

**CLACKAMAS REGIONAL CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES: May 30, 2012**

**Committee members present:** Doug Bean, Jim Gersbach, Susan Lehr, Jason Tuck, Matt Ellington, Anna Gehler, Martha Waldemar, Shelly Parini, and Bill Monahan.

**Committee members not in attendance:** Dennis Curtis, Patricia Holloway and Cyndi Lewis-Wolfram.

**Guests present:** Mayor Ferguson, Commissioner Savas and Karen Buehrig.

**Staff:** Dan Johnson, David Queener and Lori Phillips

**Minutes by:** Lori Phillips

Dan Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

**1. Introductions**

**2. Purpose of Committee**

This committee is being formed in order to provide advice on plans, processes and projects in and around the Clackamas Regional Center to the Clackamas County Commissioners. The committee was formed to include a diverse group of “leaders” representing a wide variety of interests. Some additional members representing transit and small business will be joining the committee at future meetings.

Some areas of focus for the committee are:

- Fostering a Healthy Community
- Encouraging Economic Growth
- Encouraging safe, adequate, and efficient travel options.
- Improve circulation and connections for all travel modes to and through the area.
- Complement and advise plans, processes and projects impacting the Clackamas Regional Center.

There was committee discussion as to definitions of particular words, such as Healthy community. We should look at a broader spectrum of “Healthy” to include planning for a healthier human population. “Health” also encompasses education.

It was suggested that the work other groups have already done should be integrated into this process. Harmony Community Campus worked on some aspects and there are others as well. **Action Item: At the next meeting staff will have additional information on the Harmony Community Visioning effort.**

When the Clackamas Town Center Urban Renewal district’s levy is terminated in June 2013, there will be approximately \$25 million left in the district to complete projects and goals. There was a question if this \$25 million is the figure they will be working with when prioritizing projects and goals.

Dan clarified that the remaining UR revenue was never intended to meet all the remaining needs in the Regional Center. One of the near term areas of focus would be advising on the remaining projects within the Clackamas Town Center Urban Renewal program. It is important to review remaining projects within the plan and discuss which projects provide the most return. Certain criteria should be used when evaluating, such as level of service, congestion, economic development, etc. This will be part of the discussion when looking at the project priorities. **Action Item: Staff will work to provide a summary of remaining needed transportation related projects within the regional center.**

The goals that were set during the earlier Clackamas Regional Center Area Design Plan are listed on page 3 of the informational handout. These goals can be expanded to include others that have some relevance.

**Staff will bring back some revisions to these goals for consideration by the committee.**

Martha Waldemar, who was involved with the earlier committee, stated she thought it would be interesting to see if the original goals are still relevant today. Where was the thought process and why was it there to begin with? Was it on the right track?

It was suggested that some form of a report card or project list would be helpful to measure ‘where we’ve been, where we are, how we did since original group set those goals, how did it work, do we need to change direction?’ Dan suggested staff could work on creating a report card or list of projects and assess how these projects have aligned with those goals. It will be interesting to see what we’ve accomplished. **Action Item: Staff to prepare a list of projects completed within the Regional Center**

Commissioner Savas stated that Urban Renewal has been under attack the past several years. He would like to see this UR district close and then show case the positive; show the good things UR can do. “Here are great things we have done.”

Transition is slow over the course of UR projects. The public does not recognize, or might have forgotten, what has been accomplished with UR funds because it just shows up. A historical perspective, including value of money spent, leveraging of funds with other entities, resulting private investment, job creation, etc. would be important for the public to understand. Essentially a list of the “results” of these investments. There was discussion about the overpasses at Sunnybrook and Monterey, and if those were funded by Urban Renewal. Urban Renewal funds were used, along with leveraging funds and partnering with other agencies.

Dan stated that it is difficult to quantify certain things – did new development occur through UR or because of the improvements to infrastructure, which was funded by UR. There are a number of large projects/developments that were direct results of fostering the area (Town Center, Kaiser, and halo developments occurred).

Jim Gersbach asked if there was the ability to measure housing growth in addition to private commercial growth. Need to quantify to share the story of how public investment led to private investment.

There is no time frame for when the \$25 million needs to be spent, but there is a need to get projects under construction soon to prepare for the economic turnaround we are going to see. There are congestion issues currently in the Regional Center and such issues will hamper the ability to develop.

