

## **Vision Commission Meeting December 17, 2009**

Present: Dan Goldstein, Dee Dokken, Jan Weaver, Phil Peters, Pat Smith, Tracy Greever-Rice  
Excused: Lee Henson

### **Approve Agenda (amended to add discussion of council mini retreat)**

Phil moved and Dee seconded approval of the amended agenda - in favor - all

### **Approve minutes from 11/19 meeting**

Phil moved and Dee seconded approval of the minutes - in favor - all

### **Date to present report to council**

We will request time to present at the Tuesday January 19 Council meeting. Furthermore, Dan will send a note to the council asking for an extension on the December 31 deadline so that we can improve our report.

### **Feedback from Columbia Public Schools event on December 3, 2009**

There were a couple of conversations, but not much concrete feedback. It was a very structured event seeking feedback from people, so not much time for people to view our posters. However, Jan reviewed the school's strategic planning documents and many of their goals are in line with the goals of the Education Vision Statements. Phil will email Jan whatever he got from participants

### **Feedback from community board and visions and commissions on "Vision Measurable Indicators"**

Jan read through the 5 comments she has received so far. Two had been covered in the last meeting. The three new ones (Nick Peckham, David (Tom) Vernon, Dave Overfelt and Sarah Read) are included at the end of the minutes.

### **CVC report to council**

Jan distributed a draft of the report to council for review. She will incorporate comments into the report for review and approval at the next meeting.

Jan handed out two spreadsheets. One was a list (by Vision and Goal) of the specific steps (179) recommended in the strategies and jumpstarts (from the Final Vision Report January 2008) and the medium term steps we compiled in our Logic Models. This list is effectively Performance Measures, things like setting up groups or commissions, passing ordinances or resolutions, developing and implementing a plan, writing a grant, etc. The second spreadsheet was a list (149) of the Outcome Measures, the changes we expect or hope to see as a result of fully implementing the vision. These are things like more business start ups, higher graduation rates, cleaner air, etc.

Phil and Dan suggested adding one column to the Performance Measures spreadsheet that would indicate if the measure was done, not done or its status was unknown. Jan will do that.

Tracy recommended adding two columns to the Outcome Measures spreadsheet, one for describing the measure we plan on using in more detail, and the second column for where we might get the data. Jan will do that.

Each member of the commission volunteered to review the Visions they volunteered for at the November 19 meeting (see list below). Before the January 7 meeting, they will

1. Make sure that any performance measures that are on the outcome measures list get moved to the performance measures list.
2. Identify measures that are the same or similar (which might require looking at other Vision areas) and be prepared to recommend moving or consolidation of measures.
3. Identify measures that involve conflicting priorities (which might require looking at other Vision areas). Tracy added that this is a particular concern we need to address- especially since there are already requests (from more organized interests) going before council that may preclude other Vision goals
4. Suggest, if they are able, specific data and sources for each outcome measure in their Visions

5. To the extent possible, find out the status of the performance measures in their Visions

In addition, Tracy will provide definitions of measures and will explore ways to present data we can use as examples in our reports

Dee Dokken - Environment, Parks, Recreation, Trails and Greenways

Tracy Greever-Rice - Arts and Culture, Downtown

Dan Goldstein - Governance and Decision Making, Transportation

Phil Peters - Development, Education

Pat Smith - Community Pride and Human Relations, Health, Social Services and Affordable Housing

Jan Weaver - Community Character, Community Facilities and Services, Economic Development

### **Discussion of Council mini-retreat**

Dan Goldstein attended the Council mini-retreat on December 12 (8 hours! Thanks Dan). At the retreat City Manager Bill Watkins proposed the consideration of "shovel-ready" sites, because the idea had come out of the Vision process. However, there is no mention of shovel-ready sites in the Final Vision Report January 2008. Instead it appears to have surfaced in the Draft Visioning Implementation Report prepared by The Communications Center, January 2009, in collaboration with the City Manager's office and City staff.

We discussed the problem of the recommendations of the Draft Visioning Implementation Report, prepared without formal public oversight, being confused with the recommendations of the Final Vision Report, the result of a lengthy public process. Dan pointed out that it is very important for us to protect the Vision "Brand" and not allow conflation of other interests with those expressed by the public through the Visioning meetings or through the Commission.

