



CORVALLIS
Advisory Board Restructuring Ad-Hoc Committee

Friday, August 28, 2020
9:00 am – 10:30am

Pursuant to [Governor Brown's Executive Order 20-16](#) issued in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting will be online only.

The public may register to watch the meeting live on the internet via this link:

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/9140905775404660749>

A video of the meeting will be available on the City's website

-
- I. Call to Order
 - II. Introductions
 - III. Finish Discussion on Advisory Board Restructuring
 - IV. Review Draft Memo for the September 10, 2020 Work Session
 - V. Community Comments - *This is an opportunity for the community to provide input to the Committee. Community members wishing to offer testimony in advance on topics appearing on the agenda are strongly encouraged to do so in writing by emailing Councilor Andrew Struthers at andrew.struthers@corvallisoregon.gov. Community members who wish to offer verbal testimony to the Committee either via telephone or through their computer must preregister with Councilor Struthers at the above email address or via telephone at 541-974-7240 by 5:00 pm on August 23.*
 - VI. 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

TO: Advisory Board Restructuring Ad-Hoc Committee
FROM: Councilor Andrew Struthers, Ward 9
DATE: August 25, 2020 for meeting on August 28, 2020
SUBJECT: Meeting #7
STRATEGIC OPERATIONAL PLAN PRIORITY: E-1G Advisory Board Review



Introduction

At our next meeting we will finalize our discussions on the restructuring of the city's advisory boards.

We will finish up discussing and finalizing the different boards that we want to propose moving forward.

Additionally, we will review the memo that will be coming from the Ad-Hoc Committee to the September 10 Council Work Session. Please take the time to review the memo before the meeting. If you have any suggested changes or corrections, you are welcome to provide those in advance so I can incorporate before the meeting. We will be discussing any changes needed made during the meeting as well.

Attachment A: Draft Memo for the September 10, 2020 Council Work Session

TO: City Council for September 10, 2020, Work Session
FROM: Advisory Board Restructuring Ad-Hoc Committee
DATE: August 24, 2020 for September 10, 2020
THROUGH: Andrew Struthers, Ward 9 City Councilor
SUBJECT: Advisory Board Restructuring Ad Hoc Committee Final Recommendations
STRATEGIC OPERATIONAL PLAN PRIORITY: E-1G. Conduct a review of all City advisory boards, commissions, committees, and task forces.



Action Requested:

The Advisory Board Restructuring Ad-Hoc Committee (comprised of four Councilors and four City staff members) recommends Council review and discuss the committee’s recommendations to restructure the current advisory board framework. Future work will be required to amend the Municipal Code to reflect this new strategic direction.

Discussion:

The City of Corvallis has historically placed a high value on public participation. The city is often referred to as “a very engaged community” and feedback from consultants, state agencies, and other third parties frequently indicate that they receive orders of magnitude more community input on Corvallis projects than anywhere else in the state. Public participation is such a core value of the community that the very first Focus Area statement of the Community’s 2040 Vision is “Corvallis supports and engages a changing population in a welcoming community”.

Public participation is a broad concept that includes far more than just advisory boards and commissions. The global standard for effective public participation comes from the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). IAP2 created the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation (Attachment A) that helps communities across the globe incorporate more effective and meaningful public participation in local government. IAP2 identifies over 50 different techniques for increasing public participation including the use of ongoing advisory groups (page 12 of Attachment A).

In Corvallis, public outreach efforts have traditionally focused the community’s resources on one of those 50+ techniques - ongoing advisory groups, most of which are comprised largely of community volunteers. The number of ongoing advisory groups maintained monthly by the City exceeds the number often found in cities with much larger population size. The large size of the advisory board structure has at times made it challenging for community groups to find open evenings when they can schedule their own community events without having meeting room conflicts with city advisory boards or an inability to find a time when all of the interested Councilors would be able to attend the community group meeting. The traditional advisory board structure, consisting primarily of meetings that occur over the dinner hour on weeknights, presents barriers to some in the community who might be unable to participate fully due to childcare or work obligations.

The IAP2 framework does not establish a hierarchy of public participation techniques but instead focuses on the importance of matching the appropriate public participation technique to the desired need. As the IAP2 notes, ongoing advisory groups are good for providing detailed analysis for project issues, but also have a limited number of voices so the general public may not embrace the recommendations that come from these advisory groups. IAP2 also notes that ongoing advisory groups are “time and labor intensive”.

The latter point is important as Corvallis’s large advisory board structure has intensive financial and staffing needs that must be provided by the City of Corvallis, such that many of the other public participation techniques are not able to be used frequently.

Existing Advisory Board Structure

As currently organized, these ongoing advisory bodies are comprised of community volunteers who meet monthly to work on tasks assigned to them by the City Council or, when such work do not exist, share information on subject areas of interest to their members. Each body has one Councilor assigned as a non-voting liaison.

