CCI Meeting Summary
January 18, 2022 | 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm
Virtual Zoom Meeting

Attendees:
Jim Long (CPO 4M); Mary Manseau (Code and Ordinance Subcommittee Chair); Virginia Bruce (CPO 1); Ben Marcotte (CPO 3); ~~Stan Houseman (CPO 3); Liles Garcia (CPO 6 – non-voting);~~ Bruce Bartlett (CPO 1, CCI Secretary); Paul Johnson (CPO 15); Lars Wahlstrom (CPO 10); Jill Warren (CPO 4M); Gretchen Buehner (CPO 4K); Greg Malinowski (CPO 7); Richard Smith (CPO 10); Fran Warren (CPO 1 – non-voting); ~~Raymond Eck (CPO 6);~~ Kay Gooding (CPO 4K – non-voting); Becky Morinishi (CPO 6); Ken Seymour (CPO 6); Yvonne Johnson (CPO 4K); Ellen Partal (Communication Subcommittee Chair);

Meeting Scribes: Marcus Ford, Washington County Community Engagement Program Coordinator

County Staff:
Marcus Ford, OEICE; Brenda Schaffer, WCSO; John Hutzler, Auditor;

Approximate total attendance: 35

Welcome, Introductions, Prior Meeting Summary:

- Meeting Called to Order at 7:02 pm by – Bruce Bartlett
- Introductions & Check-in
- Review of minutes – Gretchen motioned to approve the minutes Mary seconded (after some brief changes were made) – passed 10-0 with 1 abstention (Becky abstained – wasn't at last meeting)
- Announcements

CCI – CPO/CCI Program Update Discussion
Discussion of the presentation by OEICE on 12/14/2021

- Some brief discussion about who all watched/reviewed materials, and who has served on an appointed board.
- Bruce proposed discussion about the overall program first, and then the proposed recommendations

4 Main Issues

- There is the LUT component which is CCI/CPOs primary focus – Both Policy and Code elements
- There is 2-way communication that needs to be incorporated into the new process: County to community, and community to County
    - Mary asked – how much communication is happening between the volunteers and the OEICE?
    - Gretchen noted – OEICE isn't communicating with some of the other bureaus
    - Fran noted – residents, property owners, and businesses are included in "community"
    - Richard notes that contacting LUT lately results in full voicemails and not reaching anyone
        - Mary noted the Melissa De Lyser in LUT is responsive

    - Ellen states the outward chain of communication (like CPO leaders to community members) also has not been addressed – they should have access to email lists. We should be able to welcome members into the community.
    - Fran noted – City communication is important to note as well as unincorporated areas
    - Mary adds – we also need changes to the boundaries
    - Kimberly Culbertson (former chair of CPO 9) – Urban CPOs have a steep climb to get these up and running. Notes Washington County's biggest city should have a voice in redistricting things
- Neighbor to neighbor communication is working for some CPOs but not others
    - Lars - Rural has different issues with this
        - Current CPO structure seems to be meeting the needs for rural folks to gather over issues important to them
        - Broadband issues are relevant here as well
    - Becky - Big lack of people even knowing they are a part of a CPO
        - A lot of people are not on Facebook and/or Nextdoor
        - Ellen – email notices (which CE does) is helpful for this
        - There has been a lack of training for new CPO leaders so they don't know what resources are available to them
    - Mary – We are a hidden gem that nobody knows about. The flyer with the tax bill is just not cutting it. Not having access to the email list makes the neighbor-to-neighbor communication broken
    - Gretchen – some notices go to HOAs as well
        - Bruce – the County has no tracking of HOAs
    - Fran – The pandemic has truly aggravated the digital divide, and we are dependent on the OEICE which is not supporting the digital need
- Nature of the groups (appointed memberships or voluntary memberships) (Planning Commission vs Code subcommittee)
    - Bruce – we should try to become appointed members of advisory committees rather than everything be volunteer
    - Fran – When planning commission members stand in for CPOs, they are "acknowledged representation of the community," in the other instances we are at the mercy of the Board of Commissioners.
    - Lars – Was appointed to a board and was asked to leave after a few years – thinks it's not good that you volunteer your time and then are asked to leave because of term limits.
        - Mary – the Board wants to see new faces showing up on the committees because they feel it is more equitable
        - Gretchen – more turnover means more time for members to get caught up to speed
            - Bruce – not a fan of term limits because of this
    - Becky – we don't have people chomping at the bit to be CPO leaders
        - Bruce – OEICE is hoping that looking at things through an equity lens will bring people out, but unless we give them something to be excited about that won't happen
        - Becky – the inclusion process needs more work before we start appointing people with an equity lens
    - Gretchen – Folks should have at least been a part of the CCI before they are appointed to relevant boards

