



MINOR BETTERMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
November 17, 2011

<u>Members:</u>	John Douglas, URMDAC Bonnie Hadley, URMDAC Brian Irish, Staff Marty Moyer, CCI Doug Riedweg, RROMAC Stephen Roberts, Staff Lars Wahlstrom, RROMAC Aisha Willits, Staff Ed Anderson	<u>Staff:</u>	Victoria Saager Dave Schamp Stacia Sheelar Andrew Singelakis Todd Watkins
<u>Absent:</u>	Matt Meier, Staff Linda Peters, CCI Jinde Zhu, Staff	<u>Consultant:</u>	Leslie Howell
		<u>Guests:</u>	Gary Ross, CPO 1

Welcome

Leslie Howell opened the meeting with introductions and review of the last meeting minutes. The minutes were approved with one change to the Committee Discussion section. The second paragraph should start with CPO 7, not CPO 1.

Issues Bin Discussion:

There were no pending issues.

Public Input:

One member of the public was present and they spoke during the debrief on the process (comments included below).

Committee Discussion

Dave Schamp informed the committee that their recommendations for spending on minor betterments have been reviewed by the Division Managers and everyone approved. There will be a memo sent to Andrew Singelakis recommending construction start next fiscal year. Lars Wahlstrom asked if this work would be done by contract or county crews. Dave Schamp said the capacity within Operations is limited, but we would tap into Engineering Services and consultants as necessary.

The committee worked through a debriefing of the process and those topics and suggestions are below:

1. Committee Makeup and Selection
 - Good makeup of the committee
 - Non staff added passion and perspective
 - Rural and urban representation was good
 - Staff preparation was key
 - Continue to build awareness at CPOs
 - Good committee participation
 - Representative from each CPO would be good
 - CPO diversity was helpful
2. Public Involvement
 - Liked the use of the web for getting input
 - CPOs are more informed – inform them earlier
 - Think about a meeting time that works for the public
 - Access public meetings to share information
 - Ways to be involved
 - More media coverage – celebrate successes (sign the projects, share outcomes and statistics)
 - Use open house to promote minor betterments
 - Build on other county events
 - Good media information was posted
 - Facilitator added to the success
 - More public outreach through the CPOs
3. Criteria and Weighting
 - Transparency – explainable process
 - Comprehensive not unwieldy
 - Categories were good
 - More public feedback
 - Project “stickers” worked really well (during prioritization exercise)
 - Rated, sorted list added clarity (suggestions for packages of improvements)
 - Don’t change the weighting for a couple of years
 - Suggest criteria and weighting be Board adopted – public policy decision
 - Site visits for committee
 - Different “looks” at list by category
 - Committee evaluates – doesn’t just pick top candidates
 - Ranking is just a starting point
4. Information and Materials
 - Past successes
 - Evaluation of effectiveness (before and after usage)

- Project photo gallery (before and after) on the website
 - Promotional materials – handouts, flyers, cards
 - Candidate packets were cumbersome
 - Google street view would be helpful
 - Interactive map was challenging
5. Timing, Start Up of Next Round
- Start public awareness earlier
 - CPO meetings well before submittal deadlines
 - One more meeting on the front end before the list is ready
 - Field trip when school is in session
 - Timing of committee selection – earlier to the CPO
6. Other
- Criteria was the key to success

Leslie requested that staff provide their feedback. Brian Irish said that the process was much better with criteria. It presented a clearer picture. Stephen Roberts said the makeup of the committee was good and this was a huge step in the right direction. Todd Watkins said the passion from the citizens was great and was a real complement to the staff. Victoria Saager said last year was too analytical and the citizens brought a more practical view.

Leslie asked for public feedback from the guest, Gary Ross. He was very impressed by the committee. He would like to see two representatives from each CPO and more public outreach.

Andrew Singelakis thanked the committee for all of their work and thank you gifts were presented to the committee. Andrew set that good objectives were set and there was a great outcome.

What's Next?

The process going forward will be a recommendation from the Division Manager to the Director and then approved by the Board of Commissioners as part of the Annual Work Program next June.