



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

Fax (503) 378-5518

www.lcd.state.or.us

September 17, 2009



TO: Land Conservation and Development Commission

FROM: Ann Glaze, Chair, Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC)
Cliff Voliva, Communications Officer, DLCDC

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 6, October 1-2 LCDC Meeting**

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE UPDATE

I. AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

This agenda item has four parts. The CIAC is asking LCDC to:

1. Approve an amendment to the CIAC Bylaws,
2. Approve a second four-year term for CIAC member Chris White,
3. Approve moving CIAC member Gregory McClarren from his At-Large position to the Congressional District 4 position, and
4. Select a recipient for the first *STAR Award for Citizen Involvement*.

II. BACKGROUND

1. **CIAC BYLAWS:** At its August 20 meeting in Salem, CIAC approved amendments to its Bylaws, subject to approval by LCDC. The amendments (Attachment A) are intended to:
 - a. clarify that attendance of CIAC meetings is *required* and that unexcused absences can be grounds for removal, and
 - b. clarify that amendments to the CIAC Bylaws are not effective until approved by LCDC.
 - c. Provide that committee members may be removed only for just cause.
2. **CHRIS WHITE:** White's first term on CIAC officially expired at the end of June. CIAC recently voted (unanimously) to reappoint her to another four-year term, subject to LCDC's approval.
3. **GREGORY MCCLARRAN:** An opening on CIAC will occur at the end of 2009 when Ian Maitland (Congressional District 4) officially resigns. Also, McClarren (At-Large) is anticipating relocating from Redmond to North Bend (Congressional District 4) by next spring. Because it would be easier to recruit

qualified CIAC members from throughout the state as opposed to a single Congressional District, CIAC is asking LCDC to approve moving McClarren from his At-Large position to Congressional District 4 on January 1, 2010.

4. STAR AWARD: CIAC received three applications (Attachment B) earlier this year for its first-ever *STAR Award for Citizen Involvement*. A subcommittee was formed to review the applications and make a recommendation in August to the full committee. Of the three applicants, the subcommittee and CIAC agreed that the first award should go to the City of Newberg for its public outreach campaign entitled: *Newberg's Future*. The committee agreed that, while the other two applications were good, the Newberg project clearly separated itself from the others.

A. Staff Contact Information

For more information about this agenda item, please contact Cliff Voliva, Communications Officer, at 503-373-0050 ext. 268, or by e-mail at: cliff.voliva@state.or.us.

BYLAWS OF THE OREGON CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CIAC)

ARTICLE I PURPOSE

The purpose of the CIAC is to implement statewide land-use planning Goal 1: Insure the opportunity for all citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process

ARTICLE II DEFINITIONS

Section 1. The Committee

The state's Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee is established in accordance with ORS 197.160 and 197.235. It shall be referred to in these bylaws as the Committee.

Section 2. The Commission

The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) shall be referred to in these bylaws as the Commission.

Section 3. The Department

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) shall be referred to in these bylaws as the Department.

ARTICLE III RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 1. To the Commission

- a. Advise on matters of citizen involvement.
- b. Operate in accordance with ORS 197.160, ORS 197.235, and the Commission's citizen involvement program.
- c. Review and evaluate the Commission's "Citizen Involvement Guidelines for Policy Development" annually and report to the Commission on its evaluation.
- d. Develop and recommend a process for citizen involvement in the adoption and amendment of statewide goals, guidelines and related administrative rules.
- e. Review proposed LCDC policies that have potential effects on citizen involvement and prepare recommendations.
- f. Review citizen involvement programs submitted by cities or counties and report whether such proposed programs adequately provide for public involvement in the planning process. If a new proposal is considered inadequate, the Committee shall specify in what respects it is inadequate and make recommendations for improvement.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

- g. Perform other duties related to citizen involvement as requested by the Commission.

