

CPO Modernization Project Comments For Discussion at the Feb 18, 2025 WC CCI Meeting

The membership of the Washington County Committee for Community Involvement (WC CCI) has reviewed and discussed the five Community Participation Organization (CPO) Modernization project guidelines. In this document, we share our thoughts on the guidelines, ask questions, and offer recommendations for the best possible outcome of the project. Throughout this document, the term “CPO Program” is used to also refer to the WC CCI unless the subject is specific to only the WC CCI.

Table of Contents

Framework of the CPO Modernization Project	2
Desired Project Outcomes	2
Guideline 1: Modernized language	3
Guideline 2: Update Focus and Scope	3
Guideline 3: Membership and Eligibility	6
CCI Structure and Membership	6
CCI Structure Modernization.....	6
Recommended Changes to the WC CCI Structure	7
Support for Appointing Modernized CCI Membership	7
CPO Leadership Membership	8
Recommendations for Appointing CPO Leaders	8
Guideline 4: Program Requirements	9
Guideline 5: Geography/CPO Boundaries	10
Recommendations for CPO Boundaries	11
Appendix A – New Resolution and Order Required	13
R&O 80-108 Summarized	13
R&O 86-58 Summarized.....	14
Appendix B - CPO Program Reference Material	15

Framework of the CPO Modernization Project

A project of this dimension would benefit from having a framework better describing the outcomes.

It is essential to note that the CPO Program is the only public-facing component of the county's public participation system which makes it the natural channel for other groups to reach the public. To most successfully evolve the CPO Program, defining how it meets Goal 1 requirements and fits with the county's own needs, coordinating it with the county's Boards & Commissions (B&C), community-based organizations, communities of interest and youth programs would be of tremendous value. The Clackamas County Community Engagement Framework is a good example of a framework document which places their participation/CPO program in a larger context of community engagement <https://dochub.clackamas.us/documents/drupal/72aacb47-a5b1-460b-a214-e92ef7babc7e>

Desired Project Outcomes

In order to assure successful completion of the CPO Modernization projects, we feel it is necessary to specify these Outcomes:

- An emphasis be made to create a welcoming CPO program that people desire to be involved with, not just when they are upset.
- Creation of a new Resolution and Order (R&O) to define the CPO Program which must explicitly include all of the applicable elements of R&O 80-108 and R&O 86-58, replacing the original R&Os.
- Submittal of the new CPO Program to LCDC to gain approval before BCC approval.
 - Evaluation is needed to determine whether the new CPO program meets the Goal 1 requirements and is adequately funded.
 - See *Appendix A – New Resolution and Order Required* for a detailed description of these R&Os and where the CPO program is referenced in county documents that may need to be addressed as part of this project.
- The relationship between the new CPOs and the Land Use and Transportation (LUT) Community Plans are effectively addressed.
- New bylaws for the WC CCI, cooperatively developed by CPO volunteers and Washington County Staff.
- A revised Service Level Agreement between the county and the WC CCI
- A new Service Level Agreement between the county and the CPO Program
- A new template for CPOs bylaws, cooperatively developed by CPO volunteers and Washington County Staff.

- All web pages that discuss the CPO Program are updated with accurate information
- Training plans established for:
 - CPO leaders in land use, meeting facilitation, conflict resolution, etc.
 - Civic Leaders for any interested community members
 - Community members in all aspects of LUT planning and civic engagement
- An updated CPO Handbook

Guideline 1: Modernized language

“Remove outdated language that is gender exclusive or refers to “citizens” as opposed to “community members.”

The CPO framework documents clearly need updated language to bring them into the 21st century. However, “revising R&O 86-58” is an inadequate way of describing the work needed. See *Appendix A – New Resolution and Order Required*.

Guideline 2: Update Focus and Scope

“Restoring the original focus of the CPO/CCI program so that it advises the Board of County Commissioners primarily about land use and transportation planning within Washington County’s unincorporated areas. The CPOs and CCI would continue to provide opportunities for community updates on other topics.”

