



**CORVALLIS
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION**

**November 8, 2016
3:00 pm -5:30 pm**

**Madison Avenue Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Avenue**

-
- I. Call to Order
 - II. Historic Resources Commission Applicant Interview (3:00 pm)
 - III. Planning Commission Annual Report (3:30 pm)
 - IV. Transportation System Plan Update (3:50 pm)
 - V. Council Self-Evaluation (4:30 pm)
 - VI. Community Comments (*Members of the community wishing to offer advance written comments are encouraged to use the public input form at www.corvallisoregon.gov/publicinput.*) (5:10 pm)
 - VII. Other Councilor Comments (time permitting)
 - VIII. Adjournment

If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Recorder at (541) 766-6901 (for TTY services, dial 7-1-1). Notification at least two business days prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting. (In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, 28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title I and ORS 192.630(5)).

A Community That Honors Diversity

**Historic Resources Commissioner Applicant
Occupation and Residence Location Guide**

Applicant's Name	Applicant's Occupation	Ward or UGB
Susan Licht	Preservation Architect	7

Municipal Code Section 1.16.090 Residency

Except as otherwise provided by ordinance, all members of a board or commission shall meet one of the following qualifications at their appointment and shall retain such status during their term of office: At least two-thirds of any board or commission shall be composed of persons who reside in the territorial limits of the City. The appointing authority may also appoint persons who are employed or self-employed full time in the City or who reside in the Urban Growth Boundary. (Ord. 81-99 § 9, 1981)



RECEIVED

Community Development Planning Division
501 SW Madison Avenue
PO Box 1083, Corvallis, OR 97339
Telephone 541.766.6908

SEP 19 2016

2016 Historic Resources Commission Application

Community Development
Interview Date: TBD
Planning Division

Please answer the three questions that are attached on a separate page.

Please return to the Planning Division by 5 p.m. Monday, September 19, 2016. Applications received after the deadline will not be accepted, regardless of the postmark.

Name: Susan Licht Date: Sept. 18, 2016
Address (home) _____ Phone (h) _____
Address (work) same Phone (w) same
E-mail (work) sue_licht@ E-mail (home) same
Occupation/Profession: Preservation Architect

Please list each source of income that is 10% or more of your total household income:

self employed

Please identify your community/civic activities, including business or professional organizations:

Association for Preservation Technology (APT) - national
just moved here so others NA

Please list all financial interests in real property located in Benton County:

own home
own share of recreational property

Please indicate any familiarity you might have with historic preservation planning, Corvallis land use regulations, and/or the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office programs.

learning about Corvallis Preservation
Vice Chair Historic Preservation Commission 1989-2000 Iowa City, IA
Worked As Oregon State Parks Preservation Architect - 10yrs
worked with SHPO almost daily

Please indicate any familiarity you might have with land use planning, Corvallis land use regulations, and/or the Oregon Statewide Planning Program.

I grew up in Corvallis, worked and lived
here until 1986. I actually know a lot - my dad was ^{local} state
legislator for 20 yrs.

Certification: I certify the foregoing information to be true and exact to the best of my knowledge.

S t 9-18-16
Candidate's Signature Date

How did you hear about this recruitment? Newspaper City Website Other Preservation Contact

This application provides general biographical information to assist the City Council in making their appointments to the Historic Resources Commission. If you wish to elaborate on any of the above items, please attach additional pages.

*Pursuant to State law (ORS 244.050), persons appointed to the PC/HRC are required to file an annual verified statement of economic interest and a quarterly public official disclosure form with the Oregon Government Ethics Commission.

Susan L. Licht, Preservation Architect

Corvallis, OR 97330
E-mail: sue_licht@t

Education:

Bachelor of Architecture (1980), University of Oregon

Registrations:

Architect: Oregon, 2005, 4991
Architect: Washington, 2014, 10964
NCARB Certified

Professional Activities:

- Member, Association for Preservation Technology (APT)
- Advisory Board Member, Pacific Northwest Preservation Field School

Related Project Experience

HISTORICAL ARCHITECT, OREGON DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
2006 -2016.

Designed and / or Constructed over 120 historic preservation projects

Managed over 60 historic preservation projects

Consultant to SHPO for complex historic projects

Recent historic projects include:

- Restoration of the Sumpter Valley Gold Dredge. Construction finished summer 2014.
- Reroof and siding restoration of the Pete French Round Barn.
- Last phase of Restoration on the Frenchglen Hotel, including carpentry repairs, painting and new wood shingle roof.
- Upgrades to the fire suppression and detection systems, the HVAC systems and the electrical systems of the Wolf Creek Inn.
- Concrete Repairs, new windows and new plaster at the Whale Watching Center in Depoe Bay Oregon.
- Waterproofing project at the Vista House, a National Historic Landmark,
- Manage the restoration of the Kam Wah Chung Museum, a National Historic Landmark. Kam Wah Chung was a 1.6 million dollar project that included over 10 individual contracts and multiple grants including a SAT grant.
- Thompsons Mill ongoing restoration efforts at the mill keepers house and the mill building.

Lighthouse Design and Construction for OPRD

Heceta Head Lighthouse.

Grant Writer, Project Manager and Historical Architect for the complete restoration of the entire lighthouse and work room. This project was funded with a DOT enhancement grant. Restoration complete in 2012

Cape Meares Lighthouse:

Project Manager and Historical Architect for the repair of the lantern and fresnel lens after the lantern was seriously vandalized in January 2010.

Yaquina Bay Lighthouse:

Project Manager and Historical Architect for the restoration of the lighthouse roof in 2009. Last projects at this lighthouse included development of a fire suppression and detection, electrical upgrades and fire code upgrades.

Coquille River Lighthouse:

Project Manager and Historical Architect for a 3 phase complete restoration of the lighthouse. Phase 1 included the repair of the masonry and stucco exterior of this unique lighthouse and was completed in 2007. Phase 2 included the reconstruction of the wood windows in both the fog horn building and the light tower. Phase 3 will include the complete restoration of all cast iron and historic metal components and all other work not yet completed.

Cape Blanco Lighthouse:

Owned by BLM and maintained by OPRD; Project Manager and Historical Architect for the scheduled maintenance and repair required.

HISTORICAL ARCHITECT, PRIVATE PRACTICE, 1990-current

A.J. Masters House, Aloha, OR

1. Developed a Stabilization Plan for the House to protect it in the short term from weather and deterioration.
2. Developed a Preservation Plan for the House to help with restoration goals, budgeting and grant writing.
3. Prepared the Construction Documents for the new concrete foundation, this included removing additions and house raising.
4. Preparing the Construction Documents for the new wood shingle roof, structural repairs and chimney restoration.
5. Consultant to MIG on the preparation of the Park Development Plan

North Head Lighthouse, Ilwaco, WA

1. Wrote the HSR for this lighthouse in 2011 (see below)
2. Did materials investigation work in 2013 and 2014.
3. Prepared the Construction Documents for the Metal Work Restoration of the lighthouse. This work was completed in Spring 2015.
4. Prepared the Construction Documents for the Remaining Restoration of the lighthouse. Currently under construction.