Section 2. To the public

- a. Promote public participation in the adoption and amendment of goals, guidelines and related administrative rules.
- b. Review proposed adoptions and amendments to assure compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 1 and applicable statutes for citizen involvement.
- c. Promote widespread citizen involvement in all phases of the planning process at state and local levels.
- d. Review local citizen involvement programs that are found by the Department to be inadequate and prepare recommendations about such programs for the Commission or Department.
- e. Represent the interests of citizens statewide relating to land-use decisions as they pertain to citizen involvement.

ARTICLE IV
MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Composition of the Committee

- a. The Committee shall have up to eight (8) members, each of whom shall be appointed by a majority vote of the Commission.
- b. In selecting committee members, the Commission shall attempt to provide a Committee that is broadly representative of geographic areas and interests relating to land use planning. Each of Oregon's congressional districts shall be represented by at least one member of the Committee.
- c. No more than two city, county or state elected officials or professional planners shall be appointed to the Committee.
- d. Committee members should be residents of the state of Oregon who understand, have participated in, or are concerned about citizen involvement.

Section 2. Tenure

- a. Each of the Committee members shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission.
- b. Each Committee member's term of appointment shall be four years, unless terminated sooner by the Commission.
- c. An incumbent Committee member may be appointed to subsequent four-year terms.

Section 3. Selection Process

The Committee may make recommendations to the Commission regarding appointments to CIAC.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

ARTICLE V
OFFICERS AND DUTIES

Section 1. Officers

The Committee officers shall be a chairperson and a vice-chairperson, to be elected by a majority vote of the members, at the June meeting or at a meeting as soon as possible thereafter.

Section 2. Term of Office

Officers shall hold office for a period of one year, from July to June.

Section 3. Duties

- a. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings and is entitled to vote on all issues.
- b. The vice-chairperson shall perform all duties of the chairperson in his or her absence and is entitled to vote on all issues.

ARTICLE VI
MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Section 1. Regular Meetings

The Committee shall establish a time and place for regular meetings, which shall be held approximately once every two months.

Section 2. Special Meetings

Special meetings of the Committee may be called by the chairperson, vice-chairperson, or a majority of the Committee members.

Section 3. Notice of Regular Meetings

- a. Notice of all regular meetings shall be given to all members of the Committee and other interested persons at least 10 working days before such meetings.
- b. The Department shall maintain a list of persons and organizations that have expressed their interest in citizen involvement and CIAC. Notice of CIAC meetings shall be communicated to everyone who has asked to be on that list.
- c. Notices of regular CIAC meetings shall be sent to the Capitol Press Room and media outlets at least 72 hours before each meeting.

Section 4. Notice of Special Meeting

- a. Notice of all special meetings shall be sent to all members of the Committee and other interested persons at least three days before such meetings.
- b. The Department shall maintain a list of persons and organizations that have expressed their interest in citizen involvement and CIAC. Notice of CIAC meetings shall be sent to everyone who has asked to be on that list.
- c. Notices of special CIAC meetings shall be sent to the Capitol Press Room and media outlets at least 24 hours before each meeting.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Section 5. Conduct of Committee Meetings

- a. All Committee meetings shall be held in accordance with the provisions of ORS Chapter 192, the Open Meetings Law.
- b. Roberts Rules of Orders, newly revised, shall govern the conduct of meetings.
- c. A quorum for this Committee shall consist of a simple majority of the current membership. Official actions of the Committee shall be taken only when a quorum is present.
- d. An action by a majority of the total membership of the Committee shall be an action of the Committee.
- e. Each member of the Committee shall be entitled to one vote on all issues presented at all regular and special meetings at which the member is present.

Section 6. Staff Support

A member of the Department's staff shall serve as staff to the Committee. Other members of the Department's staff may be called upon as necessary. Minutes of each Committee meeting shall be prepared by staff, distributed to all Committee members and posted on the DLCD web site.

ARTICLE VII

MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Deleted: REMOVAL OF MEMBERS

Section 1. Attendance

Members shall be required to attend all regularly scheduled meetings and special meetings. Unexcused absences shall be grounds for removal.