There are currently the following number of ongoing advisory boards identified on the City’s website:

Agencies	1
Commissions	4
Boards	17
Committees	8

In addition, there are numerous operational groups throughout the organization where staff works directly with community members that are not included in the list above.

The Council’s 2020-2024 Strategic Operational Plan included an action item to explore restructuring and reimagining the City’s advisory board structure. This work effort was a direct result of feedback that emerged over the last few years from Councilors, staff, and the general public suggesting that the current structure was not achieving the policy goals of the Council or the operational goals of the City’s professional staff.

Timeline of Previous Work

The Council has held several work sessions on the restructuring topic including facilitated interactive exercises to provide general guidance on the restructuring effort. The Council also sought input from advisory boards directly early in the process.

2019 Meetings

- July 18, 2019 – Work Session Topic
- August 22, 2019 – Work Session Topic
- October 10, 2019 – Work Session Topic
- December 5, 2019 – Workshop

2020 Meetings

- June 18, 2020 – Workshop
- July 6, 2020 – Council Meeting forming Ad-Hoc Committee

The two workshops were focused a specific path that Council and Senior Staff have currently been undertaking. From those two meetings a set of themes of what we are wanting from boards was created, how those themes interact with each other, and what specifically we are wanting to be advised on. From this we were able to direct the creation of an Ad-Hoc Committee to continue the overall work.

Advisory Board Restructuring Ad Hoc Committee

Beginning in July, an Advisory Board Restructuring Ad Hoc Committee (ABAHC) consisting of four Councilors and four City staff, met for a series of seven (7) meetings to discuss a new path forward. From the beginning, the committee was tasked to set aside the current structure and imagine an entirely new framework that would support the policy needs of the City Council and build upon the work from the Council's work sessions.

The committee's membership includes: Ward 9 Councilor Andrew Struthers (chair), Ward 7 Councilor Paul Shaffer, Ward 5 Councilor Charlyn Ellis, Ward 3 Councilor Hyatt Lytle, Public Works Director Mary Steckel, Community Development Director Paul Bilotta, Library Directory Ashlee Chavez, and Public Information Officer Patrick Rollens.

ABAHC Work

Early on, the ABAHC expressed commitment that the restructuring should not be viewed as a reduction of public participation opportunities, but rather a refocusing of the civic energy in the community, in recognition that the sheer size and resource consumption of the existing advisory board framework is crowding out opportunities for other forms of public participation that are often more effective at reaching a larger and diverse pool of community members. As the Community Involvement and Diversity Advisory Board (CIDAB) has noted in the past, the current advisory board structure allows a small number of enfranchised community members to have a large amount of access to the City's public participation resources, but is a technique that is not very effective at reaching a broad spectrum of the population and particularly underrepresented segments of the community.

This critical theme is further supported by the community member-produced report "City Process, Effective, Meaningful, Efficient" ([Attachment Link](#)), which noted that 72% of advisory boards averaged 0 or 1 visitor/guests over the course of an entire year. Only two boards, (Climate Action and ICAN) averaged more than 1 community member in attendance per meeting. The report further noted even in the few meetings where community members did attend, in 53% of those meetings, the community member did not have any dialog with the advisory board.

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines advice as "recommendation regarding a decision or course of conduct". The ABAHC looked at the advisory role of the boards and realized that in order for there to be advice, there needs to be associated decisions. The ABAHC examined all of the Council's decisions over the past two years to determine what Council decisions were being made and which ones benefitted from advice from an advisory board. The ABAHC then tried to align this record of past decisions with work the City Council had performed in an earlier work session to identify topics it felt that it needed advice on. Some of the key points of this analysis were:

1. The areas that the Council had identified as needing advice on aligned closely with the categories of past Council decisions.
2. The existing structure of advisory boards did not align well with past Council decisions but was instead often aligned with operational decisions.
3. The maintenance of the large advisory board system showed up in the analysis of past Council decisions, as the Council's most common category of decision in any year is not about policy, finances or operational issues, but is instead the constant selection and approval of new members to advisory boards.

Role of Councilors

The ABAHC looked at the role of the Council liaison and determined that it was possibly not performing as well as it could and may be a key element in some of the confusion about roles that frequently came up through advisory board feedback. Councilors expressed a desire to have a working role in any advisory boards – not just a liaison position, which can create confusion on boards that are focused primarily on operations.

ABAHC Conclusions

Framework

Building on some of the work that had been previously done by the Public Participation Task Force ([Attachment Link](#)), the ABAHC created a nomenclature system to more clearly define the role of various types of advisory groups as follows. The goal of this framework to make clear the different roles the various types of advisory groups will play.