Yaquina Head Lighthouse (BLM), Newport, OR

1. Prepared the Construction Documents for the removal of the existing coatings on the exterior masonry, installation of the new natural cement wash and potassium silicate coating on the exterior masonry.
2. Prepared an updated Condition Assessment and Maintenance Plan for the Lighthouse including a Metal work assessment and a structural analysis of the stairway.
3. Consulted with BLM on this lighthouse on various projects they had underway.

McDonald House, Hillsboro, OR

Developed a Stabilization Plan for the house to protect it in the short term until a new use could be determined for the property.

Kilauea Point Lighthouse

Was Primary Historical Architect for the Materials Testing Report on the Kilauea Point Lighthouse. The work included Cast Iron and Historic Metal assessment, Concrete Testing and Assessment and additional technical recommendations for the preservation of the lighthouse following the testing results. Cost estimates for the preservation of the lighthouse were updated with information gathered from this testing. The information collected during this exploration was used to guide the restoration plans for the lighthouse.

HISTORICAL ARCHITECT AND ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN, SUBCONSULTANT TO Northwest Heritage Consultants.

Kilauea Point Light Station HSR

As a Subconsultant, was responsible for Architectural History and Historical Architecture expertise in preparation of the Historic Structures Report for the 31-acre historic light station in Kilauea, HI. Researched and synthesized station's architectural history for principal light station buildings including lighthouse, keepers' quarters, and radio beacon building; performed condition assessments for all light station buildings and other secondary structures; prepared the preservation plan and cost estimates, and a long term maintenance plan for this light station.

North Head Lighthouse HSR

As a Subconsultant was responsible for Architectural History and Historical Architecture expertise in preparation of the Historic Structures Report for the North Head Lighthouse in Ilwaco, WA. This included a detailed condition assessment report and order of magnitude cost estimates for a complete restoration.

Grays Harbor Lighthouse HSR

As a Subconsultant, was responsible for Architectural History and Historical Architecture expertise in preparation of the Historic Structures Report for the Grays Harbor Lighthouse in Westport, WA. This included a detailed condition assessment report and order of magnitude cost estimates for a complete restoration.

HISTORICAL ARCHITECT SUBCONSULTANT TO Winzler and Kelly Engineers,

Kilauea Point Lighthouse

Prepared all construction documents including drawings, specifications, contractor qualifications and evaluations for the Phase 1 Metalwork Restoration of the Kilauea Point Lighthouse for the USFWS.

Iowa 1986 -2005

Professional Activities

Vice Chair , Iowa City Historic Preservation Commission (1989-2000)

Honors and Awards

City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Blair-Lauritzen House Rehabilitation (1993)
 City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Voigt-Unash House Restoration (1992)
 Scott County Preservation Award for the Clarissa Cooke House Restoration (1994)
 City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Voigt-Unash House Restoration (1994)

Iowa Historic Preservation Alliance Award for the Restoration of the Lincoln Hotel, Lowden, Iowa (1995)

City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Lindsley Building Rehabilitation (2000)

City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Rinella Partnership Apartment Rehabilitation (2000)

Preservation Person of the Year, Iowa City, IA (2002)

City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Sylvanus Johnson House Addition (2003)

City of Iowa City Preservation Award for the Powers House Remodel and Addition (2005)

Related Project Experience

HISTORICAL ARCHITECT, SUBCONSULTANT to Tallgrass Historians & Earth Tech, Part-time consultant responsible for reviewing all historic preservation projects in the northern half of Iowa that received ISTEPA funding. Provide technical assistance to the grant recipients and their consultants on all aspects of historic preservation for restoration / rehabilitation projects. Review their documents for application of the Secretary of Interior Standards and recommend appropriate approaches for individual projects.

TAN ADVISOR FOR THE STATE OF IOWA

A member of the Technical Advisor Network for the State of Iowa, helping individuals and groups through the Historical Resource Development Program grant process and then continued to provide technical assistance after the preservation projects were funded. Wrote building condition assessments and helped individuals prioritize preservation work plans and develop budgets for the restoration of their buildings. This assignment included over 35 projects which were guided through construction.

HISTORICAL ARCHITECT FOR THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF IOWA

Part-time consultant to the State Historical Society of Iowa overseeing grant contracts and providing technical assistance for the repair and restoration of over 50 buildings listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places that were damaged in the Flood of '93. This required working very closely with the State Historical Society (especially the state Preservation Architect) for the entire duration of the work. All work had to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. All of this work was subject to Section 106 review. This work was statewide for 1994 & the first half of 1995.

OLD BRICK, IOWA CITY, IOWA

This project involved the condition assessment and restoration of the exterior masonry on the Old Brick Church. The building was built in the 1850's as the original First Presbyterian Church in Iowa City.

MONTAUK HISTORIC GOVERNOR'S MANSION IN CLERMONT, IOWA, ADA RAMP DESIGN AND PORCH REPAIR

This project included removing the existing HC ramp and replacing it with a more historically appropriate ramp and repairing the back porch to meet ADA standards.

CONDITION ASSESSMENT OF PLUM GROVE, THE GOVERNOR ROBERT LUCAS RESIDENCE, IOWA CITY, IOWA

This work was done for the State of Iowa. It included an in-depth report on the current condition of the Governor Robert Lucas Residence to determine the direct and non direct sources of water penetration to the structure. In addition it involved a detailed analysis of the building, a prioritized plan of action and an estimate of costs for the proposed work. The report also made recommendations for a proposed maintenance plan.

RESTORATION OF THE ICARIAN DINING HALL, CORNING, IOWA

This building was part of a French utopian community that settled in SW Iowa in the 1870's. The project is funded with multiple grants. It has involved doing a survey of the building, an archaeological survey, and preparing this house to move onto a cultural park site without losing its National Register eligibility. Later additions have been removed; the entire building has been restored.

RESTORATION OF THE NISHNABOTNA FERRY HOUSE, LEWIS, IOWA

This is a project funded by ISTEIA money. It has involved assessing the building condition and doing a simple restoration plan that could be handled by local contractors. The project required a partial stone foundation replacement, a rehabilitated roof structure and complete restoration of the interior and exterior of the building, including new windows. This building once served as a ferry building on an important ferry crossing that was part of the Underground Railroad and also part of the Mormon Trek Handcart Trail.

HISTORIC BUTLER HOUSE - RURAL IOWA CITY, IOWA

This project involved an in-depth structural and historic assessment of a significant historic property owned by the City of Iowa City. After the assessment was complete, plans to stabilize the stone 1850's limestone structure were completed. This work was recommended to halt the continuing deterioration of the building until a new use could be determined. The building remains mothballed.

VAN BUREN COUNTY COURTHOUSE -RESTORATION, KEOSAUQUA, IOWA

This project involved the restoration of the exterior woodwork, (eaves, cornices, decorative panels) and the restoration / recreation of the historic entry ways into the building. Also included were the restoration of all the wood windows and the recreation of the original entry doors in the courthouse. It involved careful documentation of existing conditions and complete construction documents for restoration.

