

Columbia Vision Commission Subcommittee 1 Meeting
City Hall, Conf room 1B
Wednesday, August 4, 2010
5:15pm-6:45pm

1 hour 30 minutes

Agenda - Gather Feedback on Governance Performance and Outcome Measures

Attendees

John Clark	Vision Governance Topic Group	jgclark@mchsi.com
Larry Schuster	Vision Governance Topic Group	larryschuster57@hotmail.com
Rex Campbell	Comprehensive Planning Task Force	
Larry Grossman	Vision Governance Topic Group	larry@addsheet.com
Nick Peckham	Vision Environment Topic Group & Downtown Leadership Council	npeckham@pwarchitects.com
Paul Land	Chamber of Commerce	landreal10@aol.com

Vision Commission
Khesha Duncan
Dan Goldstein
Lee Henson
Eric Peterson
Jan Weaver

Meeting called to order 5:17 pm

Weaver introduced herself and members of the Vision Commission and asked other attendees to introduce themselves. Weaver explained Performance Measures and Outcome Measures and requested the attendees review both sets of measures to see if the Vision Commission had captured the intent of the Governance Topic Group, and if they could help with deciding which performance measures had been or were in the process of being implemented.

Peckham: Better coordination among boards, commissioners and departments was part of the interim report of DLC, which highlighted the ones that interfaced with downtown. Agreed with the role of Oversight Committee to ensure commissions work together.

Clark: Turn the goals back into strategies (only significant change from the vision document was recasting strategies as goals). Don't conflate 10.5 and 10.6. Be sure the 10.6 - committee to make recommendations about size of council and compensation of council members is not diluted by adding responsibility of commission oversight. They (10.5 and 10.6) need to be separate.

Campbell: Comprehensive Plan Task Force (CPTF) is using the goals and objectives from the Visioning document 10.7 and aims to have a plan at their last meeting in August, along with ideas for outreach.

Clark: The CPTF is not charged with this level of review (for Financing Future Needs 10.7) which includes operations, improvements, infrastructure. The Infrastructure Financing Task Force is responsible for infrastructure.

Campbell: Scope of CPTF's responsibilities still being determined, may well include most/all of 10.7

Grossman: Asked a question about Performance Measures. Weaver stated they were derived from strategies and jumpstarts in the Vision document

Goldstein: Reminded Weaver about the need to get recommendations as well as feedback on performance and outcome measures.

Clark: Not sure it is a good idea to make specific recommendations, rather urge to the council to follow through on all 9 goals/strategies

Campbell: Needs are too big not to prioritize

Peckham: Asked what time frame for implementation was, Weaver replied 2 to 5 years. Peckham suggested recommendations be fit into a five year time frame

Campbell: There are still major issues with things like school siting that council has no control over at this point.

Grossman: 10.1 and 10.2 - need to develop a 1 stop shop for complaints, projects, permission so people don't have to go to multiple offices.

Clark: 10.1, 2, 3, 5 and 9 could be pulled together into a recommendation about efficiency and collaboration that includes internal and external (school, county) entities. 10.6 and 8 are about accountability. There was a strong consensus among governance group about expanding council and compensation. This should happen ahead of any redistricting required by census.

Grossman: Agreed, the top 2 issues were compensation and expanding the council. Essential to improve service since compensation would be tied to requiring council members to hold regular office hours and increase their availability to their constituents. Difference between council members and county commission compensation is absurd for a city this size.

Weaver: requested comments from attendees who had so far not spoken

Land: Was just observing on behalf of the Chamber

Schuster: Struck by inaction on the items recommended by governance group nearly 4 years after visioning had begun (general agreement with this observation). People were bothered by not being able to talk (without signing up in advance or at the end of the meeting, and being limited to 3 minutes), felt out of the loop, unable to connect with council members. Expanding council would help increase their accessibility, so that the small customer service issues they cared about could be addressed.

Duncan: Agreed with Shuster, frustrated with lack of progress

Grossman: That is why compensation is important - so council members would hold office hours where constituents could meet with them and so they would do more outreach and attend more meetings (like neighborhood association meetings)

Goldstein: How expansion occurs is important, adding a ward vs an at large representative

Clark: Not appropriate to bring this up at this meeting

Grossman: Governance group could not agree about this issue, agreed with Clark that this meeting not the place to discuss it

Campbell: Suggested if Visioning had been done in 2009/2010 rather than 2006/2007, there would have been different recommendations

Grossman: There may actually be savings in some of the recommendations since they aim to reduce duplication of services

Peterson: agreed with Campbell and Grossman about savings and different recommendations

Weaver: Any recommendations about outcome measures?

Clark: Using biennial survey to get at satisfaction good idea, need to be sure survey is representative of community

Other suggestions that emerged

- survey staff about their satisfaction

- points of contact for complaints, requests, projects go down

Meeting adjourned 6:45 pm

Submitted by Jan Weaver