

## Committee for Community Involvement

### APRIL 16, 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Time: 6 - 8 p.m.

Held via Zoom

**CCI Attendees:** Karen Bjorklund (Chair), Rick Cook, Bill Merchant, Gordon Slatford, Barbara Smolak, Sally Worthge

**Attending PGA Liaison to CCI:** Ed Nieto, Tonia Holowetzki

**Public Attendees:** None

#### 1. Welcome, Introductions

#### 2. MEETING MINUTES

Chair Bjorklund noted existence of typo in March minutes. Bill Merchant motioned to approve the minutes from the March meeting as corrected and presented. Gordon Slatford seconded the motion. The committee members then voted unanimously to approve the minutes. Sally Worthge did not participate in vote as she joined the meeting after the vote had taken place.

#### 3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mike Cebula, Chair of the Sunnyside W Mt Scott CPO, submitted a public comment via email: *“There was a request tonight during my CPO meeting regarding information about what a CPO is and how to participate. I know this exists on the County CPO page – but – maybe it is also worthy to include in a future #ClackCo Newsletter? If included in an upcoming newsletter, please consider sending a link to this specific news story to CPO Chairs so they can forward. Any questions, please call on me.”*

#### 4. Request for CCI feedback on BCC policy re: naming and renaming county parks and other facilities

Starting list of recommendations put forth by CCI members:

- A. Expand name and references to include “county parks.” Could add “buildings,” although this could be addressed in “Definitions.”
- B. List the Parks Advisory Board instead of the BCC as being responsible for *initially* gathering, considering and assessing public input and creating recommendations to present to the final decision makers, the BCC (similar to nearly identical North Clackamas Parks District policy.)
- C. Define “Facilities” under “Definitions.”
- D. If the Parks Advisory Board is the initiating body, they should be *required* to reach out further to the public beyond just listing the item on their meeting agenda to get feedback on names or renaming.
- E. This policy should also allow property owners of the county to submit names (current policy only lists ‘residents’).
- F. *If* the policy describes an ad hoc committee, add the following language regarding membership: “or area resident if the CPO or NA is not currently active.”
- G. The BCC should make its final decision on a name or renaming at a meeting which allows public comment.

Bill Merchant made a motion that CCI recommendations “B” through “G” be recommended to the Parks Advisory Board with the amendment that “B” and “D” list the appropriate advisory board or department rather than the Parks Advisory Board. Barbara Smolak seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

**Question 1 for discussion:** Should the policy include *suggested* methods/techniques of county outreach to obtain public input?

Bill Merchant made a motion that the policy should include suggested methods or techniques of county outreach to obtain public input. Sally Worthge seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Other suggestions:

- To make clear that these are suggested outreach methods, the sentence introducing them could say: "Techniques which provide county outreach to offer opportunities for public input could include, but are not limited to, the following:"

**Question 2 for discussion:** For county-initiated naming or renaming of a facility, does the language giving an option of establishing an ad hoc committee in order to invite submissions need to be in the policy, or should it be left up to the appropriate advisory board or department?

Gordon Slatford made a motion that the ad hoc committee option should remain in the policy, and that the appropriate advisory board or department "will" initiate a process to recommend a facility name by inviting the submission of nominations... or by creating an ad hoc committee, rather than "shall" initiate a process. Bill Merchant seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Other suggestion: Means for inviting name submissions should be included in the policy.

**Question 3 for discussion:** The current policy calls for publishing notice of the opportunity to comment on name nominations in the same manner as BCC meetings. If an appropriate board *or department* is giving that notice instead (a department which may not have regular public meetings), should that same *meeting notice* standard apply? Should other means of public outreach be required?

Gordon Slatford made a motion to delete the following sentence from the policy: "Notice of this comment opportunity shall be published in the same manner as [BCC/appropriate advisory board] meetings". Per the amended starting list of recommendations, the policy *would* say that "the appropriate board or department will provide at least one opportunity for public comment on the list of nominated facility names". Barbara Smolak seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

**Question 4 for discussion:** Is "published in the same manner as BCC meetings" enough notice to reach those who want to know about a pending final BCC decision and give input? If not, what other kind of outreach should be required in this policy to let the public know what the BCC is going to make a decision on this?

No motion was made for this item.

**Question 5 for discussion:** The Parks Advisory Board recommended a number of categories for naming a facility, including:

1. Geographic location
2. Natural features (e.g. Eagle Fern Park named after Eagle Creek which runs through it)
3. A person or place of historical or cultural significance
4. A person who has made significant contributions to County Parks
5. Donations/sponsorships opportunities

To help the public and staff/future advisory board members understand the categories, does the policy need to contain an example or other clarifications for each? (See Eagle Fern example). Should anything else be added or changed?

Bill Merchant made a motion to broaden #4 to state "A person who has made significant contributions to Clackamas County or County Parks." Sally Worthge seconded the motion. Rick Cook made a motion to amend

the motion by removing “County Parks,” which was accepted by Bill Merchant and Sally Worthge. The committee members then voted 4-1-1 as follows: In favor: Karen Bjorklund, Rick Cook, Bill Merchant, Sally Worthge; Against: Gordon Stratford; Abstain: Barbara Smolak. Since five “yes” votes are required for passage, the motion failed.

**Question 6 for discussion:** The Parks Advisory Board discussed establishing a higher threshold of criteria before the county commits resources to a *public-initiated request to rename a facility*. One idea was to require a certain minimum number of years since the facility was last named or renamed. How many years should it have been since the time the facility was last named or renamed?

Bill Merchant made a motion to recommend that it be at least 20 years since the name of the facility was last named or renamed unless there is a compelling reason with demonstrated community support as described in Section VIII\* [\*whatever section contains the threshold requirements for the public making a renaming request and demonstrating public support for it]. Sally Worthge seconded the motion. The committee members then voted 5-1 as follows: In favor: Karen Bjorklund, Bill Merchant, Barbara Smolak, Gordon Stratford, Sally Worthge; Against: Rick Cook. Motion was approved.

**Question 7 for discussion:** The Parks Advisory Board suggested another threshold requirement for the county considering a renaming could be receiving a petition with a certain number signatures, or a certain number of letters of support. What number of petition signatures or letters of support should be required? Add that to at least \_\_[% or #] are residents or property owners in the neighborhood association area where the park or facility is located? Say who can make the request? Any county resident/property owner? Or only residents/property owners from that NA/CPO area?

Comments (no motions were made):

- Threshold for signatures and letters (measure) of support should be developed and based on the scope of the impact with the justification left to the department/advisory board involved.
- Consideration must be proportionate to the scope of the project.
- Suggestion that considering the requirements to form a hamlet or village might be helpful for the purposes of this discussion.
- Chair recommends tabling this topic for further discussion/consideration that can be brought back to CCI in May.
- Chair recommends making PAB aware of what CCI has accomplished thus far in the discussion, and that there are other questions still to discuss at the next CCI meeting.
- County Counsel will weigh in on recommendations prior to them being shared with the BCC.

**5. CCI Work Item Tracker: Follow-up to January CPO listening session, as part of developing CCI annual report, recommendations and work plan - PGA update on survey to CPOs & public to get more information about topics raised at CPO Listening session.**

- Ed Nieto stated that he received suggested edits/changes for the survey from Chair Bjorklund. Changes will be incorporated into a Survey Monkey survey, which is the preferred survey tool by PGA. Mr. Nieto also mentioned that survey will be sent exclusively to CPOs rather than a broader survey to be shared with the public at large as originally discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 21, 2024, 6 - 8 p.m. via Zoom.**