DAVIS COUNTY COURTHOUSE, BLOOMFIELD, IOWA

There were several projects involved with this Courthouse over a period of about 5 years. Restoration of the original staircase from the entry to the courtrooms. Analysis of original interior paints and finishes, exterior restoration using Jahn mortars of the deteriorated cornerstone, and restoration of the carved stone courthouse entryway using Jahn mortars.

LUCAS COUNTY COURTHOUSE, CHARITON, IOWA

This project developed with WJE of Chicago, the construction documents for the restoration of the tower roof that was removed in the middle of the 20th century.

RESIDENTIAL REMODELS AND ADDITIONS IN HISTORIC DISTRICTS

During the 19 years practicing in Iowa I completed more than 30 projects in local historic districts. All historic districts in Iowa City were also National Register districts.

4. Describe how you meet at least one of the following criteria:
- a. A demonstrated positive interest, competence, or knowledge in historic preservation;
 - b. Prior experience in a quasi-judicial decision-making capacity; and/or
 - c. A community-wide perspective on balancing multiple objectives associated with community planning.

5. Indicate *if and how* you meet one or more of the qualifications described below:
Note: It is not required that you meet one of these qualifications to be appointed

- a) **Archaeology:** (a) Prehistoric Archaeology - Graduate degree in Anthropology or Prehistoric Archaeology, plus 2.5 years full-time professional experience; or (b) Historic Archaeology - Graduate degree in Anthropology or Historic Archaeology, plus 2.5 years full-time professional experience;
- b) **Architectural History:** (a) Graduate degree in Architectural History or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in Architectural History or a closely related field, plus 4 years full-time professional experience;
- c) **Conservation:** (a) Graduate degree in Conservation or a closely related field, plus 3 years full-time professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in Conservation or a closely related field, plus 3 years full-time apprenticeship in the field;
- d) **Cultural Anthropology:** (a) Graduate degree in Anthropology with specialization in Applied Cultural Anthropology, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in anthropology with specialization in applied cultural anthropology, plus 4 years full-time professional experience;
- e) **Curation:** (a) Graduate degree in Museum Studies or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in Museum Studies or a closely related field, plus 4 years full-time professional experience;
- f) **Engineering:** (a) State Government-recognized license to practice Civil or Structural Engineering plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) a Masters of Civil Engineering degree with course work in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or © a Bachelor's of Civil Engineering degree with one year of graduate study in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience;
- g) **Folklore:** (a) Graduate degree in Folklore or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time

professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in Folklore or a closely related field, plus 4 years full-time professional experience;

- h) **Historic Architecture:** (a) State Government-recognized license to practice Architecture plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) a Masters of Architecture degree with course work in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (c) a Bachelor's of Architecture with one year of graduate study in Historic Preservation or a closely related field plus 2 years full-time professional experience;
- i) **Historic Landscape Architecture:** (a) a State Government-recognized license to practice Landscape Architecture plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) a Masters degree in Landscape Architecture with course work in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (c) a four or five year Bachelor's degree in Landscape Architecture plus 3 years full-time professional experience;
- j) **Historic Preservation Planning:** (a) State Government-recognized certification or license in Land Use Planning, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) a graduate degree in Planning with course work in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or © an undergraduate degree in Planning with course work in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 4 years full-time professional experience;
- k) **Historic Preservation:** (a) Graduate degree in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in Historic Preservation or a closely related field, plus 4 years full-time professional experience; or
- l) **History:** (a) Graduate degree in History or a closely related field, plus 2 years full-time professional experience; or (b) an undergraduate degree in History or a closely related field, plus 4 years full-time professional experience.

6. Indicate if you own property and reside within the Avery-Helm or the College Hill West National Historic Districts, and/or if you are associated with Oregon State University professionally or as a student:

Note: It is not required that you meet any of these attributes to be appointed

Susan L. Licht

Historic Resources Commission - Position 4

Response to Questions

1. I would like to be on the Historic Resources Commission for three reasons:
 - a. I believe I have significant preservation skills to bring to the group
 - b. I think that having served for 11 years previously on a commission outside the state that I have some fresh points of view and ideas to bring to the table.
 - c. It is the best way to learn about the Corvallis Preservation community, ordinances etc.
2. I know that Corvallis has met its CLG obligation for having a commission and surveying and identifying historic properties. I know they have a commission to review changes within these districts and to individual properties. Other than that I am on a fast learning curve to understand the politics of preservation in Corvallis.
3. I have only been in town 2 months so I am unfamiliar with a single local preservation decision. However, I am familiar with issues surrounding the Levi - Hinkle house and hope to see how the issues surrounding this property get resolved in a win- win way.
4. As a preservation architect with over 30 years of experience I believe I meet criteria "a". I have worked on hundreds of historic structures and have projects currently in several states. I also believe that my prior experience as a preservation commissioner meets the criteria for "c".
5. I meet qualification 'h'.
As a practicing architect, currently with licenses in two states I have been specializing in Historic Preservation for 30 years. I recently retired from Oregon State Parks (OPRD) where I was responsible for the restoration and maintenance of over 300 historic properties within the park system. I also was the liaison between the technical staff of OPRD and SHPO to make sure the state mandates for publically owned historic properties were met.
6. I own no property in any of the historic districts of Corvallis, nor am I affiliated with OSU in any way.

Other:

I was born and raised in Corvallis. I have been gone for 30 years and came back to semi-retire this summer. This town and its future are very near and dear to my heart. My children and grandchild have all been born here. The future of Corvallis' historic properties is paramount to providing them a visual history of who they are and where they came from.

Annual Report of the Planning Commission



November 8, 2016

Members: Jasmin Woodside-Chair, Paul Woods-Vice-chair, Jim Ridlington, Tom Jensen, Rob Welsh, Carl Price, Jim Boeder, Susan Morr 

Staff: Jason Yaich

Council Liaison: Frank Hann

Purpose/Mission summary:

The Planning Commission shall function primarily as a comprehensive planning body proposing policy and legislation to Council related to the coordination of the growth and development of the community. The functions of the Planning Commission shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a) Review the Comprehensive Plan and make recommendations to Council concerning Plan amendments which it has determined are necessary based on further study or changed concepts, circumstances, or conditions.
- b) Formulate and recommend legislation to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- c) Review and recommend detailed plans including functional plans which relate to public facilities and services, and subarea plans which relate to specific areas of the community to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- d) Assist in the formulation of the Capital Investment Plan [Capital Improvement Program] and submit periodic reports and recommendations relating to the integration and conformance of the plan with the Comprehensive Plan.
- e) Review and make recommendations concerning any proposed annexation.
- f) Conduct hearings, prepare findings of fact, and take such actions concerning specific land development proposals as required by the Land Development Code.
- g) Advance cooperative and harmonious relationships with other planning commissions, public and semi-public agencies and officials, and civic and private organizations to encourage the coordination of public and private planning and development activities affecting the City and its environs.

Prior Year Report:

Activities and work completed:

The Planning Commission (PC) reviewed multiple land development proposals throughout the year. Some of the projects that were considered were Toyota of Corvallis Major Modification; Kings Blvd Extension; Denson Enterprises Zone Change and Minor Replat; Boys & Girls Club Expansion; Willamette Business Park Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and Major Planned Development Modification; Corvallis Station Lots 3 and 4; Timberhill Conceptual Development Plan Major Modification and Minor Replat; Lawndale Annexation; Airport Master Plan Update; Dutch Bros. Planned Development and Conditional Development..

