

**HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
MINUTES
November 3, 2015**

Present

Councilor Frank Hann, Chair
Councilor Mike Beilstein
Councilor Bill Glassmire

Staff

Mark Shepard, City Manager
Emely Day, City Manager's Office

Visitors

Jonathan Stoll, Oregon State University
Director of Corvallis Community
Relations (via telephone)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

	Agenda Item	Recommendations
	<i>Chair to call for corrections, if any, to November 3, 2015, HSC Minutes</i>	
	Call to Order	2:09 pm
I.	Community Relations Advisory Group Update	Information
II.	Other Business	Information
	A. Pending Issues	
	Adjournment	2:28 pm
	Next Meeting	November 17, 2015 – 2:00 pm

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

I. Community Relations Advisory Group Update

Jonathon Stoll, Oregon State University (OSU) Director of Corvallis Community Relations, reported that the Community Relations Advisory Group (CRAG) had primarily focused on a neighborhood livability survey. The Group approved proceeding with the OSU College of Liberal Arts, School of Public Policy, Policy Analysis Laboratory's estimate of a \$5,000 cost to conduct a randomized survey of 1,000 individuals. The Group agreed that the survey area should not be restricted by the OSU/City Collaboration Project area boundary; Group members were interested in surveying the entire community, understanding that the area immediately adjacent to OSU's campus was most impacted by OSU. The Group discussed a randomized survey weighted against the OSU campus neighborhoods.

Mr. Stoll said he spoke with Mayor Traber and City Manager Shepard regarding the City and OSU sharing survey costs. The CRAG suggested increasing the cost estimate to \$6,000, with \$1,000 to be used to incentivize survey responses.

Councilor Beilstein asked whether the CRAG's proposed survey could be combined with the City's citizen attitude survey to reduce expenses for both surveys.

Mr. Stoll responded that the CRAG did not discuss a combined survey, but he believed the idea was worth considering.

Mr. Shepard noted that citizen attitude surveys were conducted biannually. While combining the City's and OSU's surveys may provide some cost savings, the information may not accurately address what is desired in the neighborhood livability survey because respondents' views about OSU would be combined with their views about the City in general.

Councilor Beilstein reviewed that, for many years, citizen attitude survey responses were tabulated by OSU staff. The City then contracted for a nation-wide vendor to conduct the survey so Corvallis' survey results could be compared with those of other communities; however, the survey results did not provide the data the City desired.

Mr. Stoll, based upon his familiarity with the nationally conducted citizen attitude survey, noted that it involved livability with a broad scope. He would be interested in the OSU survey generating specific data. While the data could be obtained from a larger survey, he was concerned that a lengthy survey could impact the survey response rate. The survey was intended to gauge OSU's impact on the community. He questioned whether that issue could be included in a nationally conducted citizen attitude survey.

Chair Hann concurred with Mr. Shepard's concerns about "diluted" survey responses and mixing perceptions of OSU with perceptions of the community. He inquired about the CRAG's timeframe for conducting the survey.

Mr. Shepard said survey funding was available in the Community Development Department's budget.

Mr. Stoll said OSU identified two sociology professors/advisors who were interested in assisting with the survey; students would be identified to lead the survey project. He anticipated that the survey would be implemented during spring 2016, with recommendations concerning survey elements (e.g., design, methodology, etc.) being presented to the CRAG for approval. The survey would be conducted during March 2016 with a report during June 2016.

Chair Hann asked how the survey would guide the CRAG's actions.

Mr. Stoll explained that the survey would provide a baseline of the community's perceptions regarding OSU and data to confirm or clarify suspected issues. From survey data, the CRAG could develop recommendations concerning policies, processes, or programs. He acknowledged interest in targeting geographic areas to aggregate data and determining whether survey respondents were students or feedback concerned an issue unique to a neighborhood. The CRAG could then develop recommendations to the issues expressed in the survey responses.

Councilor Beilstein concurred that, despite efficiencies in combining the City's citizen attitude survey with OSU's community relations survey, it was more important to complete the survey and have a baseline of perceptions. He suggested reviewing the survey data to identify major differences in attitudes or opinions between OSU students and non-students regarding issues. He expected that resolving those perception differences would require the most work.

Mr. Stoll was interested in a statistically significant survey and an official randomized survey. All community members would be able to complete the survey electronically or at the Library. He was interested in the survey including a section for people to offer ideas of solutions to issues.

Mr. Shepard concurred with making the survey available to the entire community and asked whether responses to the randomized and community-accessible surveys would be kept separate to improve the validity of the randomized survey responses.

Mr. Stoll responded affirmatively. He noted the importance of making the survey results available to the community, such as via a Web site, a public forum, and public conversations, much of which would probably occur during fall 2017.

Chair Hann noted that residents near OSU's campus reaped benefits of their proximity to the campus but also were impacted most by OSU's presence; whereas residents farther from the campus might have very different views of OSU's impact on the community. He suggested that it might be helpful to track survey responses geographically.

Mr. Stoll concurred and said the survey would include a demographic question regarding the respondents' general residence locations. Some issues may be more relevant to specific areas of the community.

This issue was presented for information only.

II. Other Business

A. Pending Issues

1. Municipal Code Chapter 5.01, "City Parks Regulations" and alcoholic beverages in parks

Mr. Shepard explained that staff would attempt to address the pending issue from two perspectives:

- a. Designated parks where alcohol was allowed – The Council might want to continue the practice of allowing alcohol use in designated parks. Staff recommended discontinuing the practice, as no request had been denied. Staff recommended continuing to require permits

for alcohol use in City parks where alcohol use was not considered an allowed activity.

- b. Liability – The City could assume liability for alcohol use in City parks or defer the liability to the park user. Alcohol-related liability would be covered under a general liability provision of an insurance policy.

Chair Hann asked whether a separate entity of the City could have authority to issue permits for alcohol use in City parks and assume liability for that activity.

Mr. Shepard said he did not know whether that scenario was viable. He noted that if the City did not charge for park usage, the City's liability would change; however, Parks and Recreation Department revenue would be reduced.

In response to Chair Hann's additional inquiry, Mr. Shepard said alcohol use in City parks would be restricted to the hours parks were open to the public.