Phil drafted a letter which he read for the commission, outlining the concerns

Pat moved and Dee seconded sending the letter to the City Manager and City Council before their January meeting. The letter is included at the end of the minutes

in favor - all

### **Comments by Commissioners**

Dan passed out copies of the state Sunshine Law and referred us specifically to Chapter 610: (6) Public Record. He met with a member of the Attorney General's staff and asked him about the legality of discussing commission issues on an open site like google group. According to the staff member, such discussion would meet the standard of the Sunshine Law. Dan will see if he can get this in writing.

Jan moved and Dee seconded setting up a google group that only the commissioners could post to for discussing and exchanging drafts of commission reports but that any member of the public could view.

in favor - all

Next meeting January 7

Jan moved and Dee seconded adjourning the meeting - in favor - all

Comments on Draft Measurable Indicators

### **Nick Peckham November 24, 2009**

After printing out and reading the document, I am uncertain what you are asking me to do. Statements, goals, strategies, indicators...simply not clear. For example, it says the grayed areas are done, or are part of the original vision - but some 'grayed' jumpstarts are not done as far as I can tell. Also, this approach to implementation is not an integrated approach. So, as chair of a Vision sub-group, and chair of The Downtown Leadership Council, I request further guidance.

The motto of the Vision ought be, "Don't tell me about your dreams, tell me about your accomplishments."

### **David Vernon December 1, 2009**

I assume you've seen the "Draft Visioning Implementation Report" by The Communications Center (12/31/2009).

I like this report because simplifies and reduces the visioning material in a way that makes it more likely to be read by the

general Columbia population. For example, it reduces the number of visioning groups from 13 to 7. Also it places the Land Preservation subgroup in the Environment group (along with Conservation and Energy Efficiency) rather than the Development group where it makes no particular sense.

Perhaps more to your point it emphasizes the Land Preservation Authority needs to be a collaboration between the city and the county. This was a part of the original Land Preservation report and seems to have disappeared entirely.

**Sarah Read and Dave Overfelt December 9, 2009**

Jan, as requested, Sarah and I have reviewed the measurable indicators (the far right column in your logic model draft) for the Development Topic group and offer the following three comments.

First, it is unclear how many of the indicators will be measured. For example, how and who will decide that "planning decisions are timely", "the public knows what's going on", or "the aesthetic consistency of neighborhoods increases"? Although you asked us to focus only on development, this observation is true for other topic groups as well. For instance, in the Environment topic group, some of the indicators are "Air is clean" and "Energy conservation increases". In considering what types of alternatives might be available for measurable indicators we looked at Baltimore's website, which is a good resource ([www.bnia.org](http://www.bnia.org)) and you can also find a list of other places that are working on community indicators here: [www.communityindicators.net/INDICATOR.EFFORTS.html](http://www.communityindicators.net/INDICATOR.EFFORTS.html).

Second, although the indicators for development generally appear consistent with the strategies and action steps, some of the reasoning behind the indicators doesn't appear to reflect existing efforts and the concurrent need for adjustment in strategies to keep pace. This was recommended in the original vision report (page S-2). Such existing efforts, for example, would include the comprehensive planning process that is already underway, the recent stakeholders' meeting for the East Columbia Area Plan, and the planned annual forums on the pattern, pace and metrics of growth.

Third, the document is rather difficult to understand. On the front of the logic model, you asked for comments on where two or more goals, strategies, or measurable indicators were the same in order to help consolidate statements. We agree that any effort to eliminate significant overlaps and simplify reporting would be useful to the public. As you know, the original vision committee recommended that goal groups be developed (page S-3) and the need for simplification was an ongoing comment we got from the public during the process for preparing the Draft Implementation Report. The grouping proposed in the final draft report received some positive comments from the community (See Appendix D). That grouping reflects our observations on where such overlaps occur and is set forth in Section 2 of the implementation report, which we have attached.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. As we have previously discussed, either or both of us would be happy to sit down and discuss this further with you or others.