

**Horizon 2020 Steering Committee
February 10, 2014
Meeting Notes**

Members Present: Comm. Thellman, Comm. Amyx, Lisa Harris, Kyra Martinez, Stan Rasmussen, Clay Britton, Scott Zaremba, Bill Ackerly, Dr. Rick Doll, John Gascon (by Skype)

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Scott McCullough, Sheila Stogsdill, Jeff Crick, Amy Miller, Dave Corliss

Others Present: Several members of the public were also in attendance.

Amyx introduced the charge of the Committee and reiterated that the committee should stay as close as possible to the charge of the resolution. He also thanked the members for their time.

Thellman echoed Amyx's comments and stated that she is pleased with the make-up and representation of the committee. She expressed that she wants the public to know that they are an important part of this process and that the committee is here to advise the City, County and Planning Commissions as to the input they receive.

Each member of the Committee introduced themselves.

McCullough directed everyone to look at the Steering Committee Charge at the top of the roster and reviewed that with the group. Charge number one is issue identification. The second charge of the committee is to prioritize those issues. The third part is the draft and final plan product. The third part will not be done by the April 2015 date. The issues action report will be the product that comes out of the steering committee and gets approved by the governing bodies in order to give strong direction to staff to draft the revised plan. He then let them know that "A Guide to Horizon 2020" was included in their packet information for their use. He thinks we are in a good position with our comprehensive plan. The plan is a living document that has been applied and amended since its original adoption. This process is to identify new trends that need to be incorporated and determine what needs to be kept, modified, or removed. Do not need to start from scratch.

Rasmussen questioned whether the term "Horizon 2020" implied a year or a focused vision.

McCullough replied that for many communities that employed that term it satisfied both.

Stogsdill stated that in the case of Horizon 2020, it was a comprehensive plan that was planned for a certain year.

McCullough gave a presentation about the history, organization and content of the current comprehensive plan, Horizon 2020.

McCullough then introduced the draft Process and Timeline. Issue identification will start in the Spring and Summer of 2014. This will be done in several ways but will ultimately help to identify what the public thinks about the issues. Input from the community will be through multiple sources including online surveys, public meetings, meetings with stakeholder groups, interactive and social media, including a project website, comment page, dedicated email address and an email distribution list and various publications.

Martinez asked if the survey will be on the city's website.

McCullough said that staff was still working out details, but it could be a mailed survey with follow up phone calls and/or on the city's website. He indicated that staff planned to present more details on the survey and the public participation plan at the next meeting.

McCullough stated that after the input part of the process, the next step is to have the Steering Committee prioritize the issues. The outcome is an Issues Action Report that will come out of the Committee and be presented to the PC/BCC/CC. That is the charge for staff to draft the plan and bring it back to the Steering Committee and ultimately have it presented to the governing bodies at the end of the two year process.

Martinez asked if steering committee members will be able to go to the public meetings.

McCullough stated that there it is recommended that steering committee members go to some of them. The idea will be that there will be no steering committee meetings those months.

Rasmussen suggested that agritourism, arts and culture groups (arts center), and bioscience be added to the stakeholder groups.

Harris suggested that the Bicycle Advisory Committee, agriculture community, environment and health community be added to the stakeholder groups as well.

Thellman asked how the public meetings would be recorded and reported.

McCullough stated that there will be meeting notes from staff, but that the public meetings would have some sort of recording method for the public to submit their opinion.

Amyx asked about the survey and the possibility of having a survey done by ETC and what the cost might be.

Corliss stated that ETC has successfully performed two citizen surveys for the city. There is \$20,000 in 2014 budget funds for the citizen survey in the fall of 2014. Surveys by ETC are scientifically based with a protocol. It is usually sent by mail and followed up by phone and results in good scientific data.

Amyx stated that stakeholder groups might not capture everyone, so a survey is a good tool to seek out other's opinions.

McCullough said that a request had been made to video record each steering committee meeting and that he wanted to talk about it with the group. There is a cost associated with

video recording meetings and it would constrain the group to always meet in the City Commission room. Video recording the meetings would make them more transparent and more accessible to everyone. Currently, the City does not video record any meetings beside City Commission meetings.

Doll said that the school district only tapes board meetings.

McCullough stated that these are open meetings and people would always be allowed to bring their own video equipment.

Britton questioned if there were concerns about quasi-judicial action or KOMA.

Corliss stated because the steering committee is not taking action like other boards it is not quasi-judicial but that the committee will be subject to KOMA. The majority of the steering committee can only talk about this subject in a public meeting. There cannot be serial or continuing communications by email for the whole group, only one way communications.

