clean Water Services; and Tualatin Valley Water District. Discussion from the managers included the following comments and ideas.

Connection/Collaboration with Cities:
- It would be nice to make a better connection between city citizen participation activities and the County’s CPO Program.
- One question that is unclear is how city residents, who are also county residents, can access Washington County’s citizen participation mechanism to give feedback on issues that affect the county as a whole.
- Another key issue is county unincorporated residents who want to interact with the city or cities near them.

Special Districts:
- Special districts sometimes use the CPOs and NACs as one of their citizen participation qualifiers for new projects. The district must balance this approach so the CPO/NAC process serves as a qualifier but not the sole qualifier to ensure a full citizen input process. An issue or project brought to a CPO or NAC by a district can take over the meeting agenda if the district presenters are not careful.

Impact of Boundaries on CPO Identity/Cohesion:
- Some CPOs struggle with identity and cohesiveness, which affect their ability to remain active and vital.
- The “active” status of a CPO in one area has been in a state of flux. CPO participants seem unsure of their scope or identity. Maybe this CPO needs to be smaller geographically to help create a more cohesive sense of identity.
- School district boundaries might also be helpful in creating a common identity for CPOs.
- The changes in urban reserve designations may also need to be part of the boundary change process.
- CPO meetings can sometimes be dominated by a special purpose or special interest if a CPO only encompasses one part of a city. In some cases, a CPO that is contiguous with the entire city could help CPO participants keep the larger issues in the forefront.
- The question of identity is not just a geographic one. How we define our county and our city citizen participation groups also affects their identity.

Purpose of CPO Program:
- The beauty of the CPO Program is that it is driven by the interest of the people who participate.
- The CPOs serve the County and ultimately need to meet the needs of the County.
Addendum #2: Response from CPO Program’s Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI)

County Administration staff, together with Task Force member Jim Hough (City of Banks), presented the Task Force’s recommendations to the Committee for Citizen Involvement at their meeting on February 21, 2012. CPO Program representatives from the Task Force were also present at the meeting: Jim Long, Mary Manseau, Marty Moyer, and Albert Stanfield.

The CCI took formal action to approve the Task Force’s recommendations at a subsequent meeting on March 20, 2012, with a vote of 10 in favor and 5 against. While the meeting minutes reflect significant support for the recommendations and for the Task Force’s report, at least one member expressed a need for additional assistance and solutions regarding CPO boundary changes (particularly around the issue of CPO size) given how complicated the issues are.

*The response letter from the CCI is attached.*
April 16, 2012

Sia Lindstrom, Senior Deputy County Administrator
Philip Bransford, Communications Officer
County Administrative Office
155 N 1st Ave, Suite 300
Hillsboro, OR 97124

RE: CPO Boundary Task Force Report

Thank you for presenting the recommendations from the Boundary Task Force Report at our February 21, 2012 CCI meeting. After discussion at that meeting it was decided that CCI Representatives were to discuss the recommendations with their individual CPOs and or Steering Committees, and to provide feedback based upon their discussions at our March 20, 2012 CCI meeting.

At our March 2012 CCI meeting, written and oral comments from CPO 1, CPO 3, CPO 4K, CPO 7 and CPO 15 on the Boundary Task Force Report Recommendations were submitted and discussed by the CCI membership. CCI membership voted 10 in favor, 5 against, with no abstentions, to approve the Boundary Task Force Report Recommendations. The excerpt of the discussion on the approval of the Boundary Task Force from the meeting minutes is attached.

Sincerely,

Mary Manseau
CCI Corresponding Secretary

Attachment: Discussion Re: Boundary Task Force Report Extracted from March 20, 2012 Meeting Minutes
CCI Response to CPO Boundary Task Force Report Recommendations

Henry Oberhelman passed out the comments that the CCI Steering Committee had received about the Boundary Task Force Report.

CPO 1 – James Trumper, Steering Committee Member, “In my opinion, the current CPO system is broken—especially for those areas inside the urban growth boundary. The County needs to consider moving towards more of a “neighborhood” program like the one in Beaverton so that people feel like they are part of a neighborhood rather than part of some nebulous “citizen participation organization that has boundaries that cross multiple neighborhoods/urban areas. The County should also consider moving away from the archaic methods of information distribution (e.g. printed newsletters/email) to using more modern techniques like Facebook, Twitter, blogs and neighborhood websites. Major reform is required – especially if greater public input is desired.”

CPO 7 - Steering Committee comments - There are too many jurisdictions within our current boundaries to work with. We need to suggest boundary changes that will help make our CPO better/stronger. We can’t create a second CPO within CPO 7 because we do not have a core group of folks living south of Highway 26 to take ownership of the second CPO.

CPO 15- Kay Nakao, CPO Secretary, “It appears to me that the Task Force has indeed done a comprehensive job on the issue. I agree with their report and have nothing to add. Paul Johnson, CCI representative, “I’m satisfied that the task force has done an excellent job.”