Deleted: expected

Deleted: If three or more consecutive meetings are missed without appropriate notice and reason to the chair, the member shall be requested to resign from the CIAC

Section 2. Removal from CIAC

The Commission may remove any member of the CIAC at any time for just cause.

Deleted: ¶
Section 2. Vacation of Position
If a resignation is not received when requested under Section 1 above, the Committee shall request the Commission to vacate the position.¶

ARTICLE VIII

AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

Section 1. Amendment of Bylaws

These bylaws may be revised by the Committee, subject to LCDC approval.

Deleted: §

Deleted: :

Formatted: Underline

Deleted: for any reason

Deleted: and approved by LCDC

Section 2. Notice to Amend Bylaws

Written notice of such proposed amendment or repeal and the nature thereof shall have been sent to the membership of the Committee and other interested persons at least 10 working days before the date of the meeting at which the amendments are to be considered.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Bylaws of the Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC), Month, Date, Year

[These bylaws were reviewed by the Land Conservation and Development Commission on May 11, 1990. They were adopted unanimously by the state's Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee on May 18, 1990.]

Adopted: May 1990

Amended: Article V Section 2 – 1999/2000; Article IV Section 2b – June 2003

Amendments adopted: Dec. 2, 2005; all sections

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt

State of Oregon
STAR Award for Citizen Involvement
Awarded for Excellence in Land Use Public Involvement
NOMINATION FORM

Date June 25, 2009
Name of nominator Barton Brierley, AICP
Address (nominator) P.O. Box 970
City Newberg State OR Zip 97132
Phone number 503-537-1212 E-mail barton.brierley@ci.newberg.or.us

Name of individual or organization being nominated City of Newberg
Address (nominated party) P.O. Box 970
City Newberg State OR Zip 97132
Phone number 503-537-1212 E-mail nplan@ci.newberg.or.us
Website (if applicable) www.ci.newberg.or.us

Name of project being nominated: Newberg's Future

NOTE: Responses should not exceed five pages.

Please describe the work of the nominee(s) and challenges and opportunities they encountered regarding public outreach while engaged on this project or program:

Starting in 2004, Newberg realized that its comprehensive plan, developed in the 1980's, no longer was the appropriate tool to decide the future of the community. The UGB was filling up. The community no longer had a forward looking policy for growth and development. Key questions needed answered, including:

- How should Newberg provide for its future land needs, including needs for housing, commercial and industrial development, institutional development, and recreation?
- Should Newberg expand the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve areas? If so, where?
- Should we change growth patterns inside the UGB? If so, how?

The answers to such questions would affect the community for the next 30 years, and would touch the lives of everyone living or working in the community now and into the future. We knew we would need an extensive process that didn't just tap "the regulars," but would really get the average, stay-at-home citizens to open up and tell us what they wanted Newberg to be.

Describe the public engagement methods that were used in this effort, how they evolved, how they were implemented and how results were used.

With such a large issue, Newberg could not use just one method to reach all its citizens. Newberg chose to use a variety of methods, including the following:

- 2 Community Nights
- 21 editions of News of Newberg's Future Newsletter
- 20 meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on Newberg's Future
- About 20 Neighborhood meetings in each area proposed for a change
- Speakers at civic clubs and events
- Booths at community events
- Public Questionnaires
- Website updates
- 15 Public Hearings
- Regular articles in the *Newberg Graphic*

The following highlights the first three activities.

Community Night. A unique and effective citizen involvement tool Newberg used was Community Night. Newberg held two Community Night events during the process: October 18, 2005 and October 17, 2006.

Community Night is a unique and effective alternative to the traditional open house or public workshop process. The problem with traditional open houses is attendance: we've all been to too

many of these sessions where the paid consultants outnumber the public. Newberg definitely wanted to avoid this trap and find some way to get average citizens out of their houses and into the conversation.