The PC has been involved in training sessions, including Records Management for the 21st Century, a review of conditions approval and how they apply to applications, and a review of City adopted documents and how they interact with the Land Development Code (LDC).

Additionally, the PC began a review of the current LDC, chapter by chapter, and are assisted by staff in answering questions and providing clarifications. The PC intends that this will aid in a better

understanding of how to apply the LDC to land development proposals that are brought forward. This training began with the current PC reviewing the Unresolved Planning Issues List. The Unresolved Planning Issues List is used as the institutional memory of the past and current Commissions. There were over 50 items on the Unresolved Planning Issues List when the current PC began its review. The PC reviewed each item and decided whether they still applied. The PC has completed review of Chapter 1 and a portion of Chapter 2 of the LDC.

In March 2016, the PC began its review of the Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies relating to OSU development and the work of the OSU Plan Review Task Force. The PC gave careful consideration and deliberation to all Findings and Policies and provided a recommendation to the City Council. The PC added additional meetings and met every week in the month of July to complete the work by August 2016.

In fall of 2016, one new member was interviewed and appointed by City Council to the Planning Commission. There is currently one vacant spot on the Commission. Interviews are scheduled for early 2017.

Activities and work in progress:

The PC is involved in the ongoing review of land development proposals that are brought forward through applications received by City staff.

Continue discussions and review with the PC on the current Land Development Code (LDC). The Commission is currently reviewing Chapter 2 of the LDC. As the PC reviews the LDC, any discrepancies or areas where additional research is needed, are added to the PC's Unresolved Planning Issues List. This list will be used when initiating or reviewing legislation updates.

The PC is aware of efforts to update to the City's 20/20 Vision Statement, the Buildable Lands Inventory, Wildfire Abatement issue and the City's Transportation System Plan Update. It is anticipated that these will be reviewed and recommendations given by the PC prior to consideration by the City Council.

Next Year Proposed Work Plan:

Regular activities and work (ongoing or annual):

The PC is involved in the ongoing review of land development proposals that are brought forward through applications received by City staff.

The PC will perform an annual review of the Capital Improvement Program.

Special activities and work for the year:

Some of the main goals for the PC is to apply the LDC to applications and provide recommendations for legislative updates to staff and City Council. The PC priority will be to become more familiar with the current LDC. One way to accomplish this is to have PC members review sections of the LDC and have questions for staff when there are no public hearings on the agenda. More information will be forthcoming on the PC's goals in this regard.

The PC will update and maintain the list of Unresolved Planning Issues. This list is currently being reviewed on an annual basis. Our goal will be to update and review on a more frequent basis but also as the schedule allows.

The PC will be prepared to give valuable input and recommendations based on our knowledge of the LDC and Comprehensive Plan for the many special projects that will be up and coming, as listed below:

- 20/40 Vision and Action Plan
- Transportation System Plan Update
- Buildable Lands Inventory Update
- Wildfire Abatement/Significant Vegetation issue, which may initiate LDC amendments.

Resources:

Prior Year:

Training videos from Portland State University.
Staff availability for question and answers.

Needed for the next year:

Regular training set up for when there are no public hearings on the schedule. This training should be discussed with the PC and staff and have a list waiting so setting the agenda for a non hearing night should be easy. Some training shall be tailored to the needs of new commissioners. Training shall include Q&A sessions with staff, open discussions between staff and PC on how previous applications have been handled and what was seen as successes and failures, training videos from the Portland State University, etc. Training shall also include possible initiation of legislative updates proposed by the PC.

Feedback about the Annual Report Process:

No comments.

TO: City Council for November 8, 2016, Council Work Session

FROM: Mary Steckel, Public Works Department Director *MS*

DATE: October 28, 2016

THROUGH: Mark W. Shepard, P.E., City Manager *MWS*

SUBJECT: Transportation System Plan Quarterly Update



Action Requested:

For information only, no action required.

Discussion:

The following was completed since the last update to Council in August 2016.

- The reports describing the extent, quality, and baseline performance of the existing transportation and transit systems were finalized (Technical Memoranda #7 & #8). The final versions incorporate input received from the Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee and have been posted to the project website (<http://corvallistsp.org/library> > Study Documents).
- The evaluation of current revenue sources for transit and transportation, and the projection of likely available funding (through the year 2040), assuming there are no new revenue streams, were completed (Technical Memoranda #9 & #10). These reports were also discussed with the Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee, finalized, and posted to the project website (<http://corvallistsp.org/library> > Study Documents).
- The consultant team worked with Oregon Department of Transportation and Oregon State University to refine the regional travel demand model for the Corvallis area. With that complete, the effort moved to evaluating the impact of projected growth on future (year 2040) transportation and transit system conditions. This future conditions assessment complements the existing conditions assessment to establish the baseline set of transportation system needs for which solutions will be developed.
- The Project Team facilitated Topic Specific Work Groups focused on issues in three general categories: automobile/freight (November 3), and transit and bicycle/pedestrian (both on November 5). The intent of these Work Groups was to obtain input from targeted stakeholders in these key transportation areas to supplement the input from the committees and the general public. The transit and bicycle/pedestrian Work Groups included guided tours of those systems to stimulate discussion among participants about suggested improvements.
- A survey on how students use the transportation systems in the city is being conducted with parents and students of Corvallis' middle and high schools.

Upcoming work efforts include:

- The Project Team will analyze the results of the middle and high school transportation survey.

- The Project Team will develop a report on the growth assumptions in Corvallis and how that is projected to translate into new demand on the transportation system (Technical Memorandum #11).
- Based on the projected new demand, the assumed future (year 2040) conditions for the transportation and transit systems will be drafted and presented in Technical Memoranda #12 & #13.
- These three documents will be discussed with the Technical Advisory Committee and Steering Committee in separate meetings on November 14.
- The first project newsletter will be sent in early November to the interested parties list and will include notice of the upcoming public open house.
- The first Public Open House is scheduled for November 29 at the Corvallis-Benton County Public Library. The focus will be on concluding the discussion about transportation issues and needs and beginning the discussion about the types of solutions the community would like considered. An online Open House will be launched concurrently and will run for three weeks.

The City's consultant, along with Public Works staff, will provide a brief overview of the findings on current transportation system conditions and funding. Staff encourages the Council to review Technical Memoranda #7 through #10 and to come to the Work Session with any questions you might have.

Budget Impact:

None.

TO: City Council for November 8, 2016, Council Work Session

FROM: Mary Beth Altmann Hughes, Human Resources Director *MBA*

DATE: November 1, 2016

THROUGH: Mark W. Shepard, P.E., City Manager *MWS*

SUBJECT: 2016 Mayor/City Council Self-Evaluation



Action Requested:

Attached are the results of the annual Mayor City Council Self Evaluation. The item is for information and discussion only. No action is required.

Budget Impact:

No budget impact.

