

Community Involvement Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Time: 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

Location: 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Portland, Conference Room 2500A

Committee Members present: Paula Amato, Jason Barnstead-Long, Christina Blaser, Lois Cohen, Jessica Conner, Linda Nettekoven, Stanley Penkin, Howard Shapiro, Alison Stoll

Absent/Excused: Denise Barrett, Jovan Young, Kenneth Doswell, Peter Stark, Laura Stewart, Judy BlueHorse Skelton

Staff: Eden Dabbs, Marty Stockton, Sara Wright

Visitors: None

Meeting Goals: Evaluate Comprehensive Plan public engagement process

Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

Howard Shapiro, Chair, welcomed the group and briefly recapped the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) hearing the previous night. The PSC generally agreed with the idea of an independent community involvement committee tasked with overseeing public engagement related to implementation of the Comp Plan. CIC members discussed parameters of a new community involvement committee. Members emphasized that the committee should have clear relevance and meaning and a regular schedule for reporting to PSC. Members also discussed the importance of the expectation that committee members attend at least a certain number of meetings.

Several CIC members expressed that the CIC feels less meaningful and relevant now that the meetings are quarterly, and they feel less connected to staff's outreach activities. Members discussed CIC's dual charge of overseeing outreach and bringing in information from the communities that members live and work in.

Staff announced that BPS has been awarded a STAR Award for Citizen Involvement by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. The award is designed to recognize organizations and individuals who are meaningfully involving citizens in local land use

decisions, and actively promoting and implementing the values of Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goal 1.

Task 5 outreach overview

Sara Wright briefly described Task 5 public engagement. BPS will be using the state-required notification mailings as a major engagement tool, backed up by ongoing District Liaison outreach in communities particularly affected by Task 5 projects. There will also be an open house in early summer, and “office hours” around the city during the summer, which will be advertised in media and in the notification mailings. The Comp Plan helpline will be re-staffed to answer questions by phone. CIC members asked about targeted outreach to smaller groups, and suggested that property owners near but not in areas with proposed changes should be notified. Several members expressed concern that the CIC has lost track of what staff is doing, and need more information to provide meaningful support and feedback. *Staff agreed to send CIC monthly updates summarizing staff’s public engagement activities related to the Comp Plan, including what has worked and what has not, and linking to other news about the CPU, such as the e-newsletter and staff reports presented to PSC. CIC members agreed to meet every other month for the remainder of the committee’s charter, to regain some momentum and re-engage with staff activities*

CIC Discussion: Comprehensive Plan evaluation – what are the lessons learned?

CIC members said that they felt they could not provide meaningful evaluation for the whole period of the Comp Plan without more specific information and questions. Staff agreed to create a summary of engagement activities for each stage and formulate more specific questions for CIC members. Staff will also reach out to members individually to get their feedback. Staff will use the feedback to write a memo overview of the process, and will email it to CIC members for review before the April meeting. There, the CIC will make final adjustments to the memo, which will be submitted to the PSC two weeks before their May 12th meeting. *An executive subcommittee meeting was set for early March to discuss how to finish the*

committee's mandated tasks, including evaluating the process and presenting that evaluation to the PSC.

Members discussed issues that have surfaced in Comprehensive Plan testimony about the public engagement element of the process. Most of the process-related testimony is related to the timing of the release of the draft components of the Comprehensive Plan (particularly the Task 5 projects), and CIC members agree that this has been a concern. Members articulated community concerns about being asked to “write a blank check” by having designations considered before zones. They also pointed out that there is an issue of expectations management; some community members believe that if they submit enough testimony, they will get the outcome they prefer. Better communication about balancing issues that affect whether or not changes can be made would be helpful. Also, many people are confused about the relationship between the Comp Plan and development that is happening now, and do not understand that the development is in many cases taking place on properties that have had the same zoning for decades.

CIC members expressed frustration with public engagement around the TSP; the concerns about a compressed timeline are particularly strong for this part of the Comprehensive Plan, because the material is very complex. Concern was also expressed about the perception of a lack of connection between transportation planning and land use planning.

Next steps

- Staff agreed to send CIC monthly updates summarizing staff's public engagement activities, and linking to other news about the CPU, such as the e-newsletter and staff reports presented to PSC.
- The whole committee will shift to an every-other-month schedule, meeting next on April 22.
- The executive committee will meet in early March to plan how to accomplish the evaluation and presentation tasks.