Community Night was invented as a way to “cross-pollinate” citizen interest in community matters. Newberg asked all the public agencies in the Newberg area to hold whatever public workshops they were planning on having that year *on the same night and at the same place!* The idea was that someone who might come out to hear a presentation on the Newberg-Dundee bypass would, while they are there, attend a workshop about an affordable housing plan. Another citizen might be interested in a presentation on Newberg School District’s new “small schools”, and while there drop by a booth to get information on Newberg’s Urban Growth Boundary expansion. Instead of having a small forum with just planners, the Newberg Planning Division was able to recruit all of the following agencies to participate:

- Newberg School District
- City of Dundee
- Chehalem Parks and Recreation District
- Chehalem Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Yamhill County Commissioners
- Yamhill County Sheriff
- Yamhill Basin Council
- Newberg Public Works Department
- Newberg Fire Department
- Newberg Police Department
- Newberg Public Library

Each of the agencies had a booth at community night. Each of the community night events was held at the newly remodeled Newberg High School. This allowed the public to visit their new community facility.

Another basic goal of Community Night was to be efficient with limited resources. Instead of having every agency send a mailer to each resident, we were able to develop one combined flyer. Each agency that had regular newsletters or other correspondence was able to advertise the event using the flyer, allowing land use planning issues to be advertised to every parent of a school child, every utility bill customer, every Chamber of Commerce member, and every citizen on any agency’s e-mail list at a very limited cost! We shared meeting space, set up and clean up efforts, refreshments, and audio-visual resources. We even were able to provide child care. The net cost, including time costs, for each agency was far less than having scattered workshops individually.

Also, community night made very effective use of another extremely valuable resource: the citizens’ time. We created a “one-stop shop” for the citizens so they could get information on many different things happening in the community, give feedback, then have other evenings free for other activities.

The public was invited to visit each booth and talk with staff and elected officials. In addition, two workshops were held each half-hour from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. The public could choose which workshop to attend, or simply visit the booths. In 2006 we added a candidates' forum, which added interest and attendance to the event, and allowed prospective candidates for office to see what was happening in the area.

The Newberg Planning Division was the primary organizer of the event. We were able to hold several workshops and have several displays on topics such as:

- Plans for urban growth boundary and urban reserve area expansion
- Ways to promote affordable housing
- The Sportsman Airpark land use plan, including residential and industrial development that takes advantage of the airpark.
- A bicycle and pedestrian trail plan.
- Neighborhood meetings for rezoning two areas in the UGB to accommodate compact growth

You can count the success by the numbers. Each year we **had 200 to 300 people attend**, a far cry from the small room where staff and consultants outnumber the public!

News of Newberg's Future. Throughout the process, we sent a newsletter at important milestone. We sent 21 editions of *News of Newberg's Future*. Each time any person showed up at a meeting or commented on a survey form, we added their name to our mailing list. We sent the newsletter out both by mail and electronically. This now goes to about 300 interested citizens.

Ad Hoc Committee on Newberg's Future. Getting input from a wide variety of citizens is critical. Equally critical is distilling the various input into one coherent vision for the future. This was the task of the Ad Hoc Committee on Newberg's Future. This was a citizen committee, appointed by the Newberg City Council, and specifically charged with answering those tough questions of whether Newberg should grow, by how much, where, and how. The committee was comprised of eleven citizens, including rural property owners, business persons, educators, developers, and regular citizens. The committee held 20 meetings over a year and a half. It developed a questionnaire, which was sent in the utility bill to all of Newberg. The committee held two well advertised and attended open houses, where 100 to 200 people attended. At the end of the process, the committee produced a report to the City Council that included:

- An overall vision statement for what Newberg should be in the future.
- Recommended population growth for the next 35 years.
- Recommended areas for expanding the UGB and urban reserve.
- Areas to consider rezoning within the UGB for other uses.
- Recommendations to change development standards and implement a 27% increase in density to promote compact urban form.
- Recommendations to promote affordable housing in Newberg.

- Recommended methods to promote economic development and business growth.

The Committee presented its report to the Newberg City Council. It was unanimously accepted, which was a significant testament to the Committee's diligent work in listening to the community and distilling their feedback into a coherent recommendation.

