

Minutes of Columbia Vision Commission June 28, 2010

Called to order 5:31 pm.

Present - Khesha Duncan, Dee Dokken, Dan Goldstein, Lee Henson, Phil Peters, Eric Peterson, Pat Smith, Jan Weaver (chair)

Guests: Erica Samson (KOMU), Paula Hertwig-Hopkins (Asst. city manager), Sam Shelby(city staff)

Absent Excused - Traci Greever-Rice

Henson moved to accept proposed agenda and Goldstein seconded. Agenda approved by unanimous voice vote.

Approval of minutes - tabled until language about gifted students can be drafted and included. Peters moved and Goldstein seconded.

Vision Impact Note Presentation - Sam Shelby and Paula Hertwig Hopins demonstrated on-line, and password protected software for tracking vision goals and strategies and the 2008 consultant implementation recommendations. The vision impact note is now a standard part of the format for the city council agendas. This format has been presented to council and they liked it.

Hertwig-Hopkins - described training for departments about adding vision note to agenda items - anything that supports, is related to, impacts, don't make anything up, be thoughtful. Tried to make it automated and easy for staff.

Dokken - is the positive or negative nature of agenda item described? Hertwig-Hopkins : No

Henson - how long have they been doing this? Hertwig-Hopkins: Tracking of every agenda item was started in April.

suggestions -

align the implementation steps with the specific vision topic, goal and/or strategy that it is supposed to address include the \$ amount (general fund vs. CIP, %of annual budget if possible)

develop ways to sort by topic, goal and/or strategy in addition to sorting by agenda item

put items on GIS layer if there is a geographic impact

on the vision list, add link to agenda items

make as user friendly for the public as possible

Budget Items/Recommendations (from the January 2010 Commission Report)

Weaver referred Hertwig-Hopkins to the measures recommended in the January 2010 report -

1. Require city staff to complete the transition to using the 13 Citizen Topic Groups instead of the goal groupings of the Draft Implementation Report in all Vision reporting

2. Require city staff to include dollar estimates of the cost of any Vision step the Council is considering so that Council members can make informed decisions about tradeoffs and equitable allocation of city resources.

3. Establish neighborhood districts as recommended in the Metro 2020 plan so that it is easier to track allocation of resources based on geography within the city.

4. Include items in the next Bi-annual Citizen Survey that address Vision outcome measures.

Summary of Council Retreat in June: Hertwig-Hopkins reviewed spreadsheets which addressed the question "How are we doing at achieving the 2010-2011 Vision tasks?" Each of 46 tasks was rated as being 1. Completed 2. Being completed 3. Scheduled retreat discussion 4. No Action. Staff needs direction. Council discussion needed.

12 tasks were rated as "No Action". All other tasks showed some progress made.

Henson: How does our commission fit in? Hertwig-Hopkins: The Vision Commission's job involves the whole community, not just city government.

2012-2013 Implementation tasks will come from the Vision Commission.

Duncan: Task #32 "Convene dialogues on coordination of justice system and public safety". Would just the city council and county commission do that? Hertwig-Hopkins: The would take the lead, unless the Commission suggested someone else do that.

Hertwig-Hopkins will send the web address of the Vision tracking site, and an email with what we have agreed on.

Work Plan - Jan Weaver - based on establishing language and commission goals for 2010

2010 work plan was approved by unanimous voice vote. Moved by Dokken and seconded by Henson. Goldstein: We should let council know we are not working on all topic groups every year. Weaver: Yes, work plan should go to city manager and council.

\* Three subcommittees, each with three commissioners.

\* Each commissioner acts as the lead on one or more topics

\* As lead, the commissioner will, with the assistance of the other people in her/his subcommittee and the chair of the commission, set up one or more meetings with topic stakeholders to get their feedback on our performance and outcome measures.

\* All meetings should be completed between July 1 and September 26.

\* Each subcommittee should review the feedback and based on the feedback, update the performance measures table from the January 2010 report and select a limited number of key outcome measures with which to track progress.

\* Subcommittees will present the updated performance measures and recommended outcome measures at the commission meetings in July, August and September - these reports will be used to compile the annual report to be distributed after the October meeting for public comment

People Subcommittee - Duncan (2011), Henson (2010), Peters (2010)

4. Community Pride and Human Relations - Duncan (2010)

8. Education - Peters (2010)

10. Governance - Henson (2010)

11. Health, Social Services and Affordable Housing - 2011

Resources and Structure Subcommittee - Goldstein (2012), Peterson (2012), Smith (2013)

2. Community Character - Smith (2010)

5. Development - Peterson (2011) (with Dokken for Land Preservation sub-topic)

7. Economic Development - Peterson (2010)

9. Environment - 2011

13. Transportation - Goldstein (2010)

Intangibles/Quality of Life Subcommittee - Dokken (2013), Greever-Rice (2011), Weaver (2013)

1. Arts and Culture - Weaver (2011)

3. Community Facilities and Services - Weaver (2011)

6. Downtown - Greever-Rice (2010)

12. Parks, Recreation, Greenways and Trails - Dokken (2013)

Goal is to complete at least 6 updates out of the 13 Topics

Weaver will distribute lists of people participating in the visioning process by topic group and will update the list of meeting places

Questions/Discussion

Duncan - asked Peters to describe the process of convening stake holders, expressed concern that not everyone will be as invested as the education folks were

Peters - described process, agreed about investment. Suggested it's good to go where people with similar concerns

naturally gather.

Weaver - agreed about investment, suggested that as commissioners dug into their topic areas, it might be easier to figure out how to get feedback for a specific group of stakeholders

Dokken - suggested visiting commission meetings, what she has done with parks commission

Goldstein - it's important to make sure we integrate other commissions' efforts into the feedback

Weaver - noted that the establishing legislation enjoins cvc to work with other commissions (not sure that addressed Goldstein's concern)

Dokken (?) - when are budget recommendations due

Weaver - there are multiple dates where we are supposed to report on various things

Peters - looks like it can all come together in the December report, recommended implementation steps and budget recommendations

Weaver - Next meeting everyone should report that they have either had a stakeholder meeting or have a date for a meeting. Hopefully we can just have reports from sub-committees at our Commission meeting, and keep the meeting open for pressing issues. The more that each sub-committee fills in the needed information, the faster the process will go. The lead person of the sub-committee should suggest the most relevant indicators.

Peters handed out copy of updated Education report incorporating information gained at last month's meeting. "We can enrich our outcome measures after hearing from stakeholders".

Discussion of Joan Nelson's survey of early childhood centers was postponed.

Meeting adjourned with unanimous voice vote at 7:30 pm. Duncan moved and Smith seconded,