Attachments:

- Mayor City Council Self Evaluation- All Comments Document
- Mayor City Council Self Evaluation Ratings- Staff and Mayor/Council



Corvallis Mayor/City Council Self-Evaluation

Completed by: Staff/Council/Mayor- All Comments

Date: 2016

Rate the performance factors below:

O = Outstanding E = Exceeds Expectations M = Meets Expectations
 N = Needs Improvement B = Below Expectations NO = Not Observed

Performance Rating Definitions

The following ratings must be used to ensure commonality of language and consistency on overall ratings: (There should be supporting comments to justify ratings of “Below Expectations”)

- Outstanding: Performance surpasses all expectations.
- Exceeds Expectations: Performance is routinely above job requirements. Performance at this level is clearly superior and is difficult to achieve.
- Meets Expectations: Performance is regularly competent and dependable. This level of performance is expected.
- Needs Improvement: Performance does not consistently meet expectations. Improvement is expected.
- Below Expectations: Performance fails to meet job requirements on a frequent basis. Improvement is required.
- Not Observed: Did not have the opportunity to evaluate.

A. Strategic planning and policy development	
1. Regularly evaluate the broad strategic plan for the City with the CM using a public process. Make adjustments to the plan as warranted.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. Evaluate objectives and action plans and adjust as needed to implement the strategic plan.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Balance the needs of all parts of the community when conducting planning and prioritizing.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
4. Systematically evaluate policies and their implementation.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
5. Prioritize goals and initiatives through the budget process and other planning activities to realistically allocate City and MCC resources.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

In my opinion, the Council does not have a strategic plan. Imagine Corvallis 2040 is providing aspirations but not yet a plan.

The city does not have much uncommitted money, so prioritization through the budget process does not work. The community action plan and the sustainable budget process will have opportunities for discussion and definition of community priorities.

I prefer the work done this term over past terms but this is an area I think we can improve upon and I believe we will.

Cannot really evaluate strategic plan until there is one. In the current process we do a good job of setting and tuning our direction as we move along.

Need to work on the policy review. We now have an outline of how to do that.

We do these things in a general way.

#1 and #2: Unclear what “the broad strategic plan for the City” is referring to? Vision, Goals, something else?

Staff Comments:

Council consistently takes the long view regarding planning and policy development, which is a great strength for the City.

The City does not currently have a strategic plan. Instead recent efforts have been driven by Council goals that are adopted each term. Development of a City Strategic Plan in the next Council term will help the Council evaluate and prioritize their work and the work of the organization.

The Council will try a new Council Policy review process in the coming year that will help the Council identify the best way to effectively implement Council policies.

The Council could improve their effectiveness by concentrating their efforts on more focused areas one-at-a-time rather than trying to address multiple large issues at one time. The 2015-16 Council Goals were big goals and covered a wide breadth of issues. This stretched the Council and staff and required extra effort/time for Councilors and made it challenging to deal with the other business that came before the Council (land use, homelessness, etc.)

Need to work on the policy review. We now have an outline of how to do that.

The Council took on a lot of policy development in the last year, so the NI scores represent that the large policy development this year has not yet reached the stage where it starts to be prioritized and integrated into decision making. It is anticipated that the Council will move into that process in 2017.

Re: #5 – The Council should have been more realistic about balancing the work associated with adopting several intensive Council goals with the human resources necessary to accomplish them. Wanting to complete significant and meaningful work during the term is admirable, but the Council overloaded itself and City staff. All were good goals – just too much for one Council term. The regular business of the Council already requires a lot of time (significant land use public hearings like Campus Crest, livability code development, OSU District Plan, continued implementation of Public Participation Task Force recommendations, etc.), so adding the intense goal work on top was a recipe for burnout. In addition to goal work and routine business, the Council also took on other issues that did not directly relate to its goals (e.g. open carry). Some in the public who may have been considering running for the 2017-2018 Council may have decided against it after seeing what would be required of them.

From my vantage point...it seems the few vocal voices drive planning and overly influence prioritization. I know it’s very difficult to get balanced input and broad perspectives from all facets of the community, however we need to be careful not to lean so hard into the vocal few.

Council has adopted goals that have a significant impact to work load.

#5 – I think too much was taken on this term regarding goals

Items 1 and 2 assume the relevant plans are in place. The Council is making wholesale changes in the vision and will adopt new plans rather than to do a public evaluation of the plans that do exist. So these items seem premature.

The Council’s work on new initiatives seems very systematic, but evaluation of existing policies and the implementation of those policies seems to get less attention, and is less systematic than it is calendar driven.

B. MCC and CM relationships	
1. Communicate effectively with the CM.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. Support and respect the role of the CM as the chief administrator of the City.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Foster a teamwork approach with City staff.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

4. Councilors and Mayor and Council President maintain effective communication to enhance MCC and CM communication.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
5. Balance and prioritize Council work to ensure that MCC have adequate staff support in a way that uses staff resources efficiently.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

I think that the Mayor and the Councilors and the City Manager talk and listen to each other pretty well. The 2015-16 council goals took a lot of work from MCC and from city staff. For quite some time I did not realize how much time and effort the goals were taking, and I think it would have been helped for the council had known about that, either by asking or through (maybe unrequested) status updates from the CM.

I think each of these items is improving and I hope to see more improvement here as well. It would be helpful to me to have some guidance from CM or examples from other jurisdictions about models that work well.

MCC and staff have developed a good working relationship.

- Some councilors take the initiative to communicate regularly or as needed with the City Manager.
- The line between the policy role of the Council and our oversight role are blurry, however I do think that councilors generally understand and respect the role of the CM as the CEO of the organization.
- Teamwork with City staff is a challenge because of the role of the CM as our direct contact with staff.
- The Mayor and Council President regularly meet with the CM and have developed positive and productive relationships.
- We have stretched the Council workload beyond where we should. Individual councilors should be supported when they are clear about setting their own boundaries about what they can manage. Collectively we need to be realistic when considering what needs to come to Council and what can be handled at a staff level. We also need to have better dialogue with the CM about how much can be expected of staff (time on task, quality of work, number of revisions) so that we can be realistic about committing the City. When we realize that we have over-committed any resources (MCC, CM, staff, budget) we need to stop, analyze and adjust.

#3: Teamwork needs work from both sides – MCC and staff.

#4: Really appreciate the work that Leadership does but the model still leaves a sense with other Councilors who are not on Leadership that they are out of the loop on things and/or have less influence. Also, in a number of meetings it has appeared that Leadership with the City Manager has already decided on the path that they want and it becomes much harder for other Councilors to influence/take a different path. Some of the OSU negotiated items this term were good examples of this. It might be worth further conversation about the Leadership model and its pros and cons.

Staff Comments:

Staff support appears stretched to the limit to accommodate the six Council goals this term, which comes in addition to the full-time job of operating a city.

The Council and staff are a team working to serve the community together. It is important to continue to build trust between the City Council and staff. Staff shoulders a responsibility to provide Council with accurate and timely information in order to maintain the confidence of the Council. Council should take on the responsibility to seek understanding if/when there are concerns or complaints. This does not mean that Council should not ask tough questions of staff.

