



**Minutes – Meeting #4
Concord Property and Library Planning Task Force
Wednesday, April 3, 2019, 6:30 p.m.**

**Concord Property
3811 SE Concord Road
Oak Grove, OR 97267**

UNAPPROVED

Task Force Members Present: Grover Bornefeld, Ron Campbell, Jean Chapin, Lynn Fisher, Denis Hickey, Anna Hoesly, Doug Jones, Jan Lindstrom, Michael Newgard, Mike Schmeer, Kristi Switzer

Members Excused: Gary Bokowski, Mark Elliott, Chaunda Wild

Others Present: Laura Zentner Business and Community Services (BCS) Director; Kathryn Krygier, Project Manager; Allison Brown, Facilitator with JLA Public Involvement; Scott Archer, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) Director; Greg Williams, BCS Deputy Director.

The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions

Kathryn Krygier welcomed the group. Michael Schmeer provided a handout to the Task Force with information about the history of the Concord School District and the Concord School site and the building. He directed the group to the Oak Lodge History Detectives' website for more information on the history of the school.

Alison Brown explained that there would be one public comment period later in the evening before the tour and that the ADA entrance to the building is now open and accessible every meeting. She invited everyone to attend the tour of the school scheduled at the end of the meeting and reviewed each item on the agenda. The group engaged in a quick icebreaker exercise.

Business Items

Allison Brown asked the Task Force if there were any edits to the meeting minute drafts for meetings #2 and #3. Grover Bornefeld stated that on page 4 for Meeting #2 the sentence should say Oak *Lodge* community instead of Oak Grove. He asked about the Vice Chair and the duties that role would play. Bornefeld also asked for greater clarity on how the Task Force defines consensus versus majority, specifically the line "three-quarters majority for consensus" was misleading. Staff noted they would update the minutes to reflect these changes.

The group approved the minutes for Meeting #2. Brown asked for any edits for the minutes from Meeting #3.

Michael Schmeer asked what was meant by “PMG.” Staff noted that it should read PMT, which stands for Project Management Team and comprises the internal staff team. Schmeer noted that his comment regarding parking was made in jest and clarified that he was not in favor of demolition of the Concord building.

Bornefeld thought that the phrase *“The Task Force agrees that the Concord Property should be the first choice for the Oak Lodge Library location, if feasible”* should be amended after “the first choice” to be more specific. He suggested several alternatives, like “for evaluation” or “for vetting” in order to communicate that the Task Force agreed only to *examine* the Concord site as a possible location for the library first. Bornefeld worried that was not being effectively communicated after the meeting or in the meeting minutes. Staff agreed to make the change with the approval of the Task Force.

Bornefeld also asked about the statement, “Staff answered that the costs would be split evenly between the library and NCPRD.” He stated he did not believe Library funds should be used for a seismic evaluation on the Concord property because it is only being evaluated as a potential location for the library and it has not yet been determined. Staff explained it was referring to another aspect of the conversation, specifically the costs of the ongoing Task Force meetings, and agreed to update the verbiage in the minutes to reflect that.

Anna Hoesly asked about whether the group was planning on adding another member to the Task Force. Denis Hickey drew attention to page 2 where the conversation is noted. Staff agreed to provide an update on this process at the current meeting. Bornefeld stated a concern that the charter stated that a member missing four consecutive meetings would be grounds for dismissal and that the longer the Task Force waits to fill the vacancies, the further behind that member would be.

Brown asked if the Task Force was comfortable to approve the minutes for Meeting #3 with the aforementioned changes. The Task Force agreed.

Kathryn Krygier, Project Manager, reviewed several items of business, including ongoing staff efforts to fill the NCPRD at-large vacancy. The vacant NCPRD District Advisory Board (DAB) member position will not be filled until the advisory board is reconstituted to ensure it is a more permanent appointment. She reminded the group that this would be a lengthy public process and that members would come and go before its conclusion.

Finalize Draft Values

Allison Brown reviewed the draft values developed by the Task Force and drew attention to the several edits made in response to comments in the last meeting on March 6. She explained the next steps for the values include bringing them to the community at upcoming events and get feedback and thoughts on the values.

Ron Campbell explained some additional comments he had sent to the staff team since the last meeting. Campbell stated that throughout the values process, members have discussed both parks and green spaces and he believes both should be mentioned in the Values Statements. Campbell would also like to include the term “features” when discussing the history of the site and the building.

Further, he suggests adding community gardens to the Task Force’s raw meeting notes on values. Brown explained she did not want to include it in the raw notes since she would like them to stay true to the discussion the Task Force had.