Describe how public input and engagement in this effort has affected the land use process.

Since the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, Newberg has diligently pursued implementing the committee's recommendations. Newberg has completed several zone changes, a 200-acre UGB amendment, a 1,665 acre Urban Reserve area amendment, an affordable housing action plan, and code amendments to implement the recommended development patterns, all following these citizen recommendations. As strong evidence of the effectiveness of the public outreach, Newberg completed a hearing on a 200-acre UGB amendment *with not one citizen testifying in opposition!* We are doing what the community has asked us to do; we know what they want because we engaged them in the process!

Describe how the public engagement activities in this project support the spirit and legal requirements of Goal 1. (Goal 1, Citizen Involvement: "To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.")

The Newberg's Future process went far beyond the minimums required to meet legal requirements. Many citizens attended over 30 events! Some just attended one. I remember talking to one couple who showed up one of the Ad Hoc Committee's event. They had heard about the event from several sources, and wanted to find out what was going on. They shared how they had moved to Oregon a few years ago, and were struck by how beautiful the area was, and how well we had done in making livable cities and keeping beautiful, productive rural areas. They did not miss the sprawl and sameness of their old state at all. Even though this couple attended only one event and had no special interest, their thoughts and contributions were important factors in shaping land use plans that will guide Newberg for years to come. This is what Goal 1 is all about.

Please provide the names and contact information for two references who participated in the citizen engagement process.

Cathy Stuhr
503-702-4974
31100 NE Fernwood Rd
Newberg, OR 97132
mcstuhr@verizon.net

John Bridges
503-538-3138
515 E. First Street
Newberg, OR 97132
john@newberglaw.com

State of Oregon
STAR Award for Citizen Involvement
Awarded for Excellence in Land Use Public Involvement
NOMINATION FORM

Date__June 30, 2009__

Name of nominator__Vision into Action Coalition Staff (Cassie Cohen)

Address (nominator)__1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 7100__

City__Portland__ State__OR__ Zip__97201__

Phone number__503.816.4342__ Email__viacoalition@gmail.com

Name of organization being nominated__Tryon Life Community Farm (TLCF)__

Address (nominated party)__11640 SW Boones Ferry Rd, Portland, OR 97219__

Phone number__503-245-3847__ Email__farm@tryonfarm.org

Website__Recode: http://www.recode.ws/index.php?title=Main_Page

TLCF: <http://tryonfarm.org/>

Name of project being nominated: __Recode: Graywater__

NOTE: Responses should not exceed five pages

1. Please describe the work of the nominee(s) and challenges and opportunities they encountered regarding public outreach while engaged in this project or program:

Tryon Life Community Farm, a sustainability education and demonstration center in S.W. Portland, launched ReCode in December 2007 to identify and remove

regulatory barriers to sustainability, through grassroots organizing, education, and legislation.

Recode is a community-based group examining how city and state regulations can support rather than inhibit creative, sustainable living, while simultaneously educating and engaging grassroots communities in changing these regulations.

Over the past year, Recode built partnerships with Cascadia Green Building Council, the State Plumbing Board, Willamette Riverkeeper and many others organizations who collectively worked to legalize the exterior reuse of graywater. As a result of this organizing, HB 2080 recently passed the House and Senate and will be signed into law on June 12, 2009 by Governor Kulongoski. HB 2080 will remove barriers to graywater reuse for Oregonians and instructs the Department of Environmental Quality to make new regulations for the use of graywater.

While challenges emerged during the volunteer-based graywater legalization campaign, there were countless opportunities that resulted in particular from the organizational partnerships, the civic participation, and the successful campaign. All of the community member participants were balancing their work and family lives while contributing their time to the grassroots work. Recode had to find ways to continually remind people of their important roles and relevance to each new phase of the campaign. Similarly, working with policy makers often presented challenges, with high work loads and given the budget cuts, many people who have worked to increase understanding of sustainability issues within government are losing their jobs.