- Richard – If we lead to appointments for CPOs it will not work and the CPO program will die, there aren't enough volunteers as is.
    - Gretchen clarified that they are talking about CCI subcommittees being appointed
- Ellen – Would like to see them try and have an effective communication plan with the community before determining whether or not these should be appointed or not
- Jim – Proposed if the County goes ahead with appointed CPO leadership, they should call them Appointed Participation Organizations
- Consensus is appointment of CPO leaders does not make sense
- Fran – OEICE is supposed to have a community leaders development program and current leaders would be "mentors" in this process.
    - Bruce – OEICE is addressing the leader program in the underserved communities
    - Fran – they were supposed to funnel those newly trained leaders into our program so they could eventually replace us
- Gretchen – CPO leader training has been missing for about 5 years

Other CPO Issues

- Lars – We need a pool of speakers/presenters
- Jim – There has been some issues with the way board testimony has been working and not getting everyone captured
    - Just because planning has been going on for decades doesn't mean folks' voice today isn't valuable
- Becky – When she tried to reach out to presenters she was scolded and told to go through Marcus – some training in this area would have helped because this was off-putting
- Mary – the lack of training has been leaving people high and dry. It's better to go straight through Melissa De Lyser than OEICE because the message through sometimes gets convulsed with OEICE.
- Ken – has been sitting in on commission meetings lately – a lot of people are up in arms about the plans the County has for these roads – people are finding out at the last minute, bad notifications, etc. We should be helping to give an avenue to these people to help them out.
    - Mary – it's hard for community members to understand all of the nuances between the cities, counties, and CPOs.
    - Fran – Washington County is experiencing Rapid Urbanization
    - Virginia – Community members have legit concerns about roads and need to be heard

Specific OEICE Recommendations

Boundaries

Bruce created a DRAFT *with his recommendations and this was reviewed with all members*

- Gretchen – School districts are huge conglomerates that cross city lines and she doesn't think it would be a good idea to align with these
    - Bruce – school boundaries are bound by population relative to elementary school sizes – SOMETHING needs to define CPO boundaries and this would not need our control.
    - Gretchen – are we talking about elementary, middle, or high school districts
        - Bruce – I'm looking for something that already exists that we don't have to reinvent
    - Fran – school districts have their own boundary issues as well
    - Ben – one of the biggest benefits the CPOs provide is addressing the underrepresentation of folks outside of cities. School district boundaries would cause issues with regards to this.

    - Jim – Hillsboro School District is huge
    - Yvonne – agrees with Bruce on going with school districts, although it will make huge CPOs, so we should go to the elementary school level, but then there would be too many CPOs
        - If PTO leaders were de facto CPO leaders you would have leadership in already
            - Gretchen – not everyone has kids
                - Bruce – this is more of a "yes AND" situation where we can have the best of both worlds
- Gretchen – CPOs are way too big population-wise. 4K functions well because it is small
- Virginia – I think Commissioner districts would be a better baseline
- Greg – Sometimes cities and outside districts don't play well together when boundaries are mixed. There are things that cross boundaries (ESPD, Courts, etc.)
- Ben – Should CPO boundaries be a subdivision of commissioner boundaries? It's an interesting thought but unsure if it gets to the core of the issue. LUT development drives a lot of what happens with the CPO and there isn't a line to divide these, other than the urban growth boundary
- Ellen – the CPOs themselves are the ones capable of making these boundary changes.
    - Mary – an issue with this is you need someone to take over the other half if you are going to split
        - Gretchen the last time this was done was 1998 with CPO 4 into 4K/4M
- Fran – we need to sit down with OEICE and look at demographics data and look at different possible ways of making that proposal – right now we just don't have enough information
- Ken – we spent the first part of this meeting talking about not having enough people and now we are talking about having even more CPOs – we are being a little pre-emptive with this. How are we going to redistrict if we don't have the headcount to support it?
- Yvonne – people need to raise their hand to speak and not just interrupt others
- Lars – Retain the CPO division and borders. We shouldn't let the County commissioners redistrict us to their districts.