Lynn Fisher stated that the community has been working on developing community values since 2010 through other projects such as MAP-IT [McLoughlin Area Planning-Implementation Team]. He does not like that the group is developing a separate set of values when a lot of this work has already been contemplated. Krygier explained that the group is developing values for this project specifically and noted that the group will later examine how congruent these values are with those developed by other similar groups.

Jean Chapin stated a concern that a lot of the community has not yet been a part of this process and they should be incorporated into this exercise. She asked what was meant by bringing the values to the community. Krygier responded that there will be a fully developed public participation plan as part of the larger project once the consultants have been chosen, but that it will likely include components at public outreach events and open houses like surveys, focus groups.

Grover Bornefeld said that there is no one community and that the MAP-IT group’s values have been published in a document he would like made available to the Task Force.

Jan Lindstrom stated she felt that the group needed to include a value to reflect economic development.

Campbell reflected that in addition to other groups’ work in the community a great deal of comments have been made regarding the Concord School and the site itself. He hopes that all the work to date preceding NCPRD ownership will be acknowledged within this process. Staff invited Campbell to submit a report similar to that provided by the Oak Lodge History Detectives that provides the Task Force with a comprehensive overview of public comments to date.

Doug Jones weighed in on adding a value to reflect economic development. He spoke in support of keeping the values statement more general as opposed to specifying a business incubator as a defined value. Lindstrom stated they could frame the statement as an acknowledgment that there is economic development needed in the area generally and not specifically at the Concord site.

Anna Hoesly said she would like to stay mindful about the impacts of this process on the community, especially in light of the housing crisis. Brown reiterated that the group could add verbiage to the sustainable practices value that takes into account impacts on the community.

Hickey asked a clarifying question about the word robust in referring to the public process. Brown clarified that Hickey was comfortable with the value generally and was just worried about the wording. Brown said staff would enter edits and circulate an updated draft via email. She asked the group if they were comfortable with the values as a whole and the Task Force agreed.

Project Manager Items: Proposed Process & RFP Components

Kathryn Krygier went over the high-level schedule first, titled “NCPRD Concord Property, Oak Lodge Library & Gladstone Library Planning Processes.” She highlighted that all three projects will be master planned in the course of this process and a preferred alternative determined for each property.

Jan Lindstrom clarified that the consultants would consider an Oregon City-like combination with an older building with a new addition. Krygier confirmed this was a possibility that would be determined in the

Lynn Fisher stated he felt the decision has already been made to place the Oak Lodge Library on the Concord Property. Krygier disagreed, pointing out the graphic illustrates a “branch off” of the Oak Lodge Library process should it be determined to not be placed at the Concord site.

Anna Hoesly said she was curious whether there would be books or articles shared with the Task Force to better prepare them for this process. Staff agreed that assigning homework to the group would be a good idea. Krygier also stated they would be taking the Task Force on field trips to other relevant sites to help get their “head in the project.”

Lindstrom asked about the needs in the community for parks and other recreational resources. Krygier explained that the District has done some of that work, but that more work will need to be done specific to the Concord property as well as the two additional school sites acquired in March 2018.

Brown asked if the group was ready to move onto reviewing the near-term schedule in the interest of time. Krygier went through the proposed near-term schedule, including a recess in May and June. She went over several community events occurring over the summer at which she is proposing Task Force members attend to interact with the public regarding this project.

Brown asked if there were any comments or questions. Denis Hickey stated that during the months off, the Task Force could complete the homework.

Grover Bornefeld said he was concerned that the Task Force does not have a chair or vice chair and staff are proposing that elections not take place until October. Krygier explained that staff wanted to let the members get to know one another since the chair and vice chair are such important roles.

Kristi Switzer asked if during the summer recess Task Force members would be willing to come together to compile some of the public comment on the Concord School and Property that predated NCPRD’s ownership. Jan Lindstrom suggested members explore Google for ideas about what other communities are doing in terms of renovating public facilities.

Fisher asked what would cause the Task Force to determine Concord is the appropriate site for the Oak Lodge Library. He expressed concern regarding how much the Task Force has accomplished thus far in the process. Staff apologized for the seeming lack of progress and explained that once the consultant is on board the process will advance more quickly.

Bornefeld stated he was unclear about the scope of the RFP [Request for Proposals] and wanted to know when the Task Force would be allowed to review it. Staff explained the major components of the RFP and stated that the Procurement Division Director at the County has advised staff not to share the document directly with the Task Force. Bornefeld said he now had a great concern that staff were directing this process. He also complained that staff did not provide the process document in advance of the meeting.

