CCI Meeting Minutes – Regular Meeting

September 17, 2024| 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Virtual Zoom meeting

Attendees:

CPO 1: Bruce Bartlett, Mary Lou Oberson

CPO 3: Stan Houseman, Ben Marcotte

CP0 4M: Jill Warren, Jim Long

CPO 4K: Janet Black, Dawn Mobley

CPO 6: Ken Seymour, Caleb Bourgeois

CPO 7: Mary Manseau

CPO 10: Dick Smith

CPO 13: Jacqueline Duyck

CPO 14: Ayla Hofler

CPO 15: Paul Johnson

Additional attendees: Gretchen Buehner, Jerry, LilesG, Cheryl, Steve H., Jim Duggan, Jody Wiser, Zoe Mackey, Deborah Lockwood, Robert Young, Tanya Macedo, Mark Dinsmore, Dick Smith, Maureen Barnhart, Kenlynn's iPhone, Nats iPhone, E's iPhone,

Washington County Staff: Aika Fallstrom OEICE

Meeting Scribe: Aika Fallstrom

Approximate total attendance: 30

7:00 PM Meeting Called to order by Bruce Bartlett, CCI Chair

Amanda Garcia-Snell, Community Engagement Manager and Temporary Deputy Chief Equity and Inclusion Officer, came to the CCI meeting to provide a presentation and have a listening session on the five elements of the CPO modernization program. For full feedback, please refer to attached pdf.

Modernizing Language:

- Align with state wording (LCDC)
- Happy that wording will align with what CPO are already using
- Hoping for clarification on "citizenry" (resides, owns business or property in area)
- Maybe "constituent" instead of community

Focus and Scope Feedback:

- Quality of life issues are more critical than LUT issues, although many QOL issues are LUT issues.
- Most of urban unincorporated areas have areas in city- need consistency
- An opportunity to ask for help from LUT and County- conduit of information exchange
- CPOs are an opportunity to stay engaged in community (quality of life issues)
- What prompted the narrowing of the scope and what are alternatives?

Membership/Eligibility Feedback

- Shock and surprise- there isn't a point in the BCC appointing people (third)
- What are the goals with appointments? What are the results?
- What about inclusivity? What does this have to do with DEI?
- As a newcomer, might not be involved if there was less access
- CCI is different than B&C- the character is different (community driven)
- Appointments could be a formality

Program Requirements Feedback

- Clarification on sub-committees- if they cannot speak directly to the BCC should they be under Public Meeting Laws
- EDI concerns
- Lack of training and consistency in trainings- hoping for more training if that is the expectation
- Adds undue burden and limits freedom of expression
- What happens if we don't follow PML? Need clarification on consequences

Boundaries Feedback

- Are boundaries there for commissioners or CPO leaders?
- Code concern- multiple community plans (splits between school districts, park dists, etc).
- There is a concern about only 3 within districts- community need vs OEICE needs?
- Clarify unincorporated areas
- CCI decides the boundaries (with feedback from CPO)

- Who are you representing with the boundaries?
- Maybe look at zoning instead of commissioner districts and representing whole municipality (instead of splitting up between CPOs)
- Community is cohesive, but commissioner districts are not
- Changing boundaries could be disruptive to some CPOs
- Depending CPO functions, geography could be one factor

Bike Rack/Parking Lot Feedback:

- Who are you working with from LCDC? (Fran)
- Difference between community engagement vs. public engagement (Metro meeting)
- Citizenry used as condition of voting (CPO 14)
- If scope is rolled back to LUT, how will community members know about other topics? (ie Clean Water Services)
- 1980 R&O adds LUT piece, 1986 R&O looks at community matters
- Since BCC is also Board for CWS, where is the distinction
- Wouldn't hear about quality of life (ie Intel emissions)
- CPOs as catalyst between jurisdictions,
- Webpage: CPO blurb is helpful to newcomers
- CPO/CCI are the whiteboard (we are discussion, we are concerns, we are the direct line to the community (things that affect us) that county staff doesn't know (boots on the ground)
- CPO are usually first line of communications
- Important to get this information to CPOs
- History of OSU Extension program as helpful- some counties have Planning Commissions as community involvement (not good either)
- SLAPP suits-would want more information
- Include more EDI in this process, BCC is losing creditability with current members
- Will this modernization increase or decrease participation?
- Involvement has many layers- some are only involved for some issues or not. Levels of training.
- What protocol do we need in place for those that don't want long-term involvement
- Were CPOs originally aligned with community development plan?
- Thought that CCI was direct line to BCC (concern about flow of information)
- CPO should be able to talk about livability issues (fire safety, water, etc)
- OEICE funding- Goal One reminder
- Please make the framework clearer for CPO program (for county funds)
- Rules should be different for urban vs. rural CPOs

Subcommittee Reports

- **Significant Natural Resources Subcommittee**
    - Ordinances 901 and 902 have gone before Planning Commission

- At last meeting, there was approval for the letter to be sent to PC and BCC. First paragraph was added, but not approved.
- Motion for letter from Ken Dobson (lawyer) to be reviewed and consider endorsement by SC, Seconded by Caleb.
  - 13 approved
  - 0 disapprove
  - 0 abstain

- **Transportation Subcommittee**
  - No updates at this time.
- **Communications Subcommittee Report**
  - Looking for volunteers for Communications Subcommittee
  - Caleb Bourgeois volunteered o serve.

CPO Leaders Roundtable

- No updates at this month as time had run out.

Mary moved to end. Jim and Caleb seconded.

Meeting ended at 9:02 pm.