***Action Item Summary:***

- *Include Harmony Community Campus Visioning effort*
- *Work on Clarifying Goals and Objectives for group discussion*
- *Prepare a Report card or summary of projects to date*
- *Education on Clackamas Regional Center*

**2. Protocol**

Dan opened discussion on the meeting protocol, timing and agenda.

**Time:** Looking at 1 hour to 1 ½ hours in length

**Frequency:** Probably should meet on a monthly basis, at least to start and then might go quarterly

**Location:** Everyone agreed the Aquatic Park was a good location

**Agenda & Meeting prep:** Propose that an agenda be sent out to the committee approximately one week before the meeting. Dan requested all committee members to let us know topics you would like discussed. They don’t all have to do regarding UR, but about Regional Center as a whole. Let us know any questions/comments/concerns as well and we will discuss those too.

**Facilitation:**

There was discussion about electing a Chair and Vice-Chair, or having staff facilitate the meeting.

The committee was comfortable with staff facilitating, as it's important to have someone with knowledge leading the group. Everyone on the committee has knowledge in specialized areas, but not an encompassing knowledge. Dan stated that we begin with staff facilitation, but change at a later date, if decided.

Commissioner Savas stated he is in attendance as a County Commissioner and predicts that the County Commissioners are going to pay close attention to this committee. He wants to make sure there is clear agreement/clear messaging of what this committee wants. There is over \$100 million worth of projects remaining in this district. The commissioners decided to terminate this district in June 2013. At that time, only \$25 million will be left to complete projects. He stressed to the committee that he wants them to do this as effectively as possible and he wants to make sure the message from committee is clear.

Commissioner Savas inquired on how many people would like to see a Chair/Vice Chair. The group felt that a chair/vice chair model was not necessary and that staff facilitation was appropriate at this time.

Martha stated that when the initial Clackamas Regional committee was formed years ago, they went through various forms of meeting facilitation, but near the end they ended up selecting a Chair and Vice Chair. Martha did not think that was effective because if you served as one of those 2 positions, you could not voice the concerns from the area you represent. With no chair/vice chair, the whole committee is sharing in the recommendations and promotion of these projects.

There was then discussion about a working group v. a leadership group. There is also a shared model where it's not always the same person leading the discussion as there are those that have more knowledge on specific projects than others. Bill Monahan asked if an Advisory Committee is a working group or a leadership group?

Mayor Ferguson stated that the format he would be comfortable with is having staff lead the group as a non-voting member and consider the member list as the voting members (he is here because he was interested in the topic and not as a member of the committee). When it comes time for a survey or vote, take survey/vote only from those on the committee, otherwise results could be terribly skewed.

**Decision making:** There will be questions and elements the board would like to vet through this group. We need to determine how to do this. Is it by consensus, vote, what? We could also work through a straw poll or rating system. Dan agreed that voting members are those members listed on the committee.

Jim Gersbach stated that he has been on other committees where they have used the 1-5 rating system as a means to set level of priority. They have found that to be more valuable than just a flat yes or no.

Bill Monahan asked for clarification on what an Advisory Committee means to the County? Is there a structure or some governance to it? He is concerned that if people can come and go, then when it comes time to vote and there is no structure as to who has voting rights, it can change everything that the committee has worked on. The process should be defined early so there is no misunderstanding. Shelly stated that she views this committee as an advisory committee, making suggestions to the County Commissioners, but the Commissioners being the ones to make the decisions.

Dan agrees that there needs to be a clear direction of governance of the group. We have models that have been used for other groups through the County. Staff can provide additional information for consideration at the next meeting.

As to decision making points, staff will work on crafting a long-term calendar on where we expect discussions and key decisions to take place. Staff can also include on the Agenda whether the meeting will be an "informational" meeting or a "decision making" meeting that would entail a vote by the committee. Hopefully this will be helpful.

Dan asked about the committee's thoughts on having alternates.

A number of people shared concerns about alternates and how the voting will take place. Consensus is that alternates may not be up to speed on all the discussions of the particular item, so wouldn't be able to make an informed vote, but, as an alternate, they could bring forward a written vote from the committee member. If a committee member cannot attend a meeting, and can't send an alternate, they could contact other committee members to get the details of the discussions that took place so when it comes time to vote; they would be able to make an informed decision.

The general consensus was that sending alternates if you couldn't attend a meeting would be fine, but that alternates would not have a vote.