Staff explained the RFP needs to be confidential until it is posted to make it fair to those bidding on the project. If introduced to the Task Force, the RFP would become a public document. Fisher suggested that would be an executive session. Staff stated that a Task Force is not meant to hold executive sessions since they are not a decision-making body.

Bornefeld stated staff was dictating the guidelines and that the Task Force was not playing a significant enough role.

Anna Hoesly stated she had been involved in many public processes and that they often begin slowly due to the extraordinary groundwork and organization required to get started. She thought this process has moved at an appropriate pace. She reflected that the major point of contention is surrounding the timing of electing the chair and vice chair.

Allison Brown polled the group as to whether to address the topic immediately or move onto the next agenda item. There was discussion and the Task Force voted to hold a May meeting to further discuss some of the issues raised at this meeting. As a result, staff moved the Selection Committee agenda item to the May meeting agenda for greater discussion. Kristi Switzer asked if the chair and vice chair could be selected at the May meeting.

Campbell said he understood the privacy concerns with the RFP document, but that he would like to see the list of qualifications that are being solicited within the document. Krygier stated staff would provide a list outlining the various areas of expertise the RFP will be requesting from the consultant team to Campbell via email.

Bornefeld asked clarifying questions regarding the type of procurement process that Krygier then answered. Bornefeld asked whether the Task Force would get to see the RFP document via email in advance of it being posted. Staff reiterated that they would not be sharing the RFP document as it would then become a public document. Bornefeld stated that once it is posted it could no longer be changed and Krygier explained that there are opportunities to change requirements through adding an addendum or through negotiations.

Bornefeld requested that staff provide the meeting agenda with enough advanced notice to let the members provide feedback on the agenda before it is published. Brown explained that the agenda is published one week prior to the meeting per Task Force protocols. Bornefeld argued that members do not have a chance to weigh in on the agenda items in advance. Brown stated that if members have comments on the agenda, the agenda can be updated and reposted in advance of the meeting date.

Lindstrom asked whether the RFP would request the firm have past experience in certain areas, such as libraries or parks. Krygier said that they were asking for that. Doug Jones pointed out that the architects chosen to design and build the Happy Valley Library had never built a library before that project.

Kristi Switzer stated she felt the issue of the chair and vice chair was unsettled and that she was sensing a lot of hostility at the table regarding this issue. Staff agreed to move the election of chair and vice chair to the May meeting. Brown polled the group and the Task Force agreed to put the election on the agenda. Hickey acknowledged Switzer for bringing up her concerns regarding the chair/vice chair discussion and related hostility.

Jean Chapin reported having similar feelings and her desire to schedule another tour to take place not during a regularly scheduled meeting. Staff agreed to hold a more thorough tour during daylight hours to encompass the entire property.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Closing

The meeting closed at 8:40 p.m. to accommodate a tour of the Concord building's interior.

CONCORD PROPERTY, OAK LODGE LIBRARY AND GLADSTONE LIBRARY PLANNING PROCESSES
Anticipated Near Term Schedule

	April	May	June	July	August	September	October
Concord Task Force	<p><i>TF Meeting # 4 - 4/3/2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tour of building • Finalize values • Review design process components 	<p><i>TF Meeting # 5 - 5/1/2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elect two TF members for consultant selection committee • Elect Chair, Vice-Chair 	<p><i>Recess</i></p>		<p><i>Community event at Concord - 8/10/2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft values • Meet the team • Building tours 	<p><i>CPLP and Gladstone Task Forces Meeting #6 - TBD</i></p> <p>Review public participation plan, scope and schedule</p>	<p><i>CPLP and Gladstone Task Forces Meeting #7 - TBD</i></p>
Gladstone Task Force	<p><i>TF Meeting #2 - 4/10/2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values exercise • Review design process components • Select one TF member for selection committee 	<p><i>TF Meeting #3 - 5/8/2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize Values • Elect Chair, Vice-Chair • Background Info - Board make-up discussion 	<p><i>Recess</i></p>	<p><i>CPLP and Gladstone Task Forces Meeting #5 - TBD</i></p> <p>Meet the consultant team</p>	<p><i>Community event during Gladstone Community Festival - 8/2/2019</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft values • Meet the team 	<p>*Fill NCPRD at-large position on CPLP Task Force</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case studies: Field Trips to nearby projects
Project Management Team	<p><i>Late April</i></p> <p>Finalize and issue RFP</p>	<p><i>Consultant Selection Committee Meeting #1 – TBD</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive proposals for review • Select top proposers 	<p><i>Consultant Selection Committee Meeting #2 - TBD</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Select top proposal 	<p><i>Mid-July</i></p> <p>Board approves contract</p>			



Role of Task Force Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Before you select a Chairperson, we ask that you review some of the key characteristics of the Chairperson's role. Think about these characteristics when considering who you would like to serve in this position. Chairperson nominations and election will take place at the next meeting.