Question:

- In what ways has the CPO program expanded beyond the original scope? We understand that CPOs as bodies cannot run political campaigns or lobby elections. (https://oregon.public.law/rules/oar_165-013-0030) However, this does not require a change in focus of the program, but rather shows a need for improved CPO leader training. Please provide examples.
- Is the intent of the BCC to limit the focus of the CPO program to only land use to fulfill the requirements identified in Goal 1? Or does the BCC want the CPO program to encompass all issues of interest to the public, including land use issues?

The original focus and scope of the CPO Program was not simply to advise the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), but rather it was to fulfill the requirements as set out in [Oregon’s Land Use Goal 1](#) and Washington County’s Comprehensive Plan Documents.”

To establish our context, Goal 1 identifies the need for both a citizen (sic) involvement program and a CCI. The requirements of State Goal 1, including but not limited to a program that:

- a. Involves a widespread cross-section of the affected public in all phases of the planning or decision process;
- b. Clearly defines the procedures by which the general public will be involved in the on-going planning or decision-making process;
- c. Is appropriate to the scale of the planning effort or decision;
- d. Provides for continuity of public participation, and continuity of information that enables members of the public to identify and comprehend the issues;
- e. Provides effective two-way communication with the public, and assures that affected members of the public receive a response from policymakers; and
- f. Ensures the allotment of adequate funding and human, financial, and informational resources for public involvement.

Also from Goal 1:

“To develop a citizen (sic) involvement program that ensures an opportunity for citizens (sic) to be involved in all phases of the planning process ... Federal, state and regional agencies, and special- purpose districts shall coordinate their planning efforts with the affected governing bodies and make use of existing local citizen involvement programs established by counties and cities.”

Discussions surrounding the modernization of the CPO program, including changes to the focus and scope of the program, have been focused on an “update to R&O 86-58”. However, R&O 86-58 did NOT supersede R&O 80-108, but rather expanded the scope of the CPO Program to include all “livability issues” (aka “quality-of-life issues”.) Updates to the focus and scope of the CPO Program cannot be made without recognition of the focus and scope of participation outlined in Goal 1 and the county’s Comprehensive Plan, including the provisions in the Community Development Code (CDC), the Comprehensive Framework Plan (CFP), and the Rural and Natural Resource Plan. See App A.

Historically the CPO has served their communities by:

1. Focusing on LUT planning topics (including implementation of those plans) and
2. Providing “community updates” (which is to say “livability issues”).

The “community updates” referenced in this guideline are “quality-of-life” issues and are generally more important to many residents than LUT planning projects due of the long-range nature of planning. These “quality-of-life” issues often derive from the county’s unique form of governance. Over the last 50 years, special service districts were formed to provide urban services in the absence of the county’s adherence to Oregon land use goals’ underlying assumption that cities would provide urban services which would have allowed the county to provide only county-wide services.

[The county’s history of development guidance has resulted in approximately one third of the 600,000+ urban population living in the unincorporated urban area \(UUA\) of the county.](#) Neither the current BCC nor the residents built this old system, but we now own it. Residents feel the impacts of multiple jurisdictions on their daily lives and hence on their “community”. CPOs and the updates provided by service districts at CPO meetings play an important role in getting answers to community members who

are flummoxed by the patchwork of special service districts, and not a city, providing for their urban needs.

Question:

- Does the proposed focus and scope allow for a CPO, as a body, to comment directly on the work of any service districts? With or without the approval of the BCC?

Clean Water Services (CWS) provides an illuminating, but complex, example. As you may know, a multitude of sewage treatment systems were [consolidated into the Unified Sewerage Agency \(USA\)](#) in 1970 in order to protect the Tualatin River. A healthy river is a public health quality-of-life issue. Its charter was expanded in 2001 to become CWS with the BCC as its Board.