I have observed several occasions when Council has taken time during Council meetings to point out positive interactions they or their constituents have had with staff. This is encouraging and motivating for staff and helps to build the positive working relationship between staff and Council. I encourage the Council to continue to look for these opportunities.

The number of large Council goal initiatives this year put a large amount of strain on some areas of staffing. It was not uncommon to have staff members who had to prepare for and staff as many as 4 night meetings in a single week which basically removes them from most of their usual work tasks during the work day and does not allow for efficient work processes.

Re: #2 – For the most part, Councilors seemed to support and respect the role of the City Manager as chief administrator, but there have been instances where it seemed the Council was crossing over from policy maker to administrator.

Re: #3 – Some Councilors directly commented in public meetings that they did not trust staff. Such comments do not foster a teamwork approach.

Re: #5 – Staff work very hard to turn around reports and provide responses to Councilors’ questions, as they should, but it is challenging when staffing resources are lean due to cuts and/or vacancies, yet expectations to accomplish large volumes of work in a short amount of time remain very high.

I do believe there’s a positive balance that’s being found with how the MCC interact with the CM and staff in a supportive way.

#5 See comment above

City Council members seem to act as project managers for the task forces. This probably undercuts the role of the City Manager as chief administrator, as directions to staff on goal related materials are likely to come directly from council members (and not from the city manager) to the staff.

The very ambitious Council agenda does seem to leave staff with little time to adequately prepare materials for meetings.

C. Council operations	
1. Presiding officer and council members work together for effective and efficient meetings.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. Develop and respect clear rules and procedures for Council meetings.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Conduct City business in accordance with our adopted Guiding Principles for Public Engagement: collaborative decision-making, diversity, openness and respect, inclusiveness, and accountability.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
4. Conduct effective annual evaluations and contract reviews of MJ, CM, CAO, and MCC.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
5. Allocate MCC time and energy to effectively lead the City and to ensure that serving on the Council is as open as possible to citizens.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

In general, the MCC and the CM work hard to cooperate and to follow the Guiding Principles. I would consider modifying leadership processes to offer Councilors clear ways to make suggestions for Council meeting agendas.

The 2015-16 Council took on a lot of work, enough to make serving as a Councilor prohibitive/unattractive to many people.

I think the evaluations were significantly improved this time. I look forward to making the job of city councilor as open as possible to citizens.

Council has been great following through on their commitments around goals work along with the rest of their work. However, that has meant that we have learned the hard way that we may have challenged ourselves too much and created too much work.

- Our council meetings have a good balance of efficiency and productivity. Procedures are reviewed together and adjusted based on the wishes of the group.
- The Mayor has reached out to groups that haven't been very involved in the City and has been effective in making our advisory boards and commissions more inclusive.
- We have worked on improving our evaluation processes. I think it has been especially important to hear input from staff.
- As long as the expectation (spoken and unspoken) of the time commitment of councilors is high we have a barrier to participation. The Mayor has taken an approach to his job that is very time-intensive. I think this is effective. However, we set the expectation high for the next person and again establish a barrier. In the case of the Mayor I would like to see a Charter amendment making this a paid office so that people who are working or have family commitments can also consider running.

#1: Still could use some improvement on agenda setting/management as many meetings where conversation is cut short.

#5: Important issue that needs a larger community conversation.

Staff Comments:

Serving on Council has become a 30-hour-a-week job and is thus inaccessible to most members of our community. I encourage the Council to take substantive steps to return this body to its origins as an all-volunteer, part-time legislative body, both for the health and sanity of existing councilors and also to encourage newcomers to step up and get involved.

The Council could increase policing themselves to improve their meeting effectiveness and efficiency. There is a fine balance between maintaining Council Meetings and Work Session as business meetings while allowing an openness for public and Council discussion. This is something that will require ongoing sensitivity, efforts, and adjustments. Councilors wanting to get into more detail on issues should be encouraged to do so outside of the Council Meetings. Most but not all Councilors were good at sharing questions they had about items prior to the Council meetings to allow answers to be brought to meetings.

Council is encouraged to keep in mind that they should be making the job of the Council approachable by all in the community so that a wide representation of the community will seek to serve on the Council. Encouraging more interest in serving on the Council provides better public participation and connection with the community. This requires the Council to be careful about how much work the it takes on.

I would also encourage the Council to not feel like they must respond to every comment during Community Comments. Many times items can be referred to staff with little Council discussion required. Sometimes a statement from Council of, "That is good to know" is all that is needed. The Council can also help itself by being willing to say "no" to request from the community and from the Council body if it is not a priority item.

Serving on the Corvallis Council is a far bigger time commitment than in other communities and this is likely limiting the range of individuals who could serve on it. It seems unlikely that anyone who maintains a typical 8-5 job would be able to function as an effective Councilor, given the current structure and community expectations about Councilor availability. Anyone who volunteers to serve on a Council should be appreciated, but with the life/Councilor balance for our Councilors, the decision to choose to make that sacrifice is truly extraordinary.

Re: #1 – The Mayor and Councilors do work well together, but the time spent in meetings could be more efficient. If a Councilor has interest in diving deeper into an issue, s/he should do so outside of the Council meeting. Another way to make meetings more efficient is to be more mindful that community comments are not be the time for problem solving an issue. While the Council has discussed both of these, improvement is still needed in this area.

Re: #5 – The Mayor and Council effectively lead the City, but the amount of work the Council took on this term could easily discourage people who were considering becoming a Councilor in the future. The amount of time expected of the Mayor and Councilors is a critical consideration for potential candidates.

Outreach to the diverse community needs improvement.

The ambitious council agenda and demanding time commitments and schedules probably discourage at least some citizens from serving on the council.

D. Personal and professional development	
1. Represent the City and constituents in a professional and ethical manner.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. Continuously pursue personal learning and leadership development.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Educate ourselves about issues relevant to the City.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

For transparency and due diligence, I would consider periodically formally asking mayor and councilors whether there are individual or organizational ethical issues. Maybe the questions asked during the annual audit are sufficient.

I would like to see more training and presentations about issues relevant to the city.

Strong ethic around learning about issues.

- Our Council and Mayor represent the City well.
- We are generally curious and interested in issues related to the City and, in our own ways, we seek to learn more.

Staff Comments:

This Council is one of the most professional and ethical organizations I’ve ever been associated with. Keep up the good work!

The Council acts in a very ethical manner which reflects very favorably on the City. I appreciate the high ethics of the Council.

Re: #1 – the Mayor and Council should be commended for their professionalism and ethical behavior. They are respectful of each other during meetings. That speaks well of them as individuals and it projects a professional image of the City.

E. Code of conduct	
1. Listen, talk, and if you have something to say, say it.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. Balance efficiency and effectiveness during meeting interaction.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Seek to resolve disagreements and present decisions fairly and respectfully	O/E/M/N/B/NO
4. Demonstrate empathy by showing respect, listening, and participating.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
5. Respect others by paying attention, engaging, and acknowledging.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
6. Do our homework and come prepared to meetings.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
7. Operate transparently (be direct, authentic, and honest).	O/E/M/N/B/NO
8. Speak courteously of the Council and Councilors.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

For efficiency and effectiveness, maybe the mayor (as facilitator) could sometimes conclude a discussion by summarizing the main points made and questions raised? That already happens at times; might it help to do such a summary more often?