Both the Chairperson and Facilitator assist the Task Force. It is important that their roles be very clear. The Facilitator assists the group in working through the **process** of a discussion and remains neutral, while the Chairperson focuses on the **content** of the discussion, is an integral part of the discussion and could have strong feelings on the topics discussed. The Chairperson will be a voting member of the group.

Governance Structure (from Charter):

"The elected officers of the Task Force shall consist of a Chair and a Vice-Chair. One officer shall be drawn from the nine members residing in the NCPRD service area, the other shall be drawn from the six members representing the Oak Lodge Library and Gladstone Library service areas.

Officers shall serve for a term of one year. Officers shall be elected by a majority vote of Task Force members and may be removed for any reason by a two-thirds vote of Task Force members.

The Chair and the Project Manager shall jointly establish the agenda for Task Force meetings. The Chair shall preside over meetings. The Vice-Chair shall preside in the absence of the Chair.

The Task Force advises the Board, the Project Manager, and County staff, and has no formal delegated power of authority to represent Clackamas County or commit to the expenditure of any funds. The Task Force may identify members to present recommendations to the Board, other governing bodies, and/or other community groups as needed. "

Chairperson's Role:

- Focuses on discussion content.
- Is respected by members of the task force and has leadership qualities.
- Treats all members equally, inclusively and with respect.
- Provides committee leadership. For example, if the committee has deliberated on an issue for a while, the chair may say, "Based on what I'm hearing, I think we should do _____."
- Serves as the spokesperson and represents the Task Force in the community and with other groups.
- Works with staff to shape the agenda for task force meetings.
- Ensures members have the option to discuss all relevant ideas; does not dismiss contributions based on personal beliefs.
- Encourages full participation in the meeting by all members.

Vice-Chairperson's Role:

- If the Chair is absent, the Vice-Chairperson will assume the duties of the Chair.
- The Vice Chair will be kept informed on the strategy and crafting of agendas and will step into a leadership role if the Chair is unable to attend a meeting.

Facilitator's Role:

- Responsible for ensure the meeting process runs smoothly.
- Guides discussion, remains neutral, does not evaluate and has no stake in the outcome.
- Keeps the group focused on the agreed-upon time/task.
- Makes suggestions about alternative methods and procedures.
- Encourages participation from all group members.
- Helps the group find solutions that are acceptable to everyone.
- Encourages consensus decision-making.

Qualities to consider in a Chairperson

When considering a Chairperson, it can be useful to think about the qualities and characteristics that make a good Chair. When selecting a Chair, think about someone who is:

- Able to listen to all perspectives in a discussion, even around contentious issues.
- A good listener, and willing and able to encourage the participation of all Task Force members.
- Able to speak on behalf of the Task Force as a whole, and can accurately represent the spirit of the Task Force's discussion with the public.
- Able to work collaboratively with all members of the Task Force, and with staff members.
- Respected by all members of the Task Force.

Time Commitment

The proposed time commitment for the Chair is approximately 5 hours per month. The Chair shall be expected to participate in the following activities, in addition to attending and taking a leadership role in Task Force meetings:

- Up to two planning phone calls ahead of each Task Force meeting with the facilitator and the project manager
 - Collaboration and review of the proposed meeting agenda
 - Debrief of last meeting and plans for moving forward
- Speaking on behalf of the Task Force at periodic meetings of the Board of County Commissioners
- Other duties as needed (which could include additional planning for meetings or events, meeting with individual Task Force members as needed or engagements to speak on behalf of the Task Force).



CLACKAMAS COUNTY

TITLE: Advisory Body & Volunteer - Code of Conduct Policy

Table of Contents	Page Number
I. PURPOSE/SCOPE	1
II. POLICY	2

I. **PURPOSE/SCOPE**

To communicate the expectations for Clackamas County advisory board/volunteers to demonstrate the highest standards of legal and ethical conduct in service to the county.

