

**NEXT MEETING:**  
**WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006**  
**4:00 – 6:00 P.M.**  
**MILWAUKIE CENTER**

STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE  
For  
N. Clackamas Park

June 28, 2006, 4 – 6 p.m.  
Milwaukie Center

**Meeting Summary**

**Present:**

**Representatives:** John Denny, Lisa Gibson, JoAnn Herrigel, Eleanor Johnson, Jim Schuld, Eric Shawn, Fr. Matthew Tate

**Alternates:**

Steve Berliner, Tony Clark, Rick Frank, Susan Shawn

**Absent:** Sally Shook (rep), Joan Staley (alt)

**Guests/Observers:** none

**Staff:**

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

Introductions, Agenda Review

**FEEDBACK ON MEETING SUMMARY**

Mary Forst asked the committee for feedback about the meeting notes prepared by Michelle Healy. General agreement from the committee that they were acceptable. Michelle will ensure that notes, at a minimum, include the ideas presented by members (acknowledging who contributed) and a record of any votes taken or recommended decisions.

**CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR ELECTIONS**

Group provided input on the role and skills of the chair and vice-chair of the committee. Committee members suggested the following attributes:

- Understands and is skilled at building collaboration.
- Committed to building a coalition.
- Fill Mary's role as a facilitator.
- Focused, firm and fair
- Assures that everyone has opportunity to speak
- Present at meetings
- Good communicator
- Attentive to issues of all stakeholder positions, as well as if there are issues from outside the committee that are not being heard.
- Be aware, inclusive, and encouraging
- Welcoming of issues and input.
- Well organized
- Follows through on commitments

Committee agreed that the above list was good and moved on to determining the tasks of each position. The following tasks were suggested:

Chair:

- Facilitate meetings (i.e., be in control, move things along and make sure everyone has a chance to speak.)
- Communicate
- Set Agenda (work with vice chair and/or staff to help prepare). Members of the Committee can suggest ideas for the agenda and give to the chair.

Vice-Chair:

- Fill in when chair is absent
- Chair can delegate some duties to vice chair
- Collaborate with chair on Agenda

Committee agreed on the above-listed tasks.

Committee discussed if the chair or vice chair position could be held by an alternate. At the previous meeting, the group decided that the alternative position would be non-voting, unless the alternate was filling in for a representative. The following comments were raised:

- Eleanor Johnson felt that the alternates should not be the chair or vice chair since they are not required to attend all meetings.
- Susan Shawn commented that if the person was nominated and elected it shouldn't matter.
- JoAnn Herrigel asked "What is the difference between the representative and the alternate?"
- Steve Berliner mentioned concern that there might be an issue of two people from one interest running the committee.
- Eric Shawn voiced concern that if alternates could vote (as chair or vice chair) it might unfairly weigh the outcome towards a certain group.

- Mary Forst clarified that the committee already decided that alternates cannot vote unless the representative was absent. If the chair was an alternate and their representative was at the meeting the chair would be a non-voting position.
- Rick Frank commented that if an alternate has all the traits the committee wants they should be able to serve as the chair or vice-chair. As a compromise, he suggested the group consider limiting the chair position to representatives only and the vice chair to either.
- Steve Berliner asked the group how they felt if both positions were held by people from the same interest.
- Susan Shawn said that she didn't think it was a good idea; it would leave the group out of balance.

General consensus among the committee that one stakeholder group could not hold both positions.

Mary Forst suggested the group take a straw poll using the 5 finger method (5 being totally against) to see where everyone stood on the issues related to alternates as chair or vice chair. Only representatives participated in the straw pole, except Steve Berliner who was filling in for Sally Shook.

Straw poll on the following:

1. Chair & Vice Chair open to representatives only.
2. Vice Chair open to either representatives or alternates (but not from the same stakeholder group as the Chair).

General consensus that positions should be representatives only; however, Jim Schuld voiced the opinion that alternates should be able to be vice-chair. John Denny also commented that if you are coming to the meetings you should be able to be either. The group further discussed the options.

- Concern was raised that you could have the alternate and representative from one stakeholder group competing against one another. Steve Berliner suggested offering the position to representatives only and if the representative declines it could be offered to alternates.
- John Denny suggested the committee see who's interested in the positions, as it might help with the discussion.
- Mary Forst asked interested members to raise their hands. Eric Shawn, JoAnn Herrigel, Susan Shawn, Rick Frank and Eleanor indicated interest.
- Rick Frank just wanted to be clear that alternates do not get special voting if they serve in a position. It is still only one vote per stakeholder group.
- JoAnn Herrigel commented that there really doesn't seem to be a hierarchy of alternates vs. representatives, so it probably doesn't really matter...whoever is at the table is voting.

Committee **agreed** on the following:

1. The Chair is open to representatives only. John Denny indicated reservations about this decision, but was not against.
2. Vice Chair could be representative or alternative. Steve Berliner had reservations, but was not against.