In November 2024, CPOs 1 and 7 hosted a joint monthly meeting with CWS as the featured presenter focusing on local surface water drainage issues in the local area along with an overview of the organization. It was attended by a large audience who were very engaged in the discussion, primarily due to the drainage issues affecting their lives. CPOs have become a first line of communication between the residents and the county/agencies that provide services.

Question:

- Would CPOs as a body be allowed to comment on issues directly to agencies? Companies? With or without the approval of the BCC? An example of interaction with a company would be air pollution issues impacting area residents, such as Intel's request to increase its emissions.

In 2005, WalMart proposed constructing a large store at Hwy26 and Cedar Hills Blvd within the boundaries of CPO 1. To facilitate an easier application process, the land was annexed into Beaverton. In spite of this annexation, CPO 1 was recognized as a "group of record" and was invited by the mayor of Beaverton to comment on the proposed development, and its members provided a detailed critique of the proposal.

Questions:

- If a CPO were formally invited by a city to testify on a planned city action with impacts to area-wide residents in unincorporated areas, would this be allowed with the updated focus and scope?
- Would the updated focus and scope allow CPOs, as a body, to interact with regional and state agencies as Goal 1 explicitly directs them? Isn't the CPO program an appropriate place for community members to interact with regional and state agencies?
- Part of the CPO 1 comments on the Walmart application, as described above, addressed issues under ODOT's jurisdiction. CPO 4K now faces huge transportation issues under ODOT control. Is the intent of the changes in scope and focus of the CPO program to prohibit CPOs from working directly with ODOT?

- Intel’s request to increase emissions was controlled by DEQ. Will CPOs be shut out from working directly with DEQ with future changes in emissions from industry in Washington County?

The CPOs are the only county public participation groups that face the public; the Boards and Commissions (B&C) deal directly with county departments, rely on county staff for their agendas and direction, and only nominally, if at all, deal with the public. In this way we are a huge asset, providing the equivalent of two full-time employees reaching out to the public. We are often the first to be informed of local issues and are key in distributing balanced information to our communities. The CPOs also deal with both urban and rural issues. It is not uncommon for CPO leaders to deal with angry or frustrated residents on the county’s behalf.

Guideline 3: Membership and Eligibility

“Align the appointment framework for CPOs and CCI with what the Board has established for other County advisory boards and commissions rather than through current participant elections.”

In analyzing this proposal, it is apparent to us that the requirements of choosing CPO leaders are not identical to those for WC CCI membership.

With the modifications, as described below, to the current CCI responsibilities, we can support aligning appointments to the Modernized CCI using the B&C protocol. Because the proposal would create a strict hierarchical top-down structure with the CCI assigning CPO leadership, we do not support selection of the CPO leadership through the BCC appointment process. To maximize community involvement in geographic-based organizations, we instead support continuation of the current community-focused “bottoms up” process for selecting CPO leadership.

References for this discussion

- The OEICE presentation at the Sept 17, 2024 CCI meeting. Membership discussion at 40 minutes in: www.youtube.com/watch?v=aU2SGMeABxl&t=3s
- WC CCI Bylaws <http://www.washingtoncountyor.gov/cao/documents/cci-bylaws-adopted-11-21-17>

CCI Structure and Membership

CCI Structure Modernization

We start by adding a discussion of the structure of the WC CCI because this is the ideal opportunity address a situation that has been developing over decades: The WC CCI has come to serve two distinct functions, serving as both:

1. A committee to identify and address county-wide issues which is comprised of the representatives of the individual CPOs and representatives from communities of interest. A key part of this function is providing a forum to train CPO leaders to learn their roles and responsibilities, discuss individual and collective issues, and to advise the work of the subcommittees.
2. The committee mandated by Goal 1 to evaluate the county's community involvement processes in land development. Although WC CCI was assigned this task in both R&Os 80-108 and 86-58, the county has largely overlooked this implementing mandate.

