AGENDA

Public Participation Task Force

November 7, 2013
11 AM - 1 PM
Madison Ave. Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Ave. (across from City hall)

* Start Times are only estimates

* Start Time	Agenda Item	Lead	Est. Time	Action Needed
11:00	1. Check in, introductions, review ground rules	Kent/all	2	information
11:02	2. Review today's agenda: changes/additions	all	2	decisions?
11:04	3. Review/approve 10/17 meeting minutes *(Attachment 1*)	Penny/all	2	decision
11:07	4. Minutes template/structure and related topics *(Attachment 2)*	Penny	5	information/discussion/ next steps
11:13	5. Mayor & City Manager at 12/5 meeting and 3 Dept. Heads at 12/19 meeting: Questions for them in advance? ideas?	Kent/all	5	decisions/next steps
11:19	6. Draft outline of PPTF outcomes/work products *(Attachment 3)*	Penny/all	10	information/discussion/ next steps
11:30	7. Proposals for public meetings in Jan./Feb./March: when? where? what? how? who?	Annette/all	5	discussion
11:36	8. Review TTF draft/plans for contacting other cities/organizations - next steps *(Attachment 4)*	Kent/All	30	discussion/decisions
12:07	9. Visitors comments, suggestions, ideas		10	information
12:18	10. TTF for scope of boards and commissions - next steps?	Brenda	10	discussion/decisions
12:29	11. TTF for neighborhood associations - next steps?	Richard	10	discussion/decisions
12:40	12. Updates from Survey and cost outcomes TTFs	Emily/ Mary Beth	10	information
12:51	13. Check-out: Was time used efficiently? Was everyone prepared? Was everyone heard? Other feedback about meeting process. How could we do better? Agenda for next meeting?	Richard	10	information

Attachment 1

CITY OF CORVALLIS
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TASK FORCE Notes
October 17, 2013 – 11am-1pm DRAFT

PRESENT: Kent Daniels, Chair; Annette Mills, Vice Chair; Richard Hervey; Rocio Munoz; Emily Bowling; Brenda VanDevelder; Lee Eckroth; Penny York, volunteer notetaker; Becki Goslow; Mary Beth Altmann-Hughes, HR Manager

ABSENT: George Brown

VISITORS: Andres Munoz, Stewart Wershow

Agenda Item	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions/ Info Only
1. Welcome, check-in, introductions, ground rules review - Kent	• Called to order 11:05 a.m. • All present introduced themselves. • Noted mailed recognition from County to members of their boards and commissions. • Noted an ad for a CIP public hearing. • Noted a proposal from the OSU/City Collaboration for an ongoing civic engagement committee.	
2. Results of Budget request to City Council - Annette	• $3000 was approved. • There was uncertainty about how the budgets are tracked for boards and commissions.	**Mary Beth** will find out how B&C budgets are tracked.
3. Review and discuss both sets of minutes for 10/3/13 - Penny	• It took volunteer Penny about 3 hours total to set up, record, and complete the minutes from the last meeting. • There was feedback from a Councilor that the format was easier to read. • Rocio had missed the meeting and found Penny's format more useful in catching up on what occurred. • The new format will be a big adjustment for staff.	

Agenda Item	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions/ Info Only
4. Review and approve 10/3/13 minutes	• Since the volunteer's minutes were easier to read and more accurate, there was consensus to approve those minutes, with one correction.	The minutes were approved as corrected. **Penny** will make the correction and distribute the minutes.
5. Review today's agenda: additions, changes	• There was a suggestion to change the agenda format to include times for agenda items.	**Kent** will use the new format.
6. Review future meeting dates especially for 2014 - Kent	• All are recommended to review the dates for future meetings, since they don't always fall on the 1st/3rd.	
7. Review last meeting's work	• Brenda's spreadsheet and other work went well.	
8. Report on and review work of the Tiny Task Forces	**Survey of Corvallis Board and Commission members:** • A draft was reviewed. • Where should we gather information through open-ended questions? • Information about communication with the Council. • B&C is a collaboration between staff, members, and Council (represents various points of view.) • Add question about diversity of boards and commissions. • Add a quote from the charge. **Survey of City directors on cost factors:** • A draft was reviewed. • Add a quote from the 2020 Vision statement. **Survey of other cities**: • A draft was reviewed. • What cities should be considered? • Review website first.	**Emily, Brenda, and Annette** will revise the survey for volunteers based on discussion. **Kent** will send the survey for volunteers to Jim Patterson to forward to City directors. **Mary Beth** will revise the survey for City directors based on the discussion. Discussion to be continued.

