

**NEXT MEETING:**  
**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2006**  
**4:00 – 6:00 P.M.**  
**MILWAUKIE CENTER**

STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE  
For  
N. Clackamas Park

May 24, 2006, 4 – 6 p.m.  
Milwaukie Center

**Meeting Summary**

**Present:** Steve Berliner (alt), Tony Clark (alt), John Denny, Lisa Gibson, JoAnn Herrigel, Eleanor Johnson, Jim Schuld, Eric Shawn, Susan Shawn (alt), Sally Shook, Fr. Matthew Tate

**Absent:** Joan Staley(alt)

**Guests/Observers:** Dick Shook, Rosemary Crites

Dan Zinzer, Michelle Healy, Clackamas County  
Mary Forst, facilitator

Introductions, Agenda Review

Members continued working on Operating Protocols (see attached).

Mission, Vision, Goals Statement

The group discussed the use of the term “ombuds”, as there was concern that the term might not be widely understood. Eric Shawn provided the group with the definition and background of the word. The group discussed the fact that there really wasn’t another term that works. Group decided to keep the term.

Mary Forst explained to the group that she had shared the mission, vision and goals with her colleagues, who thought it needed a clear explanation of the “why” of the mission.

The group made the following changes to the draft Mission (see attached) (*changes are in italic*):

### ***Vision***

- Add: “To act as stewards for NCP, ***sustaining and promoting a multi-use, environmentally sound, neighbor-friendly park.***”
- Realization that the vision needs to state that the group is made up of stakeholders;
- Add: “To create a collaborative coalition ***of stakeholders, exchanging*** ideas in a positive manner and ***generating*** consensus-based solutions.”

### ***Goals***

- Discussion that the first goal needed to clarify that it is about NCP.
- Add, “to act in an ombuds function, serving as a voice for the park and citizens of the district ***about NCP.***”

### Additional Discussion

- This group provides an avenue to mediate user conflicts between the park and the District. The group would also be able to discern patterns of problems and recognize if something is not working, providing problem solving over time.

### **Structure**

- Realized that there are actually 8 members, not 7.

### **Procedures**

### ***Decision Making***

The group again discussed their methods of decision-making. Dan Zinzer reiterated that consensus-based workable solutions will be best; split decisions are not as useful, because he still has to resolve the issue. Because this is a group of stakeholders who know and represent the differing needs and points of view, it is uniquely situated to work through problems and come up with solutions that will work for everyone.

- Discussed if alternates and representatives should be at the table at the same time. Consensus that it is good to be inclusive and have all at the table. However, final decision would be made by the 8 representatives *or* their alternate (if the representative is not present).
- Group discussed the idea of voting versus consensus-based decision. As a test, the group took a straw poll using the 5-finger method (5 being totally against) to see where everyone stood on the issue.

- Eleanor Johnson and John Denny had reservations about using consensus-based decision only. They felt voting was important. John suggested that if 2/3 of the group agrees, the recommendation should be forwarded.
- Susan Shawn mentioned that voting may not give the group the opportunity to hear and learn from everyone. Preference to work together to get consensus.
- Group discussed that it was the quality of the decision, not just getting to a decision. Questioned if voting created “winners and losers”.
- Some felt that voting locked the group into a rigid process. Steve Berliner suggested that voting could be used as a back up, if consensus wasn’t achievable and a decision was needed.
- JoAnn suggested that the group strive to get agreement/consensus rather than focusing on how to get there.
- Father Tate suggested sending majority and minority opinions to policy –makers (not unlike Supreme Court decisions).
- Tony Clark mentioned that the Committee makes recommendations, not decisions.
- Group decided:
  1. If they have consensus, they will send recommendation
  2. If no consensus, they will work longer
  3. If no consensus is reached, but the group needs to provide something to policy makers, they will send a report with the differing opinions and concerns.

### **Internal Communications**

- Mary Forst will provide names, e-mails and phone numbers of committee members. This allows members to talk outside of meetings.
- Group can ask for experts to come in. If paid, would need consent of District.

### **Elections**

- Hold until next meeting. Group felt it was important to get to information from Dan Zinzer.

### **Park District**

- Eleanor Johnson mention that there needs be a sign about the large bump from Kellogg onto Rusk
- Father Tate asked if a boundary survey was done for the park; specifically, for the new fence between his church and the park. In general, if the contractor is dealing with a boundary issue, he should go over it on the ground with the property owner. Dan said he’d bring plan to the next meeting to review.
- Dan mentioned the large pothole in the parking lot. He’d show members of the group after the meeting.
- Group discussed issue of mowing along buffers. District mowed closer in than previously agreed to by group. Dan would check on this. May need to mark it off or train all of the maintenance staff.

- Member mentioned that they did not get a response when they contact Mike McLees. Dan said to contact him or Michelle Healy.
- JoAnn Herrigel suggested a future topic for the group to discuss: How do we bring issues about the park to the appropriate party? What is the method and what do we do if we get no/unsatisfactory response? Right now, both the City and District get e-mails about issues and it causes some confusion as to who is responding.

**Agenda for next meeting includes:**

1. Elect a Chair and Vice-chair at the next meeting, June 28, after discussing the tasks and responsibilities of each role, and what skills/experience would be helpful. People should consider whether they are interested in being considered.
2. Prioritize the issues brainstormed at the first meeting.
3. Discuss how to bring issues about the park to the appropriate party and what to do if there is no/unsatisfactory response.
4. Discuss issues brought by District and members.
5. Give feedback and guidance to Michelle on meeting summary.

**Next Steps:**

Send additional agenda items to Mary Forst.

The next meeting will be Wednesday, June 28, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. at the Milwaukie Center.