The following comments were provided at the meeting as representing discussions from CPO Steering Committees or at CPO meetings:

Yvonne Hoekstra reported that at a meeting of the Steering Committee of CPO4K March 8, 2012 it was agreed to present the following input on the proposed CPO boundary change proposal:

The committee was in agreement with the entire proposal and wanted to emphasize the following points:

- **Item 2 Create a Mission Statement for the CPO Program.** Committee agreed with the Task Force recommendation for the CCI to create the statement and forward it to the Board of Commissioners for consideration.

- **Item 3 Clarification of the Role and Relationship between Other Jurisdictions and CPO Program.** Committee agreed the mission statement should clarify the CPO’s role in providing citizen input to Jurisdictions other than County. The committee agreed this mission statement should be shared with other jurisdictions for input during the drafting phase.

  The committee also agreed that the relationship between a CPO and a city should be determined locally, through their collaboration. The committee further agreed with the benefit of the participation process when CPO’s and local jurisdictions work collaboratively.

- **Item 4 Update of CPO Boundary Map.** The committee fully agrees the CCI should initiate an assessment of current CPO boundaries to determine if there is a need for changes at the present time.

CCI Discussion of the CPO Boundary Task Force Report
(Extracted from March 20, 2012 CCI Meeting Minutes)
Yvonne described how CPO 4K works closely and well with the different jurisdictions. A comment was made by a CCI member that it leaves work and decision making mostly up the CCI and CPOs.

Jason Yurgel reported that during the regular meeting of CPO3 on March 15th, 2012, the members discussed the recent draft of the final report from the CPO Boundary Change Task Force, including the history behind the task force, and an overview of the guidelines and recommendations that it contains. By a vote of 11-0, CPO3 unanimously passed a motion in support of this report, and the guidelines and suggestions contained within. In addition, the leadership team of CPO3 would like to extend their thanks to the members of the CPO Boundary Change Task Force for their work on this report.

**Motion:** Albert Stanfield moved that the CCI approve the boundary task force recommendations. Jason Yurgel seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Ben Marcotte asked whether the motion should include an amendment that has some specific suggestions or recommendations, or should there be a second motion that includes additional suggestions? Mary Manseau indicated that the CPO 7 Steering Committee feels that they need some additional assistance and better solutions to address the concerns that the CPO is too large. They struggle with difficulties due to geography, the way Hwy 26 divides the CPO and the overlap with City of Hillsboro and Beaverton.

Tom Black indicated that the low meeting attendance means CPOs need to get out of our box, meet in different places, somewhere more accessible to people.

Mary Manseau – We have too many issues in our area to address well, and it is hard to get people from all areas of the CPO to attend. There are several who do, but it would be better to have smaller areas that could work with the different jurisdictions. She is concerned that if they did split the CPO that part of the area would end up without representation because the CPO would not be active. Albert Stanfield – So you are saying if you create a new CPO 7A, then it is likely that CPO7B would wither on the vine and be an inactive CPO. This probably wouldn’t meet the guidelines.

**General Question:** Does the group want to give a response to say that the issue is more complicated? Should the CCI table the discussion of amendments or other suggestions for a future meeting? There was no clear response from the group to these questions. Tom Black asked if the CCI could amend the motion to include additional comments. Yes. (No amendment was proposed.) Gary Virgin thinks that whatever the CCI says should be complete and address all of the issues.

Margot was asked to repeat the motion. She indicated that Albert’s motion was for the CCI to approve the boundary task force recommendations. The question was called. **Vote:** 10 ayes, 5 nays, no abstentions. **Motion carried**

Jim Long raised the issue of whether there should be a minority report or whether the issue should be sent back to the steering committee? Mary moved to retract the motion and send the content of the Task Force Recommendations back to the steering committee for additional comments. The motion was seconded by Jim Long. There was no discussion, the question was called. **Vote:** 6 Ayes, 7 No, No Abstentions. **Motion failed.**

CCI Discussion of the CPO Boundary Task Force Report  
(Extracted from March 20, 2012 CCI Meeting Minutes)
The question was asked whether there is a larger set of issues that weren’t addressed. The size of the CPOs was not adequately addressed through the process. Bruce Bartlett stated he feels that it isn’t worth the effort to create a more complete response. Wynne would like to send a complete package with comments. Can’t they delay? Margot Barnett reminded the group that they had agreed at the last meeting to get input from the CPO Steering Committees and craft a CCI response to the report to Sia Lindstrom and Philip Bransford. The report includes comments from the City Managers as an Appendix, and this is an opportunity for comments from the CCI to be included following the review. She indicated that there is not a particular time constraint on getting the CCI’s response. Once the CAO’s office receives comments from the CCI the report will be provided to the Board of Commissioners. There was some discussion that approval from the CCI is independent from the CPOs. The CCI could include a consensus statement.

John Driscoll stated that he feels that the document (Task Force Recommendations) solves the problem of how to address CPO boundary changes. At some point in time CPO 9 will come to CPO 8 and ask to change boundaries it is up to the CPOs to hash it out and bring it to the CCI who would say yea or nay and pass recommendation along.

There was no further discussion.