Opportunities that resulted from this campaign came from the collaborative, cross-sector partnerships. The graywater campaign highlighted the shared values of community members and policy makers, and proved that common goals can be developed and acted on between often perceived disparate groups.

Another opportunity developed through the strengthened ties among community members that surfaced during the democratic process of grassroots organizing and the influencing of state-wide policies. Through this effort, individuals were empowered to lead a campaign that built broad community awareness about the benefits of creating graywater policies and to ultimately help influence the passing of legislation.

2. Describe the public engagement methods that were used in this effort, how they evolved, how they were implemented and how results were used.

Through a consensus-based decision-making model, Recode members determined that removing legal barriers to graywater reuse was a priority for the group. As the priority surfaced, Recode supported volunteers in forming a Recode action group whose primary purpose was to begin research and to develop a campaign to remove the identified codes or legal barrier for graywater reuse.

The Recode Water Action Group chose to begin their graywater legalization campaign by convening a graywater forum. A diverse group of interested parties were invited to share their values about graywater, discuss the current legal situation and begin to develop the legal changes that they would advocate for.

When the details of the envisioned legal changes were completed Recode conducted outreach to the legislature. Oregon Senator Jackie Dingfelder and Representative Ben Cannon, members of the Committee for Energy and the Environment, and took on the leadership in the Committee of developing a bill to legalize graywater.

Throughout the process of developing the bill, to the presenting of the bill in front of the Oregon House of Representatives, and finally at the vote on HB 2080 in the Oregon House and Senate, Recode organized the community and partners to support each step of the process. This occurred through regular email and blog updates, educating the public about the legislative process. Recode offered several opportunities for members and the broader public to make their voice heard, by directly contacting their political representatives and offering chances to provide testimony.

The Recode community organizer participated in a work group to help craft the final details of HB 2080. At the same time, statewide outreach and awareness to individuals, businesses, and other groups was implemented to gather a list of supporters for HB 2080. This list was presented to the legislature in support of HB 2080.

3. Describe how public input and engagement in this effort has affected the land use process.

Public input is what legalized graywater reuse in Oregon. Recode focused on building momentum from a group of organized citizens and organizations to create the changes that they wanted to see. The creativity and collaboration of community members is what propelled the policy-level change that these times demand. The passage of HB 2080 will have a huge impact on a myriad of environmental issues that effect Oregon. Oregon will now be a leader to the rest of the country regarding progressive, forward thinking resource management.

4. Describe how the public engagement activities in this project support the spirit and legal requirements of Goal 1. (Goal 1, Citizen Involvement: *“To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.”*)

Recode is a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for the community to be involved in all phases of the planning process. The Recode project is designed specifically to empower people from all walks of life to become policy makers. The members of Recode are the ones who set the agenda of the group and create dialogue on a local and state level. Recode acts as a conduit for the public to create a powerful, collective voice for sustainable development and living. The process of developing HB 2080 and its success has inspired individuals to continue being active in policy making.

5. Please provide the names and contact information for two references who participated in the citizen engagement process.

Jon Gray

Interface Engineering; State Plumbing Board
(503) 382-2626
jonathang@interfaceeng.com

David Osborn

Oregon Food Bank
(503) 516-8932
osborn.david.a@gmail.com

State of Oregon
STAR Award for Citizen Involvement
Awarded for Excellence in Land Use Public Involvement
NOMINATION FORM

Date: 1 July 2009

Name and Address of nominator:

Bruce Bartlett
PO Box 91582
Portland, OR 97291
503-645-4683
bruce@actisdesign.com

Name and Address of individuals being nominated:

Virginia Bruce
PO Box 91061
Portland, OR 97291
503-629-5799
vrb@teamweb.com

Bruce Bartlett
PO Box 91582
Portland, OR 97291
503-645-4683
bruce@actisdesign.com

Website:

cedarmill.org/news/archive/UrbanNeeds.html

Name of project being nominated:

Urban Needs, Rural Government article series

NOTE: Responses should not exceed five pages.

1. Please describe the work of the nominee(s) and challenges and opportunities they encountered regarding public outreach while engaged on this project or program.