Because both functions of the WC CCI are very different in nature and are difficult for one volunteer group to adequately address, we are recommending splitting the functions between two separate committees:

- the BCC-appointed CCI (Modernized CCI) and
- the community-elected, BCC approved Community Participation Leaders (CPL)

Recommended Changes to the WC CCI Structure

Modernized CCI would:

- Be appointed by the BCC through the County's existing B&C process.
- Be responsible for evaluating the county's community engagement/public involvement programs as required by Goal 1. Consideration should be given to including evaluation of other B&C public outreach.
- Be responsible for marketing of the CPO program and other community outreach programs, and coordinating the necessary training.

Community Participation Leaders would:

- Be formed with representatives from the individual CPOs and communities of interest.
- Would identify and address issues of county-wide significance to advise the Board of County Commissioners, the Planning Department, and the Planning Commission.

Support for Appointing Modernized CCI Membership

We accept that the Modernized CCI membership will be appointed by the BCC using its established process for appointing B&C members. A review of other CCIs in Oregon shows that their membership is approved by the governing body. Goal 1 requires selection of CCI membership through an open inclusive and public process. Appointment of Modernized CCI members through the B&C process

would provide a more open, inclusive and public process than the process currently used and would improve the County's compliance with Goal 1.

Membership requirements for the Modernized CCI:

- the person must live, work or own property within the county, be a representative of a community of interest as approved by the CCI steering committee or serve as a CCI subcommittee chair.
- CCI membership is limited to those elected or appointed by individual CPOs, the chairs of WC CCI subcommittees or by application from communities of interest with approval of the WC CCI membership. The specifics of membership to be spelled out in the WC CCI Bylaws.

CPO Leadership Membership

CPOs are currently defined on www.washingtoncountyor.gov/oeice/community-participation-organizations as:

“Washington County Community Participation Organizations (CPOs) are community-led organizations made up of neighbors who work together to improve their communities. CPOs welcome participation by everyone in the communities they serve.”

It is our desire to retain the truth in this statement.

Recommendations for Appointing CPO Leaders

- Creation of the CPL comprised of representatives of the individual CPOs and communities of interest to focus on county-wide issues .
- Allow for a community-focused “bottom up” appointment process to maximize community involvement where CPOs recommend their own new leadership for the individual CPOs and the CPL.
- The WC CCI endorses the following process for electing CPO leaders and CCI representatives:
 - CPOs nominate a slate of CPO officers and (the new) CPL representatives
 - CPOs hold annual leadership elections at their general meeting
 - Once elected, CPO leaders and CPL members names, a shortened biography, and contact information would be forwarded to the BCC by OEICE
 - Upon timely receipt of the information on newly elected CPO leadership from OEICE, the BCC can accept or reject the leadership elected by the CPO membership.
 - Background checking is encouraged.
- Membership requirements for CPOs remain the same as they are now: the person must be of voting age and live, own property or own or operate a business within the CPO Boundary.
 - US citizenship will not be a requirement for membership.

Questions:

- How will the county support their desire for the program to be inclusive and support increasing diversity among participants?
- What are the goals with appointments? What are the results? What about inclusivity?
- What about representation of geographic areas as required by Goal1?

Guideline 4: Program Requirements

“Require compliance with Oregon Public Meeting and Records Law; clarify the minimum number of participants needed to activate; the duties of program leaders, procedures for making decisions and distinct roles for staff vs. participants.”

CPO leaders are subject to Oregon Ethics Rules

www.oregon.gov/ogec/public-records/pages/seis.aspx

This guideline is entirely prescriptive in that CPO leaders have no control over what Oregon Public Meeting and Records Law (PML) says or how the county’s Counsel interprets them. Thorough training in PML is critically essential for all people volunteering at Washington County to receive. The WC CCI received its initial PML training on Nov 21, 2023 with this presentation:

www.washingtoncountyor.gov/oeice/documents/wchomerulecharter-orpublicmtgslaw-orethicslawandpublicrecslawpdf

While County Counsel has already provided PML training for the CCI and other advisory groups at the county, new people become involved who do not expect the level of scrutiny required of public participants. The new bylaws must be clear in all necessary areas. The following element of the Beaverton CCI (BCCI) Bylaws is an instructive example regarding political activities. We note that Beaverton Counsel prohibits the BCCI from hosting candidate forums, relying instead on the Wash Co Public Affairs Forum or the Wash Co League of Women Voters. From