Agenda Item	Key Discussion Points	Recommendations/Actions/ Info Only
	• Best practices, how is public involved, effective operating structures, etc. may be questions for the other cities.	
9. Visitor's propositions	Stewart Wershow spoke: • Format of minutes has varied over time. • Councilors use minutes to understand the reasoning behind recommendations. • Boards and Commissions should have paid notetakers so all members can participate. • He had questions about the requirements for minutes per the Public Records law.	
10. Continue working on CC charge and plans for continuing work	•	
11. Agenda for next meeting - Kent	• Report out on TTF work.	The agenda was developed. Members should let Kent know if they need something added.
12. Check-out	• Good participation. • Consider asking TF members how to proceed if an item is running long.	

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Kent Daniels, Chair

Next Meeting(s):

- November 7th & 21st
- December 5th & 19th

Parking Lot:

- No additions

Attachment 2

DRAFT: Guidelines for 'Key Discussion Points' Minutes

The Public Participation Task Force was charged to make recommendations to make the Boards and Commission system efficient and effective. (include into language to charge.) One result of their work was to create a new method of recording meeting minutes which would improve the information needed by participants and decision makers, while reducing the staff time necessary to prepare, record, and review them. This work should result in reduced costs and improved access to information. The guidelines below are intended to provide a reference to how to prepare minutes using this new "Key Discussion Points" method. For questions, see the City Recorder.

- Purpose - ORS xxx requires that a record be taken of public meetings. They are intended to inform the reader who was unable.
- Use – this format is to be used by most City boards and commissions. The City Council, it's standing committees, and the quasi-judicial Planning Commission and Historic Resources Commission have separate requirements and this method is not suitable for them.
- Audience – there are several audiences for meeting minutes and they serve somewhat different purposes.
    - Members of the board or commission
        - Reminders of items discussed.
        - Reminders of 'to do' activities and who is responsible.
    - Members who were unable to attend.
        - Keep informed about the ongoing work of the committee.
    - City Council, department heads, other city officials
        - Keep informed about the ongoing work of the committee.
        - Identify issues and timelines that may involve the Council, other boards or commissions, or staff members.
    - General public
        - Learn about the work of the committee.
        - Track individual issues of importance.
- "Key Discussion Points" concept
    - The two extremes of meeting minute formats are action minutes and verbatim minutes.
    - Action minutes only include information about decisions that are made by the body and do not provide information about how the decision was reached or issues of concern or interest to the members. Action minutes can be recorded during the meeting with little preparation or time to polish the document after the meeting. Therefore they are relatively inexpensive to use.
    - Verbatim minutes give a great amount of detail including "who said what". They require audio recordings so the notetaker can verify detail after the meeting. They require a very skilled notetaker who is familiar with the content of the meeting, specialized vocabulary, and knows the members. They require a lot of time after the meeting to finalize – the general rule is two hours for every hour of the meeting. They are very expensive to complete.
    - Key Discussion Point minutes

- During the meeting
    - It is appropriate during the meeting for the notetaker to direct a clarifying question to the chair, such as “Who was the maker of the motion?” or “You mentioned four actions to be taken but I only have three, what am I missing?”
- Audio recordings
- Volunteers as note takers or participants.
- Basic format
- Template sections
    - Introductory information
    - Attendance
    - Agenda items
    - “Key Discussion Points”
    - Recommendations/actions/information only
    - Attachments
    - Other
- For the notetaker:
    - Meeting preparation
    - Recording
    - Finalizing
    - Review
    - Distribution

Attach template.