Other

Bruce – The other 3 recommendations dance around why would people want to be involved with our CPO system as it currently stands

- County Strategic Planning Process
    - How involved could the CCI be in the Strategic Planning Process
    - Mary – why are we having this conversation among ourselves and not with County staff facilitated by a third party
        - Ellen – Very few recommendations have been taken by OEICE – it would be in our best interest to be on the same page on all these things so we aren't spread thin across all these issues.
            - Mary – we need to have a working group that works through these issues.
    - Marcus gave a very brief synopsis of One Washington County
        - Trying to ensure everyone has the same experience when interacting with all the different Washington County departments, which currently is not happening
    - Fran – we have a very vast county, I don't think the County has given us enough credit for covering such a vast array of things
- Updating R&O 86-58

    - Bruce – This needs updating far beyond just the linguistics
- CPO structure
    - Bruce – there is still so much valid and relevant parts of the 2016 CPO transition plan that was done, and should be used
        - Ellen – we need to go deeper as well. They cannot reposition us without our alignment.
    - Jim – I was part of the transition planning team and the County still hasn't done any of these things. The county should be more accountable to this.
    - Mary – There needs to be clarification and details about the budget for the CPO – Maybe a budget summary, a breakdown of the $350k they quoted from the report
        - Fran – Also, where is the money coming from?
    - Jim – Roy Rogers brought up the money situation, and if it was ran like a business it wouldn't hold up. Mary's right – we need to know what we're asking
    - Virginia – we need to make a formal vote *to* ***request a written and detailed report about how the CPO budget ($350k) is spent, and what are the source of the funds over the last two years (and if need be, a presentation after)***
        - Mary moved – Gretchen seconded – passed 11-0 (1 abstention)
            - Jim wants this to be more thought out so he abstained – thinks it may open a can of worms. We should probably go back all the way to the OSU budgets and such
            - This may be discussed further in the steering committee meeting to draft a letter
    - Mary made a motion – Gretchen seconded – **to create a task force to address this issue, which will include a staff, LUT, and a facilitator** – with discussion, it was decided steering committee would address it and this would be tabled. Motion passed to table this – 10 – 0
        - Fran – can they stop making changes to our webpage without telling us about it?

Code and Ordinance Subcommittee Update – Mary Manseau:

- Suspended currently while the CPO revisioning is happening
- Jim - There are a lot of ordinances that are still happening, I hope this subcommittee is keeping an eye on these
- Mary – all the focus is going to be on Middle Housing
    - We need help from OEICE to let people know we are here to help and support the community

Significant Natural Resources Subcommittee Update – Jim Long:

- There were a couple decisions in the last couple of months that were against Washington County and in favor of CPO 4M
    - Jim will send something out to everyone about this within the next week or so
- There was also a separate appeal of the habitat assessment guidelines that they were successful on as well
- Still waiting to hear from the county on these things.

Communication Subcommittee Update – Ellen Partal:

- They discussed the 4 recommendations we talked about here today when they met

Upcoming proposed CCI meetings – Bruce Bartlett

Round the Group: CPO updates, Relevant, Request for Help, Spark an Idea:

Public Comment:

Adjourn:
Jim moved to adjourn meeting – Gretchen seconded – no votes against
Meeting adjourned at 9:05pm