

Randy Leonard, Commissioner
David Lane, Ph.D., Director
1221 S.W. Fourth Avenue, Room 110
Portland, OR 97204
Phone (503) 823-4519
FAX (503) 823-3050
TTY (503) 823-6868
www.myportlandneighborhood.org



*enhancing the quality
of neighborhoods
through
community participation*

**City of Portland, Office of Neighborhood of Involvement
Great – Guidelines Review Committee Meeting**

Tuesday, July 8, 2003

8:30 AM to 10:00 AM, Lovejoy Room, Portland City Hall

MINUTES AND SUMMARY NOTES

Members Present:

Patricia Gardner, Co-Chair	Pearl District Neighborhood Association
Moshe Lenske, Co-Chair	Woodstock Neighborhood Association
Kathy Bambeck	Bridlemile Neighborhood Association
Nancy Chapin	Alliance of PDX Neighborhood Bus. Assocs.
Cathryn Crawford	University Park Neighborhood Association
Leonard Gard	Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.
Raymond Hites	Lents Neighborhood Association
Brian Hoop	Office of Neighborhood Involvement
David Lane	Office of Neighborhood Involvement
Stanley Lewis	Downtown Community Association
Michael O'Malley	Irvington Community Association
Jerry Powell	At-Large
Mark Sieber	Neighbors West/Northwest
Ruth Spetter	City Attorney's Office
William Warren	Central Northeast Neighbors

Absent:

Brent Canode	Office of Commissioner Randy Leonard
Charles Shi	Communities Beyond Neighborhood Boundaries

Visitors

Lee Perlman	Media
Don MacGillivray	Buckman Neighborhood Association
Mike Sanders	Licenses
Lynne Knox	Housing and Community Development
Jeff Cohan	Commissioner Dan Saltzman
Eric King	Neighborhood Involvement
Tim Hall	Water

**Information & Referral
Center**
503-823-4000

**Crime Prevention
Center**
503-823-4519

**Neighborhood Mediation
Center**
503-823-3152

**Metropolitan Human
Rights Center**
503-823-5136

**Civic Involvement
Center**
503-823-4519

Bryan Aptekar	Parks and Recreation
Bob Cynkar	Environmental Services
Mary Volm	Management & Finance, Transportation, Planning
David Nemo	Portland Development Commission
Becky Chiao	Ombudsman Office
Greg Lewis	ONI intern
Chris Frankenis	Media

*Decisions by this group are subject to change at future meetings.
Opportunities for public input are at the end of meeting and future workshops.
The committee has approved these summary notes.*

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes approved for June 24, 2003 meeting.

Minutes

Motions approved:

- GREAT members vote to support, in concept, rewriting section on Responsibilities of City Agencies. Limit language to the establishment of standards and consider other parts of David Nemo's proposal. A subcommittee of citizens and staff will work out details.

Summary of Notes for July 8, 2003

- Dialogue notes on conversation between GREAT committee members and City staff regarding proposed changes to City code chapter 3.96, specifically responsibilities of City agencies.
- Staff main concerns are on vague language. 45-day notification does not harmonize with other code notification requirements. Need to clarify what kinds of decisions does this apply to. Staff concern they were not involved in early crafting of language.
- Straw vote approved to support basic concepts proposed by David Nemo.

Dialogue between City staff and neighborhood committee members

Issues brought up:

- Co-chair states goal is to dialogue and come up with proposals for substitute language.

"A" - Initial proposal and issue of establishing standards in code 3.96:

- Brian notes David Nemo crafted proposed language. David reviews his proposal: Concerns are time notification and how we define "all decisions" are key issues of staff. Suggests limit language to establishing standards to be developed by PI Taskforce and adopted by Council. This would be a policy that is developed in partnership with ONI and the Taskforce. ONI should have a role in monitoring how bureaus do public involvement.
- Some GREAT members supportive. Some concerned that simply listing the establishment of Standards not adequate. Perhaps a purpose statement would clarify and strengthen why we are establishing standards.
- Standards do not have the legal strength that placing language in City Code would provide. Need more definition in code of what legal authority standards would have.

- Suggestion to list under Responsibilities of ONI that ONI would be responsible for facilitating establishment of standards for public involvement.