Working with this council has been incredibly rewarding because of the values expressed here and the commitment to them.

Council works well together maintaining mutual respect and trying to work efficiently and effectively. We can do more of balancing the latter two better.

I think our MCC work together with respect, regardless of whether we agree on a particular issue.

#2: We still have too many conversations that feel rushed/or have to be cut off.

Staff Comments:

This is another strength of our Council. You won't find the sort of petty sniping and shouting that makes headlines in other towns. Our Council can agree to disagree on certain issues and still get down to the business of doing the people's work, which is a tremendous strength.

I am gratefully for the high standards at which the Council conducts its business. This high standard assist with community relations and with getting work done.

Re: #2 – Improvement could be made with regard to efficient use of meeting time. For example, trying to problem solve with a community member during community comments is a time sink. Meetings of the Council should be focused to accomplish the work in an efficient, yet effective, manner. That is not to say that adequate time should not be taken to fully understand an issue before making a decision, but sometimes Councilors have drifted toward discussions about things that are not germane to the matter at hand. This can push meeting times to late in the evening. When people are tired, they do not think clearly.

There are times when some comments boarder verbose. Concise is preferred and many of the councilors excel in this.

In many Council meetings, some councilors clearly have thoughts and concerns they wish to discuss on various issues, but seem apologetic or are not confident enough in their abilities to express their thoughts.

F. Intergovernmental relationships	
1. Working through the MCC's Legislative Committee whenever possible, lobby the state and federal government on behalf of the City.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. Work collaboratively with other jurisdictions toward mutual goals.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Organize the MCC to effectively interact formally with other jurisdictions through the Mayor and/or selected Council member representatives whenever possible.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
4. Participate in local, regional and state government committees and organizations.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

From what I see, the legislative committee does not do much lobbying. Maybe there is not time for that. Probably there is more collaboration with other jurisdictions than I know about. I think that there are several issues which affect the entire state (and the nation and the world) and consequently, time permitting, improving collaboration is worthwhile.

My sense is we could be doing more in this area but it's hard to know.

#1: Our Mayor should really be applauded on this as he has really owned the legislative advocacy/lobbying part of his job.

Staff Comments:

I'm encouraged by the high level of dialogue and collaboration that exists between our Council and other local bodies, including Benton County and OSU.

Council Leadership's interactions with other local agencies such as the Board of Commissioners and School District are appropriate, as are joint meetings between the bodies when warranted.

G. Communication and community relationships	
1. The City Council effectively charters and regularly reviews advisory boards and commissions.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
2. The Mayor appoints advisory board and commission members to broadly represent interested and affected members of the community.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
3. Encourage effective public participation.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
4. Mayor and City Council members are accessible and visible to community members.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
5. The Mayor and Council communicate with and address the needs of staff, officials, and the public fairly, effectively and respectfully, regardless of their perspective or cultural background.	O/E/M/N/B/NO
6. Celebrate success.	O/E/M/N/B/NO

Comments

Council Comments:

I think that city government, both MCC and staff, are generally open to community participation. I also think that any improvements in community participation will improve relations between the city and the public.

Hopefully we can improve the diversity on advisory boards and commissions by increasing understanding of them and interest in them.

Boards and commissions need a broader representation.

MCC do many things for participation but we seem to miss many groups or interests. Need to search for and implement imaginative improvements.

Celebrate more.

- Our annual conversations with advisory boards is going well.
- We are using more varied methods of community engagement.
- We recognize staff and community successes. However, we don't celebrate our own. I think one reason is that we have a hard time saying that something we do is finished, or a phase is finished.

#1: The annual reports and the work session conversations they have spurred have been a nice addition.

#3: I'm hoping the CIDAB work and continued implementation of the Public Participation Task Force recommendations can help with this.

Staff Comments:

Council's commitment to transparency and public participation are really exemplary. Sometimes this commitment results in late nights at the fire station, but on balance our community is better when everyone's voice is heard.

The Council has been so busy that there has been little time or energy available to recognize or celebrate success.

Council has occasionally recognized positive interactions they or their constituents have had with staff. This is encouraging to staff.

The new Advisory Board and Commission Annual Report process is a great way to ensure regular discussions with the Council occur.

Accomplishments: Has the City Council effectively accomplished or worked towards accomplishing the goals it has established during the council term? Why or why not?

Comments

Council Comments:

The City Council has effectively worked towards accomplishing the goals it established at the start of the council term. In general, I think that the Council has used its traditional processes well. I think that the traditional processes could be modified/improved in some ways, such as: (1) obtain public input by more organized outreach to civic groups and to relatively uninvolved populations; (2) help all Councilors learn how to chair effective meetings; (3) organized discussion with other cities about common problems, something like Councilor York's study of Hillsboro's vision processes and Councilor Brauner's work with CAMPO.

I think a lot was accomplished this term toward most of the goals even with many new councilors and lead staff.

The goals were ambitious but council got to work and have exceeded expectations for the goals.

We have worked hard and have made good progress. As I write this we are working out how to complete part of each of our goals and ensure continued progress on the remainder.

Yes. We are headed towards some mix of acceptance/adoption for the work coming out of the Task Forces. But, the goals will also require implementation work beyond the Council term/into the future and there needs to be planning for/management of that.

Staff Comments:

This is difficult to evaluate. It seems clear that the six Council goals and their associated task forces will wrap up their work this term, but it's also clear that individual Councilors and city staff have been spread very thin working on these goals. The work got done, but it probably wasn't as effective as it could have been if we had been focusing on, say, three goals instead of six.

The Council adopted a lot of big goals for this Council term. But the Council has also been willing to put in a lot of work to move those goals forward. It is impressive how much work the Council has invested during this term. Council's work along with the significant efforts of staff have moved the goals forward as far as can be expected with the resources available. The Council should be proud of their work and accomplishments over the last year.

However, the level of work and time commitment from Council this term is not sustainable. Two of our new Councilors (both work) will not be seeking re-election next term in part due to the work load demands. A balance must be struck to allow the Council and the organization some room to breathe.

Staggering out some of these major tasks would have likely provided better outcomes both in terms of managing workloads, but also by allowing the later goals to benefit from the knowledge obtained in an earlier one. For instance, if Sustainable Budget were completed before the others, it could have altered the tone of some of the other goals. Going parallel created unnecessary tension between Vision and Climate task force members who tried to determine if one should be considered more important/urgent than another.

The Council appears to be on track for accomplishing its goals, or at least setting the stage for the next Council to implement those that require a multi-year approach.

I do believe the effort and desire has existed to accomplish goals established. I also think the list is too long and at times feels as if more continues to be added. I'd recommend reducing the number of goals.

Yes, CC has made progress on CC goals. It would be helpful for the next CC to keep the same goals and work on implementation.

Big goals this term; all of the work is not completed to this end; would hope new Council understands this and keeps going in same direction.

The City Council has effectively worked towards accomplishing the goals it has established this Council term. This has been a very ambitious undertaking the Council should celebrate.

