



June 3, 2010

**To:** LCOG Executive Committee

**From:** George Kloeppel

**Subject:** Climate of Prosperity Follow-up Report & Recommendation to Board of Directors—Agenda Item 2

At the May Executive Committee meeting, follow-up reports were requested of staff for four of the “action steps” that had been discussed by the Board in April. This memo addresses these issues, and in each area identifies a primary staff contact and suggests an action for the consideration, first of the Executive Committee, and then the Board of Directors at its meeting on June 24.

Regarding the “Regional Voice” concept, it was suggested that staff work with the IGR professionals from the largest member jurisdictions to identify 2-4 high-level issues that could form the basis of a Regional Voice communication to the legislative delegation. Further, the Committee asked that the delegation be invited to attend and participate in the Board meeting on September 23.

Regarding the Lane Economic Committee mission and membership, it was requested that staff bring back potential changes to the Bylaws for discussion by the Executive Committee.

Regarding the Lane County Human Services Commission, it was requested that further input be obtained from the County and that such counsel be reported back to the Executive Committee. It should be noted that another recommendation of the human services coordination subcommittee was for representatives of the “2-1-1” project to make a presentation to the LCOG Board. That presentation has been scheduled for the June 24 meeting.

Finally, regarding LCOG’s communication activities, shortcomings and possible new efforts, a more extensive background report was requested, along with additional time for discussion.

1. **Regional Voice**—Staff contacts: Jamon Kent and George Kloeppel

By the time of the Board meeting, an illustrative listing of actual or potential legislative issues will be in hand. Clearly, the Regional Voice will not be a pertinent tool for advocacy on issues where there are different (perhaps directly competing or opposing) views held by the different types of local government in Lane County. The Regional Voice can articulate and make more forceful local positions that are widely held at the local level. As has been discussed, the most effective “amplifier” for the Regional Voice will likely be the professional IGR people working for our largest member jurisdictions. It would be of great value to them to have the ability to represent a position, not just as that of their respective employers, but of all or a substantial number of LCOG member governments. To make that happen, regional positions on some issues can be taken well in advance of the 2011 Session. But, for the Regional Voice to be most effective, a *process* needs to be in place that can quickly elicit thumbs-up or thumbs-down positions from member governments in the heat of the legislative session.

It is expected that the attention of LCOG members in the upcoming session will be focused primarily upon money—and specifically, in protecting revenue sources that local governments already have. Examples of topics that will be on the list prior to the Board meeting will be:

- Support of “pay equity” for Transfer AAAs (admittedly an LCOG issue, but one that has been supported at the Board level in the past)
- Opposition to moving to an every-other-year OLCC licensing process
- Opposition to proposed one dollar fees for LEDS record checks by public agencies
- Opposition to proposed prohibition of wireless fees charged by municipal governments for right-of-way use
- Protection of the revenue stream for the 9-1-1 emergency system

Other topics will be added to LCOG’s prospective list in the coming weeks, but these may offer useful examples. As to the process for getting concurrence from LCOG’s membership quickly, the Committee is urged to explore a mechanism that would involve (1) a request for support from, say Brenda Wilson, lobbying for the City of Eugene, or Alex Cuyler working on

behalf of Lane County; (2) that request broadcast to designated individuals in LCOG's membership (probably at the city manager, school superintendent level) with a request for a thumbs-up or no-comment response in a 24 hour turn-around time; and (3) the Regional Voice position being communicated to the Lane County delegation and, importantly, to the professional advocates for our larger members. The question is, will such a notification and approval process work. How can it be made better?

**Recommended is:** (1) An invitation to the Lane County legislative delegation to attend and participate in the Board's September 23 meeting, and (2) a discussion/decision regarding the organization's regional legislative priorities and Regional Voice process, described above.

2. **Lane Economic Committee**—Staff contact: Steve Dignam

To address a part of the Committee's vision for a more vigorous Lane Economic Committee, a proposed revision to the LEC Bylaws is attached. The changes, as suggested by the economic enhancement subcommittee, are found in Article III, Membership. Proposed is the addition of a specific set of member positions representing government. The LEC had a robust discussion of the concept of adding elected officials to the body, and ultimately the recommendation was supported. While the idea of strengthening the "charge" to the Committee was considered, such a change seemed unnecessary, given the current Purpose and Function provisions found in Article II of the Bylaws.