Advisory Policy Board: Policy Boards are on-going bodies that focus on specific policy areas. They advise the Council on the policy that has been assigned to them and have the potential to collaborate with other Policy Boards if there is an area that crosses policy boards. In the case of cross-policy than there would be the formation of a short-term ad-hoc group made of members from both boards. Policy boards focus primarily on policy areas only, however, there may be times that they are asked to look at an operational aspect depending on need.

Policy Task Force: Short-term advisory body that has the ability to provide advice on a policy area. A task force sunset when the project is complete.

Advisory Operational Committee: Committees are primarily focused on advising on operational aspects of the City. Depending on the need some committees may be short-term or long-term. These bodies can take different formations and make-ups as the need arises.

Operational Work Group: Short-term advisory body that has the ability to provide advice on an operation area. A workgroup sunset when the project is complete.

Agencies: The Council has created a full independent body with legal decision-making authority.

Commissions: Commissions are those decision-making bodies that have a mandate on their formation and requirement. These bodies would meet one of the following attributes:

1. Commission that is mandated by state law (i.e. Budget commission)
2. Decision making bodies that are part of the state's land use appeals process (i.e. Planning Commission). It should be noted that land use commissions are recognized but not required by state law and many cities have moved to the use of Hearings Officers to fulfill the same function.
3. Formal decision-making bodies that make decisions that are appealed directly to the City Council

Multi-jurisdictional: The Council and City will and have entered into Intergovernmental Agreements were boards have been setup as multi-jurisdictional. These boards typically do not report to any specific body unless the IGA states that will be the case. These boards general provide feedback and advise to all jurisdictions that are involved in the IGA.

Community Groups: These are bodies that are created by the community and can provide advice to the City either through formal partnership or on an ad hoc basis. The City typically doesn't have an organizational role in such groups but may choose to seek policy advice from them.

Structure

The structure that is being proposed fits within framework and continues building on the various discussion points including a focus on efficiency, public participation and clear roles. The total of “Advisory Boards” as they exist now goes from 17 to potential 6. There are Advisory Operational Committees that are recommended be solidified in the Municipal Code as their importance of being public facing.

Agencies	1
Commission	4
Multi-Jurisdictional	5
Advisory Policy Board	6*
Advisory Policy Task Forces	3**
Advisory Operational Committee	4*
Advisory Operational Work Groups	<u>1**</u>
Total	24 (10 of 24 are mandated in some form or multi-jurisdictional)

*Discussion needed on certain boards that will affect the overall number

**These are recommended bodies that are not ongoing

Agencies (1):

1. South Corvallis Urban Renewal Agency

No Changes are being recommended for the Urban Renewal Agency. However, it is important body for the work that it will be doing for the Urban Renewal District. It does have independent authority from the City Council.

Commissions (4):

1. Planning Commission
2. Budget Commission
3. Historic Resource Commission
4. South Corvallis Urban Renewal Agency Budget Commission

Currently no changes are being recommended for the Commissions as the currently are formed. There was discussion of whether additional commission should be created. Example was the Parks and Natural Areas Board, though there was discussion if they would be delegated any decision-making authority and if so, what would be appealed to Council. If Council is interested in additional Commissions this would be discussion point for the Work Session.

Multi-Jurisdictional Groups (5):

1. Imagine Corvallis Action Network (ICAN)
2. 9-1-1 Service District
3. Library Service District
4. Economic Development
5. Home, Opportunity, Planning and Equity Advisory Board

All the multi-jurisdictional groups are set by IGA and so their creation, existence, and discontinuation is based on those IGAs themselves. At this time there is no recommendation to change or add any

additional Multi-Jurisdictional Groups. However, it is important to recognize that these groups to add to total Advisory Groups that City is able to tap into for advice.

Advisory Policy Boards (6):

1. Fees Review

The concept of this board would assist Council all fees that get an annual review. One of their charges would be looking at all fees from a holistic approach on an annual basis. A discussion point for Council will be how the make up of the body will be done. There are two different approaches that have been discussed:

1. Body is made of only members of the Budget Commission
2. Body is made up of a mix of Councilors, Citizen Budget Commissioners, and other non-budget commission community members

2. Council Governance

This body and other likes it could be setup as an advisory policy board that advises the Council on matter as a whole. The concept of this board is to provide advise on Council operations and review of processes. Additional boards could be brought up depending on the ongoing need, however there is no recommendations at this time. Finally, there was discussion that Advisory Task Forces can be brought up for Council related work items like the Charter Review Ad-Hoc Committee and Board Restructuring Ad-Hoc Committee.

3. Climate Action

There as agreement that continuing the Climate Action Board as an Advisory Policy Board was important. It plays a vital role in providing advice and recommendation from a Climate Action point of view, including reviewing the City's Strategic Operational Plan. There is an opportunity to incorporate some of their work in other policy areas. Additional as an Advisory Policy Board, it allows for some operational advising as it is needed by departments.