Strengths: Based upon your overall evaluation of the City Council, what areas would you list as its strong points?

Comments

Council Comments:

Very important to me, the Council has worked together cooperatively this term.

The Council has done a pretty good job of long-term, big-picture thinking; I think that there is room to improve.

Strong leadership, mutual respect among councilors.

Council works together well, making good decisions and getting the city's business done.

- We work together well and can disagree respectfully.
- We all value public participation, though we may each take a different approach to how to achieve good participation (and how to define it!)

Respect for each other even if there are policy disagreements

Care/concern for the city/community

Staff Comments:

I am always impressed by the commitment and competence of these volunteer public servants.

-Civil discussion and community dialogue is a huge strength for this Council. Each elected official is a superb ambassador for his or her ward, and they also interact positively during Council meetings.

The Council continues to work very well together. Difficult issues with opposing views are addressed in a professional and productive manner. That positive example of working productively on challenging issues is a great example for the community and the staff.

Dedicated individuals who truly love the community. Councilors are very respectful of each other and community members.

Taking a more assertive role in dealing with OSU was a strength of this Council. The University has a tremendous impact on Corvallis' livability and it was refreshing to see a Council stand up for the community and push back when appropriate.

The Mayor and Council have consistently sought ways to further engage the public. The Vision outreach effort was very comprehensive.

The Council displays a positive energy and authentic desire to accomplish its work in the best interest of the City. Members are engaged and want to learn and be effective.

1. Commitment
2. Being informed

Ability to take on large tasks – 2040 vision, climate change, housing, etc.

Commitment to the goals and work ethic.

Improvements Suggested: Based upon your overall evaluation, what areas would you suggest the City Council work on to improve its skills and to be even more effective? Please be as specific as possible.

Comments

Council Comments:

I support City Manager Shepard's project to reduce the burden on individual Councilors. Further, I think it would be good to increase Council diversity (for example, in age, income and economic status, ethnicity) and, as part of that, to figure out how diverse groups can do effective politics/government.

I think that the Council would benefit from education on a few topics, such as: (1) organizing effective meetings; (2) Oregon's land use system, especially needed housing. If this idea were to be adopted, one consideration would be how to balance the additional work with reducing the burden on Councilors.

Continue to improve communication between leadership and council, and council and the public.

MCC need to always think about effective use of time and efficient meeting progress.

Reduce the time spent by Councilors. Be judicious and creative when planning public engagement so that it is inclusive yet doesn't slow down the delivery of services or present an obstacle to serving on the Council. Be reasonable and responsible as Mark's supervisor – keeping expectations reasonable.

Examine Council Leadership structure

Address issues around Council/staff workload

Staff Comments:

-I suggest focusing on fewer, more narrowly defined goals in future terms. In addition to being a more effective use of staff time, this approach also ensures that the community has an easier time tracking progress and becoming invested in the outcomes.

-I would encourage Council to pull back from some of the more mundane aspects of administration and leave those tasks to staff. This will have the added benefit of making the role of City Councilor a bit less hectic, as demands on Councilors' time will be reduced.

I think the place the Council can improve most on is reducing the new work load for themselves and the organization. There is a substantial amount of daily business the City Council and staff must take care of in the natural course of running the day-to-day operation of the City. I suggest the Council move away from setting new goals every term which adds to the work load and makes prioritization of ongoing work difficult.

I think it has improved throughout the year, but Council could utilize staff and meeting time more effectively by bringing questions up before meetings so staff can resolve them or provide more information and also figuring out a way to provide direction to staff regarding how deep the Council wants to go into discussions at work sessions.

On the subject of public participation, it is important to remember that the number of people who attend Council meetings or work sessions isn't necessarily an effective measure of community participation. There are many other ways to obtain constituent input (which is participation), such as attending neighborhood meetings, Government Comment Corner, Ward meetings, community events, etc. People have busy lives and most of them are either do not have the time or are not interested in attending Council meetings. If they are concerned about an issue, they will find a way to let the Council know how they feel. As long as the City is effectively providing residents with information about City government and how they can become involved, responsibility for participation falls back to the resident.

Be cognizant of roles between the Council and the Administration of the City. Those lines can get blurred relatively easy. This is not a negative comment or concern, rather stated to maintain perspectives.

1. Resist working down in the weeds.

Decrease number of goals – would allow for time to address unanticipated items as they arise.

The council needs to spend some time after making important decisions to reflect on the processes, not the decisions themselves. Discussing what worked, what went wrong, and what could have been done differently to get to the same result can help avoid making the same mistakes, even if the end result is the right one.

Overall Assessment:

Comments

Council Comments:

I think that the Council has good intentions, that Mayor and Councilors work together well, and that the Council does a good job. Those are fundamental strengths.

Given that those strengths continue, I think that the best way to improve is to educate the Council and to develop more effective communication methods/processes.

I think we should feel good about what has been accomplished and continue the work at a slower pace.

Great council year.

This has been a good and productive term.

Staff Comments:

Highly favorable.

This is a very caring and respectful Council that needs to take the next steps after this big year of policy in order to implement, which means making hard decisions about prioritizing.

This Council has accomplished a lot of really good work during the term and it is apparent that each one of them cares deeply about Corvallis. Their service to the City is appreciated.

I would prefer a change so that councilors were elected to 4 year terms rather than 2 year terms. Or have some combination of both. I think having all councilors on a 2 year rotation is too short.

A lot of change this term with big goals; hard work on the part Mayor, Council and staff; good communication with Councilors/Mayor.

Revision date 5/10/2016

Mayor/City Council Self Evaluation Ratings 2016

	Staff AVERAGE	Mayor/City Council AVERAGE
Strategic Planning and Policy Development		
1	2.83	2.50
2	2.83	2.75
3	2.75	2.80
4	2.71	2.80
5	2.71	2.80
Ave. by Reviewer	2.77	2.73
MCC and CM Relationships		
1	3.25	3.20
2	2.88	3.00
3	2.88	3.00
4	3.25	3.00
5	2.13	2.40
Ave. by Reviewer	2.88	2.92
Council Operations		
1	2.78	3.20
2	3.22	3.40
3	3.22	3.60
4	3.00	3.60
5	2.63	2.20
Ave. by Reviewer	2.97	3.20
Personal and Professional Development		
1	3.56	3.60
2	3.00	3.00
3	3.00	3.20
Ave. by Reviewer	3.19	3.27

Code of Conduct

1	3.11	3.40
2	2.78	2.80
3	3.44	3.40
4	3.44	3.60
5	3.22	3.40
6	3.11	3.40
7	3.11	3.60
8	3.56	3.80
Ave. by Reviewer	3.22	3.43

Intergovernmental Relationships

1	3.00	2.80
2	3.33	2.75
3	3.20	2.75
4	3.20	2.75
Ave. by Reviewer	3.18	2.76

Communication and Community Relationships

1	3.13	3.40
2	3.25	3.40
3	3.67	2.80
4	3.33	3.20
5	3.11	3.40
6	2.88	2.40
Ave. by Reviewer	3.23	3.10

Staff Ave.	Council Ave.
------------	--------------

2.68	2.68
------	------