

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Changes – What needs updating?:

Information distribution/dissemination – *less*

Substantive discussion – *more*

Reinstate Subcommittees - *workgroups bring information back to group*

More Information about what the County is doing – present at C4 before it gets out to cities and others

Alternate monthly full and subcommittee meetings....but monthly C4 meeting is needed

How to find common theme/input for decision making

Everyone should drive the agenda, not just the County – get input from members

Modify voting to allow non-metro-members to vote on those issues

Rethink committees, be creative

- rural transportation, must integrate rural & urban transportation

Split meetings – 1st half for subcommittees / 2nd half for full

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Opportunities Missed in 2010:

Too much duplication – put information in writing

Not enough coordination at state level

Better definition of issues

Complete more discussions

Not enough policy discussions on issues like annexation & infrastructure standards

More executive summaries needed

C4 needs decision tasks/tests

Lack of focus in discussions

Different levels of discussion needs focus groups/subgroups

Revise structure to fit needs

Incorporate urban/rural perspectives

No specific work done

Didn't follow through with items on work plan

Lack of a common voice in C4

Better definition of what C4 is

What are the end goals of the group

What is effect of C4 on the County

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Accomplishments in 2010:

New members in group – H&V / CPOs

Heard by BCC

Water / Urban Services discussion

Consistent forum to discuss issues

Increased representation

Enthusiasm

Lots of information downloaded

Heard about other jurisdictions activities

Better informed officials

Relationship building

C4 Day at the Capitol / legislative visits

Pre JPACT / MPACT meetings

Community infrastructure standards – some movement

Increased participation / attendance

Annexation consensus

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Goals for 2011 – phase 1 of discussion:

Input BCC Goals

Economic viability focus

Share resources

Sounding board for county initiatives (i.e. transportation funding)

Joint lobbying

Subcommittees – revisit by-laws

Information before C4 meetings

Split meetings – 1st half for subcommittees / 2nd half for full C4

Annexation / voter approved boundaries

Service provision boundaries

PERS pick-up and collective bargaining issues

Measure 5/47 Reform

Infrastructure projects of regional importance

Transportation funding

Legislative agenda / advocacy

Rural services

Unincorporated urban are services

Housing needs assessment (multi-generational)

Code enforcement

Breakout caucuses for H&V / CPOs

Economic development strategy

Cities – efficient services / lower costs

Communities to become cities

Transportation - coordinated jurisdictions for non-peak hour commutes

Rural fiber

City merging - services and/or cities

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Goals for 2011 – phase 2 of discussion:

1

Process

- Input BCC Goals
- Sounding board for County & city initiatives
- Subcommittee restructure/resurrection
- Information before C4 meetings
- Split C4 meetings (1st half / 2nd half of meeting or e.o. month subcommittees)

2

Advocacy

- Lobbying / Legislative - DHS cuts
- Measures 5/47 – infrastructure financing
- PERs pick-up

3

Econ efficiency / services

- 5-Shared service delivery HV/CPO
- 5-Code enforcement
- 8-Urban unincorporated area services
- 7-Rural services
- 7-Rural fiber
- 4-Merge city / services - urbanization policies
- 6-Communities to become cities
- 6-Economic viability - ruralization services / policies
- Annexation / voter approved boundaries

4

Priority Planning

- 3-Housing Assessment
- Economic Development Strategy - viability/share practices
- Transportation Planning/Coordinate/Peak hours
- Transportation Funding

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Bylaws Update/Suggestions

- I. bullet 4, add “city, county...”
or add another bullet “to provide input to city / county”
or strike 4th bullet altogether (opt. out clause)
or strike “unified” and add “collective”
or C4’s primary function is bullet #1 and strike the rest
-

- III. add HV,CPO, or rural rep to Executive Committee
add water **and** sewer district representative to Executive Committee
-

- V.(b) quorum – does it follow ORS & MPAC/JPACT regs?
(nothing in statute dictating what constitute a quorum – reference to a groups governing documents (by-laws) - JA

- V.(g) need to add other c4 members in language – missing HV & CPOs or state “all members”
-

VI. Subcommittees

- A. METRO – should special districts be included in “all C4 members”?
See page 1. I.2 – member policy (check MPAC by-laws)

- B. Rural – H&V are included, should not be

NEW – Rural Citizen Committee (CPS & HV)?

- C. Add “or their designee” or “assistant city administrator”

- D.1&2 combine Transportation and Landuse Subcommittees

- Add E.** This (above) is staff – create a new C4 only subcommittee

Add in language about when subcommittee meets?

VII. Definitions

Redundant and inconsistent with membership as outlined in II.
CPO definition – is this accurate? Check ordinance. Citizens are elected to CPO Boards, *from the CPO Q&A: “Who is in the CPO? CPO’s are run by citizen volunteers...”*

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

(Bylaws discussion continued)

Misc.

Can staff or another proxy vote in the place of a designee or alternate?

Who sits at the table for discussion / voting? Member only or both member and alternate?

Executive Committee – who votes – how and when?

Anyone eligible to be chair or co-chair

Additional HV representation: 1 voting member from each Hamlet and Village

Rural & urban CPO reps: one from both

Include Clackamas County Soil and Water Conservation District to group

2010 C4 Retreat Notes

Presentation by Elaine Hallmark of Oregon Consensus

Collaborative Governance

- All Sectors
- Work Together
- Solutions to Public Issues
- Beyond any one Sector

Principles of Collaboration

- Transparency
- Incisiveness
- Effectiveness
- Responsiveness
- Relationship Building
- Forum Neutrality
- Consensus Based

What made (makes) collaboration work well?

- Agreeing on the problem that needs solving
- Vision
- Trust
- Buy-in
- Respect
- Equality
- Confidence in the process
- Good information / Open sharing
- Parameters
- Playing by rules
- Common ground
- Team Leaders – reporting back
- All views heard and discussed
- Collective decision
- Decision makers/leaders need to be involved with those with an interest
- Collaboration on priorities (DOT process – discussion)
- Good facilitator
- Mutual enemy
- Decision – majority not strongly opposed