<https://content.civicplus.com/api/assets/8aaf1258-616a-4a46-826e-3a1a7ba1d8f2>:

“To make recommendations on legislation and ballot measures relating to land use or public participation in land use decisions. BCCI will elicit the views of the NACs and other residents for inclusion in such recommendations. In doing so, any information provided by BCCI representatives will be neutral and include either all or no positions so as not to bias residents’ views. BCCI will take positions on legislation and ballot measures relating to land use or public participation in land use decisions only by a 2/3 majority vote of BCCI taken at a meeting that conforms to public meeting law. BCCI shall not expend any public funds to support or oppose any ballot measure or candidate for elective office. BCCI shall not take a position for or against any quasi-judicial land use application or any political candidate.”

The following element of the Clackamas Co CCI Bylaws regarding formal Subcommittees is an instructive example regarding the number of voting members. From ARTICLE V - VOTING of the same bylaws:

*“Except for ARTICLE VII on AMENDMENTS, a vote shall be decided by an affirmative vote of the majority of all voting members of the CCI, **not just those present.**”*

From ARTICLE VI - Task Forces, Subcommittees, Work Groups

<https://dochub.clackamas.us/documents/drupal/456e8387-d186-4187-b479-e6dde772b844>

*“Task Forces, Subcommittees, Work Groups The Chairperson will create CCI Task Forces, Subcommittees, or Work Groups as needed, and establish the parameters of responsibility after discussion with CCI voting members. **The number of CCI voting members in a Task Force, Subcommittee, or Work Group shall be less than a CCI meeting quorum.**”*

From ARTICLE VII- Amendments

*“These bylaws may be amended. Amendments approved by at least two-thirds of the CCI voting membership shall be **submitted to the County Counsel for approval.** Should the County Counsel approve the amendments with any changes, the proposed amendments must be **approved by at least two-thirds of the CCI voting membership** to be forwarded to the Clackamas Board of County Commissioners. However, amendments shall not be in effect until approved by the Clackamas Board of County Commissioners and that approval has been communicated back to the CCI Chairperson.*

Questions:

- What sort of training will be provided to CPO leaders? Will this training be required before an elected can serve in their role?
- Are CCI/CPO personal computers, phones and personal notes subject to public record requests? If so, will the county be paying a stipend to volunteers for use of these resources.
- Will CPO/CCI leaders be protected against SLAPP suits?
- What happens if PML are not followed?
- Do CPO leaders need to file the statement of economic interest?
- If subcommittees do not directly advise the BCC, are they required to follow Public Meeting Laws in their meetings?

Guideline 5: Geography/CPO Boundaries

“Create new CPO boundaries that align with District Commissioner Boundaries, do not include areas inside incorporated cities, automatically adjust as redistricting and annexation occurs, and contain no less than one but no more than three CPOs per District Commissioner boundary.”

A primary stated intent of this proposal is to reduce the staff time required to manage the CPOs. However, if each District Commissioner Boundary (“commissioner district”) commissioner district has its allowed three CPOs, we wind up with essentially the same number of CPOs as we currently have. Furthermore, Goal 1 specifies the community engagement program provide a geographically based, not population based. Huge swaths of rural Washington County will be included in single CPOs even if no more than 3 CPOs per commissioner district is allowed. Using Commissioner District will base CPOs on population, not geography.

Using commissioner districts presents a great opportunity for CPO bylaws to specify that each Commissioner attend the monthly CPO meeting with their constituents. This would be huge attraction for residents to be involved with their CPOs. Attendance at CPO meetings is always higher when a Commissioner is on the agenda.

However, the impulse to use commissioner districts while eliminating incorporated areas artificially restricts the ability of Commissioners to connect with all their constituents. It also divides service districts which serve both incorporated and unincorporated areas to no good advantage. While this is not a Goal 1 requirement, using the CPO program to connect the commissioners with their constituents/residents enhances the potential synergies.