4. Community Involvement and Diversity Advisory Board (CIDAB)

Recommendation at this time is to keep CIDAB in the current format that is exists. However, there is a strong encouragement to do an overall review of its charge and looking at the recommendations that came out of the Public Participation Task Force. Additionally, having an Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Social Justice Task Force be formed to do an holistic review. This review would either look at changing CIDAB and sunseting it for a newer board with a different charge.

5. Kings Legacy Advisory Board

Recommendation at this time is to keep the King Legacy Advisory Board in its current format. However, along with CIDAB there is a discussion of a bigger review with an Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Social Justice Task Force. The work and review would help provide the proper direction in which CIDAB and Kings Legacy Advisory Board work together.

6. Vision Zero*

There are some mix thoughts on whether there should be a separate Vision Zero Policy Board that reports and advises directly to the Council or should it be a subset of the Multi-Modal Operational

Committee, either as a work item or working group. One thing that has come out is that there is no longer a Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board, making there no standalone board that would address these specific issues. Though the idea of the Multi-Modal Transportation Operational Committee is having the holistic approach.

Another thought is looking at starting a Advisory Task Force for Vision Zero that will provide advise directly to Council on next steps on Vision Zero and if a separate standalone board should be created.

The discussion should be focused on what type of board if any should there be for Vision Zero, not the overall topic itself as Council has taken previous action related to that.

Advisory Policy Task Forces (3):

1. Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Social Justice

The committee does recommend forming a Task Force that looks at the Council and Cities approach to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Social Justice. Through this process if the Council agrees that a task force should be created we then at a later date can discuss the charge of the task force and the outcome the Council is seeking. As previously discussed, the work related to this task force should also look at the work of the Kings Legacy Advisory Board and the Community Involvement and Diversity Advisory Board.

2. Public Safety

This was a topic that took many forms with the overall community and public safety. Items that were discussed including, safety of community, COVID response, public health champions, community policing, and other related public safety topics. There was no one consensus policy area or areas that would need an ongoing board. At this time, the recommendation is that a task force would be formed on as needed basis to address these issues. However, that does not prevent a ongoing board being formed at some point in the future.

3. Housing Related

The recommendation at this time is to not have an ongoing housing board for the purposes of an Advisory Policy Board, however that it shifts to an Advisory Operational Committee. A majority of the work that is on going is from an operation point of view since the adaption of the 2016 Housing Development Task Force Recommendations.

If there are specific housing related policy decisions that the Council needs advise on in the future, a task force can be formed to complete that work. Similar to the recommendations that come from a task force in 2016.

Advisory Operational Committee (4):

1. Park and Natural Area

Previous actions and information for the Parks and Natural Area have primarily been operational in nature. There has not been any specific action that the Council has needed to take based on recommendation and advise of the current board. Therefore, the recommendation is to move this to a Advisory Operation Committee. There was some discussion about making the Park and Natura Area Board a Commission giving them full decision-making authority. However, that would require some discussion among Council if that is the right approach. It should be noted that this will be a board that is complete front facing. Meetings would be setup similar to those of the Policy Advisory Boards.

2. Housing Related**

As previously mentioned, since the 2016 Housing Development Task Force Recommendations, much of the work has shifted to operational facing.

3. Multi-Modal Transportation*

Part of the discussions over the years and the various reports previously mentioned looked the need for a multi-modal transportation board. This would bring multiple stakeholders to the table including freight, automobile, bike, pedestrians, and other forms of transportation. The idea is to give a full holistic view and discussion to how transportation network is developed within the City. It should be noted that this will be a board that is complete front facing. Meetings would be setup similar to those of the Policy Advisory Boards.

As previously mentioned under the discussion for Vision Zero, there maybe a working group formed out of this group or a work topic charged to this group.

4. Police Review Board

This is a mandatory board that would stay as a Advisory Operational Committee. The recommendation is to make no changes to this body as the mandate it holds with CALEA accreditation

Advisory Operational Workgroups (1):

1. Empowerment Grants, City Grants, Public Art and Culture

The agreement that these types of grants can be done by an operational workgroup that get formed as they are needed to review different types of grants. Additional determining how public art is approved would still need to be resolved, though there is agreement that can be done by a work group.

Size of Boards

There was different discussions about the size of boards and how the membership would be selected. The committee recommends that we keep this as board as possible and to not immediately assign a set number. The boards and committees should have the flexibility to grow and shrink in size as the needs arise. This also will help address previous issues with quorum of not having fixed body sizes.

Additionally, there was discussion about reserving slots for individuals who are K-12, OSU, or LBCC students. The idea is to ensure that different parts of our community are being represented within our City government. There maybe other groups we want to ensure that have spots reserved, but those discussion can happen on an as needed basis.

Attachments:

<List all attachments. Remove if no attachments. Remove the “s” if only one attachment.>