

**CCI Meeting Summary**  
**November 17, 2021 | 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, Washington County Community Engagement Program Coordinator; Melissa De Lyser, LUT; Philip Bransford, CAO; Kathryn Harrington, CAO

**Approximate total attendance:** 34

**Welcome, Introductions, Prior Meeting Summary:**

- Meeting Called to Order at 7:02 pm by – Bruce Bartlett
- Introductions & Check-in
  - Discussion about recording and live transcription
- Review of minutes – Gretchen motioned to approve the minutes (after some brief changes were made) – Lars seconded – passed 13-0
- Announcements

**Kathryn Harrington – BCC Update**

*Introduction by BCC Chair Harrington, followed by Q&A*

- Group – What is your overall impression of the current state of the CPO system? (This includes the CCI.)
  - Kathryn – Great deal of respect and gratefulness for you all being involved in government. You are some of the select few who have chosen to be diligent with this. There is more we have to do with community engagement across the county. Equity resolution passed in early 2020 – we are working on making improvements with limited English access. Proud of how quickly we have all pivoted from face-to-face to Zoom meetings.
  - Kathryn – at the county we are looking at making long-term and genuine relationships with our community member who have been historically excluded. Respects how the CPOs provide input on the LUT work plans – you play an important role in advising on this.
  - Bruce – Reflecting that CPOs can be more proactive in inviting her and other commissioners to meetings

- Kathryn – Yes, not just as a speaker, but as a listener on important topics
- Lars – There’s an issue going on I’d like your help to resolve – as the county is looking to fill the Planning Commission with candidates. Some of the rural candidates are having a hard time applying due to the time requirements in the middle of the day/week.
  - Kathryn – I asked the Planning Commission to work on this because it is difficult. It’s important that this is accessible for people to attend in the evening as well. It’s a very reasonable ask and I would like to be more informed on this.
- Fran – Our state Community Involvement Advisory Committee will be reviewing/revisiting Goal #1 in the upcoming year - is there any one item that you would want us to be looking into adjusting in the Goal #1 Statement?
  - Kathryn – Community involvement is one of the things I love about Oregon – it is accessible and transparent. I have not had the opportunity to think about it – I understand community involvement is different from county to county. If the state level committee can help inform the rest of us, that will be great.
  - Bruce – is anyone from OEICE participating in this committee?
  - Kathryn – I don’t believe so
  - Fran – It’s purely volunteers from around the state, at least 6 members, focusing on Goal 1 right now
  - Kathryn – excited to hear about the opportunity of a Goal 20 – like it or not, climate change is here. They finally recently had a Board conversation, along with CWS, about climate change.
- Group – Currently CPO leaders have no way to freely communicate directly with our CPO members unless we set up separate social media channels and/or maintain our own email lists. Washington County controls access to the CPO email lists and there is evidently a county-imposed limitation on how often CPO members may be contacted. This level of support limits our ability to alert members to urgent information and regular updates. What options are available to provide CPO leaders better access to the CPO email lists?
  - Kathryn – we faced these challenges similarly at Metro. There are also concerns about privacy and we must follow government rules towards that. It’s somewhat frustrating that there are certain limits, but they are there to protect people. I don’t know about other options at this point without wholesale asking each person on the email list what they want individually – right now we aren’t resourced to do that.
  - Bruce – I would invite the CCI members to take these comments and formulate options that we could suggest in our next meeting
- Group – Does the county’s Communications office handle all the outbound communications to residents county-wide? Is there one master email list of county residents or does each department maintain its own email list? How much access to various county and community groups do Community Engagement and other departments have independent of the Communication office?
  - Kathryn – this is part of our transformation. Historically, Washington County has been siloed from department to department. There are a lot of older back-end systems in place and we are at the end of life for some of those. We must find

the resources to make generational changes to that infrastructure. We have a lot of different lists and they are not merged. We are making changes and improvements so there is more centralization so it is all part of One Washington County in our Design the Future. We have a Board that is supportive of this, but in a rough time fiscally to keep up with this.

- Bruce – how is the county website update progressing?
  - Kathryn – Will have a briefing on this next Monday. Will work with Marcus to get info back to CCI.
- Ellen – is it the plan to centralize all the communications at this point?
  - Kathryn – we haven't tasked that out yet, but we are going to task having a more coordinated communications strategy. The County will connect with the community (and CCI) throughout this process for feedback.
- Gretchen – we have a proposal later this evening. We would love for you to stay past your time to listen to this.
  - Kathryn – Unfortunately will not be able to stay due to her time constraints being on the East Coast currently. Appreciates your engagement with the Planning Commission.
- Virginia – When we have issues with staff support and management, we don't seem to have anyone to bring them to. We get very little response from OEICE leaders. Who do we need to reach out to? More and more we are hearing the CE Team is too busy dealing with Diversity issues to work with us.
  - Kathryn – I'll have to learn more about how the OEICE is engaged with you and what they are looking at for their usage of resources. I'm not close enough to that to give you an informed answer. It is fair to say that you're interested in a level of service that we are not able to provide – however it is fair for you to know what level of service we CAN provide.
- Group – What is the county's plan to implement rural broadband? Who will be on the team to work on that? How much federal money is now available?
  - Kathryn – there is an agency called COL-PAC talking about the needs to do a study about access for rural broadband. COL-PAC is funding that study. We are studying urban broadband as well with some ARPA funding.
- Group – Protection for the natural resources in our beautiful county is not only a state requirement (Goal 5) but also necessary to ensure Washington County can remain as one of the most livable places. How do we balance the need for housing and associated infrastructure with the need to protect and enhance the environment that provides essential climate-mitigating protections to our air, water and temperature? When will the SNR concerns be on par with developments?
  - Kathryn – there are some constraints with all the legal things surrounding this. SNR is important to us as humans. Here in Oregon we have decided to live in an "aggressive urban form." We are investing in middle housing so we can protect some of that rural land outside the urban growth boundary. This will continue to be a struggle. For example – Lake Oswego has one of the most aggressive tree codes around, but good luck finding housing out there. There is no straightforward answer regarding this.