“B” - Issue of prior notification/30 day/45 day notice:

- Discussion about existing 30 day notices and why the need for more time for early notification. Comment that many bureaus did not know it existed.
- Citizens feel strongly its appropriate to set a minimum notice period. Skepticism expressed that bureaus will follow through with these notification requirements since many have ignored the 30-day notice.
- 45 day timeline is minimum time period needed for citizen groups to be able to meet at their regular monthly meeting, decide an action, develop a response, and mobilize the community.
- Committee members say this was not intended to relate to all city actions, such as manhole covers. This should focus on policy issues only.
- Acknowledgement there is conflict in time notifications between different code chapters. Senate bill 100 lays out many land use timelines. Bureaus need flexibility to meet their state and federal mandates as well.
- Suggestion that we need to put requirements for longer notification periods in each bureaus' code language since many were not even familiar with the existing language. Staff concerns that many bureaus already have notification periods in code, and part of problem is that one set time period will not work for all decisions.
- Staff people are caught between meeting federal and state mandates requirements for quick response to funding timelines and need of citizen activists to have longer periods of time for notification. Often a project was planned many years ago and don't receive funding till much later.
- Bureaus need flexibility to respond to unique nature of projects, time of year, meeting schedules of neighborhood associations that may not meet in the summer and miss the 45-time period being proposed.

“C” - Issue of including public in “all planning efforts...”:

- Concern raised that the concept "all planning efforts, policy matters," etc. includes virtually every decision a city bureau makes. Staff wants clarification of what “decisions” the public involvement process needs to follow and for code to simply refer to the future standards.

Process issues:

- Clarify confusion over difference between Standards/Guidelines for neighborhood associations vs. Standards for bureaus public involvement efforts.
- Differentiate between public involvement processes for policy and planning vs. public information for construction project, for examples.
- There is distrust by some that the PI Taskforce will succeed in improving what already exists in the code. Others believe this dialogue will advance the need to prioritize public involvement.
- Need to organize opportunity for neighborhood leaders from both committees to meet and network to share strategy since there is mistrust about the role of the PI Taskforce.
- PI Taskforce and GREAT need to have similar timelines so there will be time to work out differences and harmonize the language in both.
- Use consensus process that includes both citizens and staff.

Other suggestions:

- Bureaus need adequate financial support for public involvement to meet these goals.

- ONI needs authority to convene public involvement staff on a regular basis to network and find opportunities to cooperate. Lack of regular staff dialogue and networking is part of the problem.
- Need archives of previous planning efforts and their public involvement processes.
- ONI to be responsible for legal notification of policy and capital construction projects through a citywide notification process, such as ads in the paper or a citywide newsletter.
- Support more education and leadership skills training for citizens about how the city works and how decisions are made.
- Communicate all types of project to neighborhood associations. Email is a more useful communication system to allow quick neighborhood notification. Send postcards to all residents about major construction projects.
- Create a system for updating plans that are created 10 to 20 years ago that allows for citizen input throughout the life of a project. Priorities of neighborhood residents change over time and something that was needed a decade ago may not be needed now.
- There is a need for public information as well and the commissioners are not seeing a public outcry for these services. We need to be advocating before Council at budget time.

Motion: Straw vote re: Responsibilities of City Agencies:

- GREAT members vote to support, in concept, rewriting section on Responsibilities of City Agencies. Limit language to the establishment of standards and consider other parts of David Nemo's proposal. A subcommittee of citizens and staff will work out details.
- Basic components:
 - Set out broad concept that bureaus have public involvement responsibilities.
 - Establish a set of standards.
 - Locate in responsibilities of ONI: facilitate process for establishing standards.
- Joint subcommittee suggestions for equal number of staff and citizens: Tim Hall, Mary Volm, David Nemo, Laurel Butman, Patricia Gardner, Leonard Gard, David Lane. Will need to limit staff and add citizens.

The committee has approved these summary notes. The information contained in this document is preliminary and informal in nature and does not necessarily reflect the views or adopted policies of the City of Portland or the final outcomes of this project; the reader should exercise caution in its interpretation.

NEXT MEETINGS

Tuesday, July 22, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Tuesday, August 12, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Tuesday, August 26, 2003

8:30 AM - 10:30 AM

City Hall, Lovejoy Room, 1221 SW 4th Avenue

Prepared by: Brian Hoop, Office of Neighborhood Involvement