Mary Forst asked the committee for nominations. Nominations:

Eleanor Johnson nominated JoAnn Herrigel – accepted  
Steve Berliner nominated Eric Shawn – accepted  
John Denny nominated Eleanor Johnson – declined

Committee agreed that the person with the highest number of votes would be chair and the second highest would be vice chair. Mary Forst asked each committee member to write their vote on a piece of paper and submit to her. Ballots would be confidential.

Election results:

**Chair – Eric Shawn**  
**Vice Chair – JoAnn Herrigel**

### **ISSUES AND PRIORITIES**

The committee reviewed the issues generated by the committee during the first meeting of the committee. Additionally, Dan Zinzer brought up the issue of how to deal with volunteer projects on the north side of the park prior to completion of a concept plan. Volunteer project issue was added to the “policy issues” list.

The committee then moved onto selecting priority issues. Mary Forst asked each stakeholder group to rate the issues using colored dot stickers (1 sticker per stakeholder group).

Stickers and significance:

- Red – top issue, need to address immediately
- Green – important, but not immediate
- Blue – long term

The results of the rating are as follows:

<b>Issue</b>	<b># of Red</b>	<b># of Green</b>	<b># of Blue</b>
Become a voice the DAB will here and respond		1	
Provide “omsbud” service	1	3	
Provide safe place for citizens to bring questions			2
Updates for construction	1	1	
Dog off leash	1.5	1	1
Protect creek buffers	1	1	

Enhance buffers		1	
Horse trailer parking		1	
Alternative horse plan		2	
North side planning and design	1.5	3	4

The committee discussed the outcome of the rating. Consistent interest in creek buffers, dog/animal issues and north side planning. Comments include:

- How do people know about the committee? Susan Shawn asked if it might be possible to put something in the Milwaukie Center Newsletter. Eleanor Johnson said yes, possibly in September.
- Father Tate suggested establishing a process that committee members could distribute to their constituents.
- Concern that the committee shouldn't be dealing with gripes about day to day stuff, but rather concrete issues.
- Dan Zinzer commented that it was essential that the committee agree on issues. They could then be taken to the DAB/City of Milwaukie via Dan, Michelle or JoAnn.
- Eric Shawn suggested that it is important for the committee to first deal with an issue with a high likelihood of success. Look at the number of dots next to the issues, not really the color.
- JoAnn Herrigel mentioned that issues related to dogs, buffers and wetlands could all come under the north side planning.
- Steve Berliner wanted a distinction between buffer protections versus enhancement.
- Susan Shawn voiced concerns over the public process for the north side planning. She wants assurance that people have an opportunity to be involved in the development of the plan.
- Michelle Healy gave a description of a possible process that would encourage public input from the beginning.
- Dan Zinzer stated that the committee will determine the process.

Further discussion of priorities will occur at the next meeting due to time constraints.

### **COMMUNICATION OF PARK ISSUES**

Committee discussed the process by which the public should communicate issues about the park. Specifically, who to bring issues about the park to? What is the process and what to do if there is an unsatisfactory response. JoAnn Herrigel refreshed the committee on the background of the issue. The City owns the park and the District maintains. The City and District have a good relationship and the City can't dictate to the District how it specifically operates. Committee comments are as follows:

- It is not transparent to the public who to talk to.
- Maybe the stewardship committee could help sort through issues.

- How does the committee communicate with the District?
- Michelle or Dan could be the conduit between the committee and the District.
- There needs to be someone that is accountable for assuring an issue is addressed.

### COMMITTEE ISSUES/COMMENTS

- Eleanor Johnson suggested a smaller agenda at future meetings, so that the committee can get to everything.
- Mary Forst will be at the next meeting to help facilitate.
- JoAnn Herrigel suggested that the committee have a “parking lot” for issues that come up. The list will include who, when and how the issue is being followed up on.
- Jim Schuld distributed a proposal for off leash dog hours at North Clackamas Park. Committee will discuss at next meeting.
- Tony Clark suggested that committee members e-mail issues to the group prior to the meeting, so that there is time to review.
- Tony Clark also brought up issue about having a place to post notices in the park. Currently, notices are torn down. This will be discussed at the next meeting.
- Father Tate voiced concern about construction fencing on his property. He mentioned that it is confusing who to talk to. He gave information to Michelle. Michelle gave to Dan to follow up since she will be on vacation.
- If there are immediate issues at the park, please give to Dan and/or Michelle.
- Committee requested periodic construction updates via e-mail. Michelle/Dan to follow up and see how this might work.

#### Agenda for next meeting includes:

1. Continue discussion on the priority of issues.
2. Discuss success indicators.
3. Discuss issues brought by District and committee members (i.e., dog proposal, bulletin board, creek buffers, reserved areas, and invasive species removal project).

#### Next Steps:

Send possible agenda items to Eric Shawn.

The next meeting will be **Wednesday, July 26, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.** at the Milwaukie Center.