## **CCI – Planning Commission Draft Letter**

*Discussion about letter, led by Bruce*

- Mary – they are doing a little better job in training incoming PC members than they did in the past
  - Liles – Back when he was on, PC members were chosen/nominated by County Commissioners and they thought they already had land use background to rely on.
  - Mary – There is so much of focus now to bring in more diverse perspectives that more training may be needed. CE should be sending us to Planning Commission trainings.
  - Bruce – clarifying that LUT has a conversation with developers and Mary wants them to be able to go to these as well.
  - Virginia – I would be willing to work with others to create a training about this. Mary suggests CE should do this, but Marcus has said himself he doesn't know Land Use, for example.
  - Fran – as I attend more planning meetings with different agenda, there is such a larger complexity to it now. There are far more aspects to learn about this now (rural, urban, suburban, diversity, etc.), which is where the CPO and CCI melding will help the PC.
  - Gretchen – I've served on 2 different city planning commission and the sub-planning commission in Portland. I went through a half day training on land use code for the city of Tigard. We would have workshop (work study) meetings every other commission meeting. The PC is having more workshops, which is great. It would be useful to have a dedicate day of training and then have segments at least once a month to deep dive into parts of the code more often.
  - Lars – We are very effective working as volunteers, but there are some people who get stopped at the door (especially in rural areas) because some of these things happen in the middle of the day.
  - Mary – We would get LUT to come to meetings to explain what a land use application is. The suggestions that come out of the neighborhood meetings don't necessarily need to be responded to by the developers. We wouldn't need LUT to come to every CPO meeting, but with Zoom they can be recorded and the questions from community members can be addressed.
  - Paul – there are numerous perspectives when it comes to a development. Educating on the process needs to keep in mind the objectives of all the folks involved in the process.
  - Virginia – that's why we don't want to rely solely on LUT – so things are more digestible by more people.
- Bruce – I think we need to revamp that letter and maybe take out the training request. The letter will be revised. Originally it was around having alternative members for PC in case of an opening (or in case of no quorum), but as I was listening, the need for training should be a separate issue.
- Gretchen moved to allow the letter, with revisions to take the training portion out, to be approved and sent, seconded by Ellen – vote passed 11-0

## **Code and Ordinance Subcommittee Update – Mary Manseau:**

- Last meeting, they had a presentation from Long Range Planning on middle housing – ordinance will be filed in late December/early January, goal to have work done by June 30. Number of ordinances deemed as transportation updates (881/882/883) and there was a group of folks

who knew nothing about it and wanted things to slow down. Communication is not where it needs to be.

- In the January meeting looking to have approval on their annual letter about the long-range work plan. Will speak on getting advanced notice of public release of issue papers. Also, will talk about zombie houses, public art, climate change, PC appointment alternates, and other issues from last year that didn't get addressed.
- Would like to have adequate time in the agenda (in January) to speak on some of the issues they are addressing.
- Ken notes that usually the last people that are informed are the property owners.

#### **Significant Natural Resources Subcommittee Update – Jim Long:**

- SNR Subcommittee met this morning – Theresa Cherniak was there and said things still need to be “clear and objective” regarding LUBA.
- They prepared questions for Kathryn
- They believe mitigation should be local instead of Astoria – discussed bringing in the County Auditor again to get more facts on mitigation.

#### **Communication Subcommittee Update – Ellen Partal:**

- Talked about training opportunities (including land use 101 training) tabled until after the new year
- Talked about the County website and the newsletter – they've reached a stalemate – there are so many links that go nowhere and communication isn't great.
  - Would like to have a meeting with CE to address these issues again or we will continue to lose membership
- Lots of issues to address with the website.
- Wanted to touch on the auditor coming in and auditing the CCI for effectiveness
- Can get email lists through a public records request

#### **Upcoming proposed CCI meetings – Bruce Bartlett**

- December – No meeting in December

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

- CPO 1 putting together a water agenda for December (TVWD/CWS) after a commotion on Nextdoor about how high the water rates are.
- CPO 4M will be revising their bylaws. County needs to update their R&O for CPOs. Will also be talking about habitat assessment guidelines next steps.
- CPO 6 has a lot of angst about land use ordinance 881 – transit department trying to put in a road which will impact property owners. They will be attending the PC meeting tomorrow night.

#### **LUT Update – Melissa De Lyser**

- Melissa De Lyser – LUT is revamping the temporary neighborhood meeting supplement for the COVID temporary supplement and they want your feedback. (*Briefly reviewed what was in the packet she sent for review*)
  - The differences from the original policy include:
    - Developers using a URL shortener
    - During the meeting – notify all participants if the meeting is being recorded
    - Require CPO rep to be able to make comment if wanted
    - Allow all attendees to speak if they wish to (as opposed to only allowing chat)
- Feedback
  - Bruce – Teams is inferior to Zoom, let's discontinue the use of that.
    - Melissa we will likely not be able to require that
  - Mary – are we getting sign-in sheets at these? It would be great to have names and email addresses.
  - Fran – there should be something in here about the digital divide and ensuring everyone has access

**Public Comment:**

**Adjourn:**

Jim moved to adjourn meeting – Mary seconded – no votes against  
Meeting adjourned at 9:17pm