**Recommended is:** The approval of amended Bylaws for the LEC

3. **Lane County Human Services Commission**—Staff contact: Kay Metzger

The Human Services Commission operates under the auspices of Lane County's Department of Health and Human Services. The HSC discussed the proposal, offered by the Climate of Prosperity Task Force, that a member or members be added that would represent non-metro communities. Kay Metzger participated in that discussion. Kay further communicated the subcommittee's recommendation for a presentation by the HSC to the LCOG Board. It was the general conclusion of the current HSC members that the membership should be left intact. This was at least in part based upon the belief that the funding agencies (Eugene, Lane County and Springfield) had a responsibility to their taxpayers to directly manage the fund distribution process. There was also discussion about the risk of diminishing the

efficiency of the HSC with an expanded membership. The HSC members suggested that the goals of the Task Force could be addressed by having representation from non-metro cities on the HSC Advisory Committee. It should be noted that, at present, each of the two “rural” Commissioners recommends a potential member for appointment to the Advisory Committee. The HSC acknowledged that better communication with the rural communities was desired. In that vein, it was suggested that the HSC ask the LCOG Board—particularly non-metro members—to provide input on an annual basis regarding human services needs.

**Recommended is:** (1) consider a presentation by the HSC at a future LCOG Board meeting; (2) consider requesting the HSC to seek from LCOG a candidate for appointment to the Advisory Committee; and (3) discontinue consideration of a non-metro city appointment to the HSC.

4. **Communication**—Staff contacts: Byron Vanderpool and George Kloepfel

At last month’s meeting, the Committee specifically asked that there be sufficient time allotted to the discussion of this broad topic. The Committee might want to move communication to the top of the agenda. The input from the communications subcommittee was content-rich. Byron Vanderpool’s summary of the subcommittee’s work and consideration of “outcomes” and “approaches” is as follows:

The Subcommittee chose to define “Communications” in very broad terms, so that it includes:

- All communications among and between:
  - Citizens and Government
  - Business and Government
  - Government and Government
- Communications Technologies.
- Coordination, for example on grant applications.
- Relationship management.
- Mediation – neutral-party services.
- Training and education.
- Branding, i.e. “when I have a need for information, I immediately think to call LCOG.”
- Intergenerational communications strategies, especially new technologies.

**The subcommittee identified several issues with communications. Among them were:**

- Member Agencies don't know what services LCOG provides. What are LCOG's specialties?
- Agencies/Citizens don't have a single place to go for contacts/services.
- Could use one location to find out what other jurisdictions are doing – something like the AOC newsletter to keep everyone informed.
- Public should have one location to find meeting dates and times, as well as agendas and meeting materials. Also a single location for government news and updates.  
Would like to have a 3-1-1 telephone system region wide. One location for information and referral.
- As an elected official/government employee how do I find the expert and specialized information in a topic area? Knowledgebase.  
LCOG has done a poor job of marketing itself.
- Could use a course in “Respectful Communications 101.”

A number of **desired outcomes** can be generated from this list. Several which the Board might address, and possible approaches, are:

- **LCOG Board Members and Member Agency Policy Bodies and Staff have a good knowledge of LCOG's services.** Possible Approaches:
  - General – encourage members to call (or e-mail) and talk to LCOG staff about services desired. Even if LCOG doesn't provide those services, LCOG can often make referrals. Note you're not “on the clock” when talking with LCOG staff.
  - Have a conversation with LCOG Board members to determine what information and format(s) would be useful to individual members.
  - Following the Board discussion above, LCOG staff provide a series of informational sessions, regular communications about upcoming events, information on projects and products, (daily/weekly/monthly?) “it's happening at LCOG” messages, or whatever the Board feels would be useful to inform our membership and keep everyone current on LCOG services.
  - LCOG Board Members agree to be ambassadors with their elected peers and regularly carry back information about LCOG. LCOG staff could provide briefing materials (e.g. meeting summaries) for this.
  - Improve LCOG's website to make it easier to find LCOG services.
  - Expand LCOG's “new city manager” briefing process and make more presentations available for member agencies.
- **The Public Has One Location Where They Can Find Information About Government.** Possible Approaches:
  - LCOG has the necessary technology in place to serve this information up, but needs a better way to obtain current information from other governments. For example,

[www.KeepusMoving.info](http://www.KeepusMoving.info), developed and operated by LCOG, provides current information on traffic construction and delays. The weakness of this system is getting local governments to contribute the information (in a recent RG article, of the four agencies listing websites for construction information, only one had agreed to use KeepusMoving.) Although twitter, RSS, etc. aren't currently in place, they can speedily be added if desired.

- A commercial “portal” software package could be deployed for a more feature rich version of the prior approach. This does not overcome the basic issue of receiving and keeping current information from 28 (or more) governments in Lane County. Means of funding development and operations would have to be found.
- The region could explore implementation of a 3-1-1 system to telephonically serve up the information collected above. Means of funding development and operations would have to be found.

- **Communications Are Respectful.** Possible Approaches:

- Agencies and individuals pledge to maintain a respectful approach to their public and private dealings. Disagreements are fine (and healthy); disrespect and personal assaults are not.

**Recommended is:** (1) Confirm the validity of, or modify, the “desired outcomes” listed; (2) consider the “possible approaches” identified in Byron’s summary—expand, change and augment; (3) refine the recommendation that will go to the Board of Directors.