Template

CITY OF CORVALLIS
(name of Board or Commission) Minutes
Date/Time DRAFT

Members present		
Members absent		
Staff		
Visitors		

Agenda Item	**Key Discussion Points**	**Action* Or Information Only**
1. Welcome & introductions, Chair	• The meeting was called to order at _____. •	•
2. Visitor's propositions	(name of speaker): • (name of speaker) •	•
3. Item, person responsible	• •	•
4. Item, person responsible	• •	•
5. Item, person responsible	• •	•
6. Next agenda, Chair	• •	•
7. Adjourn	• The meeting was adjourned at _____.	

Respectfully submitted, Chair

Next Meeting(s):

•

Attachments:

•

* Record the maker of the motion. Note decisions made by consensus.

Attachment 3

PPTF Outcomes and Work Products, DRAFT

1. Guidelines for “Key Discussion Points” Minutes

2. Public Participation Guiding Principles

3. Boards and Commissions: operations (ex.: evaluation, goals and work plans, etc. – as defined in the charge to PPTF)

4. Boards and Commissions: structure (ex.: gaps, overlaps, options) (include CCI per charge to PPTF)

5. Public participation: outreach and inclusiveness

6. Public participation: neighborhood associations (what is the City’s role?)

Re-DRAFT - 10/29/2013

Possible questions or processes to follow in contacting other cities/organizations to obtain information

Process

1. PPTF members could pair up and each pair take responsibility for 2 cities or organizations, or individuals could work on their own.
2. Cities/organizations suggested to date: Ashland, OR; Benton Co. OR; Eugene, OR; Ithica, NY; Lake Oswego, OR; League of Oregon Cities (Alan Berg awards); Monmouth, OR; McMinnville, OR; Pasadena, CA; Salem, OR; Springfield, OR; Valley Delaware, PA; West Linn, OR.

3. **First, look at web sites for**: boards and commissions; citizen or public participation; neighborhoods/neighborhood associations; other relevant information, such as documents on roles and responsibilities, etc.

Q. Did you find anything unique and helpful for residents on the website related to: Boards and Commissions, neighborhood Associations or public participation?

4. Contact someone at the city/organization and talk with them or ask who would be the best person to talk with about Boards and Commissions, citizen participation and neighborhood association. Suggestions: (not in any preferred order) someone you may know: the Mayor or a Councilor (or County Commissioner/Director); The City Manager; A Commission or Board member.

5. Possible questions (stressing use of the PPTF Charge):

* Where can I find information on the number and scope of your organizations Advisory Boards and Commissions? (Charge #1)
* How do you make decisions about forming, evaluating, revising or sunsetting Boards and Commissions? (Charge #2)
* What is the City Council/Governing Body relationship to Boards and Commissions? Do you have City Council liaisons and if so what is their role? (Charge #4)
* In general, how do you/does your organization go about generating citizen involvement or participation in decision-making outside your Board and Commission system? (Charge #5)
* How do you manage costs for supporting boards and commissions? Do you have or have you done any cost analyses regarding your Board and Commission system and/or public participation? (Charge #6)
* Do your boards and commissions use any regular goal setting processes, and if so, how is progress towards completing those goals measured? (decision-making improvement language in charge)
* How does your organization work with or provide support to neighborhood organizations? (Charge #8)

* What process(es) do you use, or have, to advertise for/find, and select persons to serve on your Boards and Commissions? Who makes the selection decisions? (general charge language)
* Do you have any processes or documents that you use to train volunteers, or which explain their roles and responsibilities? (general charge language)
* How does your organization recognize or honor volunteer service from board and commission members? (general charge language)
* If you could make one improvement in your board and commission system, what would it be? (general charge language)