Britton and Zaremba stated that they do not see a need for videotaping.

Gascon stated that he had feedback from LAN that there is distrust and that they wanted the video record because the meeting notes won't express the true comments.

Britton asked if it was possible to just audio record the meetings.

Corliss stated that audio can be difficult because the speaker has to speak up, turn microphone on and identify themselves.

McCullough stated that again the issue is resources, and there are not resources to provide full meeting minutes and audio for each meeting.

Harris asked if the group have a chance to comment on the notes.

McCullough stated that staff will send a draft the steering committee members and put the draft on the next agenda for approval.

Britton asked if the group City, County and Planning Commission would take action on the Issues Action Report based on the recommendation of the steering committee.

McCullough said that, yes, that was true and the issue action report becomes integral to the process in order to vet out issues and move forward in agreement.

Thellman asked if the plan is to open up sector plans and re-think those recent decisions.

McCullough stated that may be a future work item or implementation step to a changing policy that comes out of the revised comprehensive plan. Recent and valid documents would take a significant policy shift to change them in a wholesale way. The steering committee may identify an issue that would lead to a change in a plan, but sector plans would not be changed during this process.

Harris asked who would be developing the survey questions.

McCullough stated that staff in conjunction with ETC would develop the survey and bring it to the Steering Committee for review.

Rasmussen asked if staff could review the process again.

McCullough stated that the steering committee is guiding the process and acting as a sounding board for staff. At next meeting staff will bring the steering committee the toolkit and maybe the survey. As we get out to the community, the steering committee should sit in on some of the public meeting and have another ear. Staff will compile comments and issues to provide to steering committee members. The steering committee will provide guidance to staff in their work, but the steering committee will not write the plan.

Amyx stated that the steering committee should be able to bring in ideas and participate.

McCullough said that is true, but the tough part is going to be getting help from the steering committee to prioritize those issues and have the steering committee members connect with their respective groups to keep them informed.

Ackerly asked if the Issues Action Report is the steering committee's deliverable.

McCullough said that staff will present the committee with various forms of input at each meeting. The issue prioritization will be a deliverable from committee.

Doll asked if the group isn't in consensus, does the group take a vote.

McCullough stated that the group needs to decide if they want to follow a format with majority consensus with a vote.

Amyx stated that might be a topic for next meeting.

Thellman thinks that technology is a good thing and that if we start out with a distrust of the situation then she thinks if there is a capability to video record the meeting, then they should be recorded.

Rasmussen said he is not opposed to video recording the meetings.

Doll thinks it sets a bit of a precedent. There are a lot of other meetings that rise to similar level of importance.

McCullough asked if the group wanted to set a static meeting time, such as the second Monday of the month, or whether staff should suggest a few times and send out another poll to the group.

Doll had to leave the meeting early.

Harris asked if we will talk about the document as a whole as tool in our process.

McCullough said, definitely and that hopefully there will be a sub set of strategic issues out of the issue identification as well.

Thellman asked if there was research about peer communities comprehensive plans or gold standard comp plans.

McCullough referred everyone to the "A Guide to Horizon 2020" document and have every one look at the last page with the topics recently addressed. He asked what else the steering committee wants to see for the next meeting besides a more detailed public involvement plan, and possibly a survey and asked the group if there were comfortable posting the process timeline and Horizon 2020 history PowerPoint to the website.

Gascon stated that he thinks that because the city has the money and the technology, then the meetings should be videotaped in order to make the process more transparent.

McCullough said that staff will look at what it takes and bring it back to the steering committee in March.

Martinez stated that she is pretty private person and is not comfortable with being videotaped. The Planning Commission meetings are not even videotaped and it sets a precedent.

Amyx stated that the public's access to us is important.

Thellman stated that this is the communities' document and the chance for the community to shape the future. If the ability is there then it should be an option. Anything we can do to help the public have confidence.

Ackerly stated he had no problem especially if it helps address the transparency issue. Horizon 2020 gets discussed a lot and it might make people see an opportunity to participate.

McCullough stated that general consensus is to videotape the next meeting in this room.

Ackerly stated the he was fine with 2nd Monday of the month.

Group gave consensus for meeting 2nd Monday of the month from 4-6 pm.

Moved by Thellman to add natural and cultural heritage, agritourism, arts and culture groups (arts center), bioscience, Bicycle Advisory Committee, agriculture community, environment and health community be added to the stakeholder groups before the next meeting. Second by Zaremba. Motion passed 8-0-1 (Gascon abstained because of Skype).

Moved by Harris and seconded by Ackerly to adjourn. Motion passed 8-0-1 (Gascon abstained because of Skype).