While the redistricting of the commissioner districts sought to minimize the division of school districts, service districts, neighborhoods, etc., it is clear from a casual observation of the boundaries of the new districts that that was not practical.

We have to ask: Are CPO boundaries for the county commissioners or for community members? Communities are cohesive, but commissioner districts are not. For example, Aloha would be split between three commissioner districts. Aloha already suffers enough lack of identity without dividing its community members into three different CPOs. The logistics of maintaining this tangle of boundaries would appear to exceed the value of the effort.

The issue of the Community Plans comes into focus in the discussion of CPO boundaries which are aligned with the Community Plans. Changing CPO boundaries will be quite disruptive to the entire CPO program so this action needs to be very carefully thought out, and especially done in collaboration with the CPO leaders and the WC CCI. Changing the CPO boundaries without addressing the Community Plans will create a confusing situation in the future.

The Community Plans represent specific geographies. Most of the issues that residents/CPO members have are hyper-local: speeding on neighborhood streets, intersection safety, surface water drainage, signage, sidewalks, safe routes to school and especially impacts of new residential developments. Providing a way to organize residents at this level will help ensure a healthy, well-used CPO Program.

Recommendations for CPO Boundaries

- **The CCI recommends a team be assigned to look at alternative approaches to defining highly functional CPO boundaries which may include several different overlays on the population.**

- The CCI generally does not see substantial value to the community to aligning CPO boundaries with Commissioner District Boundaries.
- Increasingly, CPOs are working with cities on community issues. This guideline undermines a critical function which is of interest to community members.
 - We encourage the county to engage in a dialog with city leaders to determine the optimal approach.

Appendix A – New Resolution and Order Required

Resolution and Order 80-108, 86-58 and 01-75 are detailed in Appendix A of the Comprehensive Framework Plan. To implement the county’s vision of Oregon’s Goal 1, R&O 86-58 only builds on but does not supersede the earlier adopted R&O 80-108, the Community Development Code Section (CDC) 107-6 and 107-7, or Policy 2 in the Comprehensive Framework Plan (CFP).

Additionally multiple references to the Citizen Participation Organization and the Committee for Citizen Involvement program are scattered throughout the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) documents. It is infeasible to update to only R&O 86-58 which would leave the source documents within the CPO/CCI framework inconsistent and outdated.

- Policy 2 in the CFP was adopted to memorialize the Citizen Planning Organizations that were created to develop the original Community Plans that were adopted in the early 1980s. The CPOs were deemed the organizations to fulfill the Goal 1 requirement for a program to allow community members to be engaged in all phases of land development planning. The CPO leadership group was identified in Policy 2 to serve as the Goal 1 required CCI.
- CDC 107-6 and 107-7 provide the guidelines to implement Policy 2.
- R&O 80-108 implemented the specific rules designed to provide the detailed framework for the CPO program as a land use planning committee.
- R&O 86-58 expanded the role of the CPO program to include planning for livability issues.

R&O 80-108 Summarized

To ensure the new R&O covers all the desired aspects of the CPO program as the county’s method for compliance with, we provide this condensed summary of R&O 80-108.

The philosophy – CPOs

CPOs are based upon the philosophy of self- determination and participation by as many members of the community as possible, and that direct citizen involvement in decisions affecting the quality of their lives is fundamental to the success of community development. Although focused initially on planning activities beginning with land use decisions, these quickly extend to other areas of life, including roads, schools, parks, and all other essential services.

- state-wide planning goal #1
- the county’s Comprehensive Framework Plan (CFP)
- the county’s Rural and Natural Resource Plan
- the county’s Community Development Code (CDC)

Section II of the R&O outlines the purpose, scope and role of the CPO, CPO Coordinators, the Planning Department, and CCI. This summary focuses on the purpose, scope and role of the CPOs and CCI.