John Gersbach commented that the group's work needs to be a defensible process. Some will follow the whole process and others will just be interested in one specific issue. Voting members will have been through the entire thing. In order for citizens to not feel locked out, we need to be able to share with the citizen(s) the discussion behind the vote, i.e. there has been considerable discussion, different viewpoints have been taken into consideration and this is the decision the committee has reached.

This is an open process and other people can weigh in  
We need to be able to say that we heard their opinions and this is what the committee decided.

Commissioner Savas said that Dan Johnson does a good job facilitating but the perception is that he is an employee. He also stated he would like to see the composition of group include some local small business people on the committee.

Susan Lehr offered Dan the Chamber's assistance with additional business contacts, if the businesses already contacted can't participate.

Martha suggested that committee members be advised of the time commitment. Anyone can volunteer to be on a committee but if they don't attend and participate, the information is hard to share. We need the members to attend. Martha suggested something be created stating the expectations of this group. Dan feels there will be interest and participation by this committee, with the decisions that will have to be made.

There was a lot of discussion on the definition of "public testimony". Does this mean taking testimony at an Advisory committee meeting, out talking to the public, speaking with reporters or presenting at a County Commissioner meeting?

Dan stated that he looks at "public testimony" as taking place during a County Commissioner meeting when they have a hearing, not within our committee meetings. Others stated they looked at "public testimony" as being more informal. Maybe it would be beneficial to choose a different word or phrase. Jason Tuck asked how you determine *who* your audience is. This term "public testimony" really needs to get nailed down.

Jim Gersbach asked if the County was looking to the group to determine how the \$25 million should be prioritized or are they looking to hear from everybody? The committee represents a basis of groups. Citizens can make public testimony by writing letters.

Shelly asked if public testimony was allowing people to provide information to this group or is it this group providing information to the Commissioners?

Dan said that all of us, through our circles, will have people asking questions. *Do we determine that public testimony or public outreach?*

Mayor Ferguson commented that what seems to be most important is the format. He sees the representatives on the committee as representing other groups, and using them as a liaison to funnel the information between

the group they represent and the Advisory committee. His view is that if he appoints Bill Monahan to this committee, he would want Bill to funnel the concerns of the City (the group he represents) to this committee.

Regarding input from businesses – he has seen businesses on committees in the past that should represent a larger community only to find out they are only representing themselves and not the wishes of all the businesses. He suggested making sure that the businesses on this committee be well connected in the community and that they have connections to other businesses. Find someone that will go out and do the leg work. Each person on this committee should be bringing forth the concerns of the area they represent.

Doug Bean –believes small retailers are just as important as big employers. Doug leases out 450,000 square feet of office space. He is reaching out to those businesses to see what they need to grow their business. Fostering small and large business is important.

Dan thanked Doug for touching on something very important. This committee is a great place to vet these issues; to discuss and then get the information out.

**Future meeting discussions:**

- thoughts on quantifying growth, i.e. assessed value, jobs, new business
- difference between public input and/or public testimony.

Commissioner Savas suggested that staff could come back with examples of structure for consensus building and decision making. He reinforced the importance to have balance on the committee.

Near Term Tasks:

Will come back to these at future meetings.

Transportation System Plan

Karen Buehrig presented a quick update on the TSP efforts countywide.

The TSP committee will be identifying transportation related policies and projects that are needed county-wide in the next 20 years

The TSP work is one-third of the way through the project.

The next phase will be a review of existing conditions and future analysis, over next 3-4 months.

They have divided the County into 5 geographies; 1 is Clackamas Regional Center and 1 is Clackamas Industrial Area. Series of meetings related to greater Clackamas County. These 5 different geographic areas are being called GAPS (Geographic Area Project). Hopefully a few members of CRC Advisory can also participate in these GAPS groups. It's a 3 meeting commitment; June 18<sup>th</sup>, July and October, as well as a fair amount of reading.

The first meeting for the CRC area is June 18<sup>th</sup>, mostly to talk about existing conditions. July will discuss alternatives and October will make recommendations. The TSP committee will also incorporate the recommendations of the CRC committee.

Dan asked what type of structure would be needed to realize your goals.

Actually this will be information that our group will be looking at; this is actually really good.

Dan and Karen will work together so there isn't confusion between the 2 groups.

Near term – identifying projects, etc. not necessarily transportation

TSP – transportation focused – near, mid and future planning

Dan stated he was looking at scheduling the next meeting of the CRC Advisory on June 20<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 am, but that date might need to be adjusted.

Anna Geller believes it would be a good idea if the next meeting was before July 4<sup>th</sup>

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.