The Core Values of Clackamas County are *Service, Professionalism, Integrity, Respect, Individual Accountability and Trust*. The volunteer code of conduct is intended to clarify the importance of Our Core Values and to ensure that public participation at Clackamas County is safe and welcoming.

Clackamas County is committed to providing consistently high quality services and supports to clients and community at large consistent with our mission and goals. This includes maintaining a culture that promotes ethical behavior and a welcoming environment.


Clackamas County recognizes that its greatest strength lies in the talent of its employees, volunteers and governing/advisory boards, and expects its employees, volunteers and governing/advisory board members to treat their clients and colleagues with respect, dignity, and courtesy and to avoid conflicts of interest, or the appearance of such conflicts.

It is important for Clackamas County volunteers and governing/advisory board members be committed to:

- Immediately acknowledge any biased, discriminatory, or harassing behavior in a meeting environment.
- Creating a safe, comfortable meeting environment in which all members and the public at-large feel heard and encouraged to fully participate.

As such, Clackamas County volunteer and governing/advisory board members should be sensitive to the way in which their actions and communications may be received by others.

Although each individual is ultimately responsible for their own conduct, Clackamas County is committed to assisting its governing/advisory boards and volunteers in these efforts by maintaining an environment that promotes these standards and encourages volunteers and governing/advisory boards to demonstrate the highest ethical standards in performing their advisory or volunteer role.

	CLACKAMAS COUNTY
	TITLE: Advisory Body & Volunteer - Code of Conduct Policy


II. POLICY

- A. Clackamas County encourages volunteers and governing/advisory board members to demonstrate the highest ethical standards in performing their advisory or volunteer role.
- B. That Code of Conduct requires that all members of Clackamas County Governing/Advisory Boards or Volunteers:
 - (1) Serve the best interest of the advisory board or committee as a whole regardless of personal interests;
 - (2) Conduct open, fair and well-publicized meetings;
 - (3) Treat all staff, colleagues, and members of the public with respect and dignity (without regard to race, religion, creed, color, gender, economic status, sexual orientation, age, or any other characteristic);
 - (4) Embrace and adopt the County's - Our Core Values of Service, Professionalism, Integrity, Respect, Individual Accountability, and Trust.
 - (5) Provide opportunities for meaningful participation by all communities.
 - (6) Perform duties without bias for or against any individual or group;
 - (7) Act within the boundaries of authority as advisory to the Board of County Commissioners;
 - (8) Comply with all other aspects of Oregon public records law, public meeting law, ethics law, and election laws;
 - (9) Report all concerns or alleged violations promptly to advisory body Chair and staff liaison and/or their director;

Advisory body/volunteer liaison Responsibilities

- 1. Model ethical behavior and foster a culture of transparency by listening and being receptive to volunteer and governing /advisory board member's concerns about observed or perceived issues.
- 2. Monitor and ensure compliance with the Code of Conduct, County policies and standards, and federal, state and local laws and regulations.
- 3. Take corrective action to report or address issues and violations not consistent with the Volunteer Code of Conduct
- 4. Prevent retaliation against any governing/advisory body member or volunteer who reports or assists in an investigation into an issue or possible violation.

All county staff have the responsibility to report behavior not consistent with the volunteer code of conduct to a supervisor, manager or director. The report will be investigated and action will be taken to resolve the issue up to or requesting the Board of County Commissioners remove the volunteer in question.

	CLACKAMAS COUNTY
	TITLE: Advisory Body & Volunteer - Code of Conduct Policy

Removal Process:

Any member of a Clackamas County Advisory Board or Commission (ABC) may be removed by a vote of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). The BCC may enter an order removing an ABC volunteer if the BCC finds any of the following:

- a) It's in the best interests of fellow ABC volunteers
- b) The volunteer in question has failed to regularly follow the Advisory Board or Commission's adopted bylaws; or
- c) That the volunteer has failed to comply with the code of conduct.



CLACKAMAS COUNTY

TITLE: Advisory Body & Volunteer - Code of Conduct Policy

SIGNATURE PAGE

Advisory Body Applicants and Volunteers must sign this document to acknowledge they understand the information provided in the document and the accompanying policies.

Failure to meet these standards, and all other standards outlined in this County policies and procedures may result in termination of Advisory and/or volunteer service.

This document will be retained in the volunteers' file for this activity.

Volunteer Printed Name

Volunteer Signature and Date

Staff Liaison Printed Name

Staff Liaison Signature and Date

History: First draft issued on 12/18/18

Second draft issued 1/24/19

Third draft issued 3/06/19

Fourth draft issued on 3/21/19