IIA. CPO: Purpose, Role and Scope

A. Purpose: To provide a structure to facilitate effective community involvement in the environmental, social, economic, and esthetic development of their communities.

1. Role: The role of the CPO will be determined by the individual CPO.
2. Identifying community goals, policies, and criteria relative to needs and issues while recognizing and evaluating environmental, social, economic, political, jurisdictional, aesthetic and design factors.
3. Scope:
 - Assist in the development of the long-range community plans.
 - CPOs will review and make recommendations by engaging in the following activities
 - a. Existing and proposed land use ordinances
 - b. Capital improvement priorities and expenditures
 - c. Planning activities at the local, regional and state level
 - d. Amendments to the CDC
 - e. Proposed zoning changes, subdivisions, variances, minor partitions and conditional use applications
 - f. Land use applications even when the proposed use is compliance with plan designation and zoning.
 - Special studies

B. Community Development Coordinator: Purpose, Role, Scope and Accountability as they pertain to the CPO program.

C. Planning Department: Purpose, Role, Scope and Accountability as they pertain to the CPO program.

D. CCI

1. Purpose: To support the development and success of the CPO program.
2. Role: CCI will:
 - a. Assist Washington County with the development of a program that enhances and promotes public involvement
 - b. Assist Washington County with the implementation of the CPO program
 - c. Evaluate the system being used for public involvement.
 - d. Serve as an advisory group of CPO elected leaders and/or representatives.
3. Scope: To support the CPOs

R&O 86-58 Summarized

<tbs>

Appendix B - CPO Program Reference Material

OEICE presentation on Modernization project at Sept 17, 2024 CCI meeting.

www.youtube.com/watch?v=aU2SGMeABxl&t=3s

Membership recommendations by staff discussed at 40 minutes in:

- People who want to be on the CCI would apply, then BCC appoints
 - Qualifying criteria to be figured out
- CCI assigns/appoints CPO leaders
- B&C members review and nominate who serves on them, then BCC appoints

For background, the Modernization project is discussed at the November 2024 CCI meeting:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HaNNJmEoJMs>

More discussion of the project with Commissioner Roy Rogers at the December 2024 CCI meeting:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r05a3LRamfU>

These documents provide essential information to understand as we review this project:

- **Goal 1: Citizen Involvement**
 - www.oregon.gov/lcd/op/pages/goal-1.aspx
- **Putting People in Planning**
 - <https://pages.uoregon.edu/rgp/PPPM613/CitizenInvolvement/toc.htm>
- **PSU Study in Support of the CPO Transition Report: Seeking Solutions to Long-Term Public Engagement in Rapidly Diversifying Communities: A Case Study in Washington County, Oregon**
 - <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1140&context=metropolitanstudies>
- **Washington County Comprehensive Plan Documents:**
 - Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area:
<http://www.washingtoncountyor.gov/lut/planning/documents/comprehensive-framework-plan-urban-area-11-2024>
 - Page 36 – Citizen Involvement
 - Appendix B – R&O 80-108: Community Planning Organizations
 - Appendix C – R7O 86-58: Citizen Participation in Washington County, Oregon
 - Rural Natural Resource Plan
[https://washcomultimedia.s3.amazonaws.com/CMSBigFiles/LUT/PDS/Wash+Co+Comp+Plan/Rural Natural Resource Plan 080422 sm.pdf](https://washcomultimedia.s3.amazonaws.com/CMSBigFiles/LUT/PDS/Wash+Co+Comp+Plan/Rural+Natural+Resource+Plan+080422+sm.pdf)
 - Community Development Code Sections 107-6 and 107-7
https://library.municode.com/or/washington_county/codes/community_development_code

Bylaw Examples:

- Beaverton CCI Bylaws - <https://content.civicplus.com/api/assets/8aaf1258-616a-4a46-826e-3a1a7ba1d8f2>
- Clackamas County CCI Bylaws - <https://dochub.clackamas.us/documents/drupal/456e8387-d186-4187-b479-e6dde772b844>