Washington County has implemented the Citizen Participation Organizations (CPO) in order to satisfy Oregon Land Use Goal 1 (extension.oregonstate.edu/washington/cpo). Bruce Bartlett is the chair of CPO #1 (www.cpolfriends.org) in the Cedar Hills/Cedar Mill area of Beaverton. Virginia Bruce is the vice-chair and is also the publisher and editor of the Cedar Mill News, (cedarmill.org/news) a monthly 12-page newsletter devoted to news of the Cedar Mill area of Washington County. In these capacities, they are in constant contact with citizens dealing with land use issues such as development activities, road expansion projects, pedestrian issues (connectivity, sidewalks, trails & paths, biking, etc.), noise and light pollution, and most significantly, civic education. The largest challenge citizen leaders face in promoting meaningful citizen involvement is the residents' lack of familiarity with the processes of government and accurate details on civic issues.

In order to have meaningful civic involvement, it is necessary for people to understand the system of government they are dealing with. This requires them to know the background, policies and processes of government so they can use techniques that are likely to yield results. Bruce & Virginia have spent many hours explaining the system which often entails overcoming citizens' biases and misconceptions. They have seen citizens fight aspects of development, typically road expansions, on the basis of self-interest but over the long term, these small victories often wind up confounding the larger needs of the community. A myriad of examples of misplaced citizen activism are available.

The challenge for citizen leaders is to understand what the real goal of someone's activism is and to help them make a contribution to the Common Good. This requires that there be a common understanding of the issue, discussed in a common language. Taken individually, most people will arrive at a common understanding with compassionate, deliberate and patient discussion. However, it is impossible to have a wide impact on civic education one person at a time.

2. Describe the public engagement methods that were used in this effort, how they evolved, how they were implemented and how results were used.

To educate the public on the history and present state of Washington County's Urban Unincorporated Areas (UUAs), Bruce and Virginia wrote a series of articles on Washington County land use history, policy and service provision. The first of six articles was published in the Cedar Mill News in October 2007 and the last article was published in April 2008. Their titles:

[Part one: How did we get here?](#)

[Part two: Annexation in Washington County](#)

[Part three: Washington County's Special Service Districts](#)

[Part four: Our Urban Service Providers](#)

[Part five: What do cities have that we don't \(1 of 2\)?](#)

[Part six: What do cities have that we don't \(2 of 2\)?](#)

This series of articles has been widely read and is promoted by Washington County's staff educators as a way for citizens to understand their local government. More articles are planned in the near future as the Washington County Urbanization Forum became the focus for the last year.

3. Describe how public input and engagement in this effort has affected the land use process.

The articles have proven to be remarkably non-controversial in that they contain mainly facts and not opinions. This allows citizens of all political persuasions to gain a common understanding without hitting hot buttons. Rather than have to spend the time explaining the basic information to people, citizens can be directed to read the articles and volunteer citizen leaders can make better use of their time. There has been no formal before/after analysis of the impact but the series is often referred to as a point of reference.

4. Describe how the public engagement activities in this project support the spirit and legal requirements of Goal 1. (Goal 1, Citizen Involvement: "To develop a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.")

The entire notion of citizen involvement is directly predicated on the assumption that people will make valuable contributions when they get involved. However, without sufficient knowledge, this is virtually impossible. The Urban Needs/Rural Government series gives anyone who cares to learn a way to understand the system thus helping ensure the quality of their contributions.

5. Please provide the names and contact information for two references who participated in the citizen engagement process.

Henry Oberhelman
CPO 8 Chair and Wash Co Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) Steering
Committee
503-648-7309
hoberhelman@gmail.com

Note: The Washington County CCI voted to endorse this nomination at their June 16, 2009 meeting.

Anne Madden
Washington County Senior Educator
503-846-4963
Anne_Madden@co.washington.or.us

Marc San Soucie
Beaverton City Council, Washington County Planning Commission
503-645-5229
msansoucie@ci.beaverton.or.us
503-645-5229