

CI PEG Suggested Working Draft Revisions

The following tables outline the CI PEG’s ideas for revisions to Working Draft goals and policies and additional commentary related to these ideas.

GOALS - Ch 1

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	CI PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>GOAL 1.A. Community involvement as a partnership: The City and our communities work together as genuine partners. The City builds and maintains relationships and communication with communities, business organizations, and individuals.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Revise Goal 1.A to clarify that ‘businesses’ are part of the list and not necessarily part of a ‘business organization’ <u>and retain ‘organizations’ as one of the partners.</u></p>
<p>GOAL 1.B. Value of community wisdom and participation: The City honors community wisdom and recognizes that the public possesses expertise that can strengthen plans, policies and decision making. Portland is a great place to live, work, play, and learn in large part because of volunteerism and a cherished tradition of civic participation.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Revise Goal 1.B to remove excess language against which it would be difficult for staff to make findings, while maintaining the spirit of the statement. Suggested revised language:</p> <p>Value of community wisdom and participation: The City seeks out and <u>considers</u> community wisdom, participation, and <u>volunteerism</u> and recognizes that the public possesses expertise and knowledge that can strengthen plans, policies, and decision making.</p>
<p>GOAL 1.C. Transparency and accountability: City planning and decision-making processes are transparent and work to balance a variety of community interests. Decision makers are accountable and connected to the community, and they inspire others to act toward common goals.</p>	<p>[The CI PEG has no additional revisions to this goal.]</p>
<p>GOAL 1.D. Ongoing and diverse participation: Community members have meaningful opportunities to participate, and their efforts are respected at all stages of planning and decision making. Public processes engage the full diversity of affected Portlanders and welcome those who lack influence or formal involvement in organizations.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Goal 1.D should be revised to align with the common language being used by the Portland Office of Equity and Human Rights - especially with regard to how underrepresented communities, those who lack influence, all populations that should be considered when developing ongoing and diverse <u>participation.</u></p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The Office of Equity and Human Rights has developed a common language about how to define and refer to underrepresented communities and individuals. To improve communications and clarity, the CI PEG recommends BPS align verbiage of this goal (and potentially other goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan) with the common language.</p>
<p>GOAL 1.E. Accessible and effective participation: Portlanders find participating in planning and decision-making processes to be easy, accessible, effective, rewarding, and satisfying. The City goes beyond the minimum legal requirements for public participation. In doing so, the City draws upon acknowledged best practices and uses a wide variety of tools to promote inclusive and robust community involvement in well-designed processes.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Amend Goal 1.E to remove the phrase, “The City goes beyond the minimum legal requirements for public participation.”</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The CI PEG believes this phrase is confusing and potentially misleading. In some cases it may not be necessary to exceed the minimum legal requirement. Following best practices for effective participation is the critical issue under this goal. In crafting the accompanying Community Involvement Manual, it is proposed that staff explore best practices and opportunities that describe when and how going beyond the minimum would be most appropriate.</p>

Comment [Deb1]: COMMENT FROM LINDA: NEED TO MENTION ORGANIZATIONS AS A GENERIC CATEGORY IN THIS LIST. THE CITY PARTNERS WITH ORGANIZATIONS OF ALL KINDS IN DOING ITS WORK IN ADDITION TO INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESSES AND COMMUNITIES

Comment [Deb2]: COMMENT FROM GREG: “Values’ might be a better word. Don’t like the “seeks out and considers” verb because it doesn’t apply as well to “participation” and “volunteerism” as it does to “wisdom”. I don’t want to say the City “considers participation”.

Comment [Deb3]: COMMENT FROM LINDA: This still seems a little “clunky.” -- due to the insertion of volunteerism which does need to be acknowledged.. I took a stab at a revision:

“Portland values and encourages community participation and volunteerism. The City seeks out and considers community wisdom recognizing that the public possesses expertise and knowledge that can strengthen plans, policies and decision making.”

Comment [Deb4]: COMMENT FROM LINDA: I hope we don’t lose reference to “those who lack formal involvement in organizations.”

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	CI PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>GOAL 1.F. Social justice: The City seeks social justice by working to expand choice and opportunity for all Portlanders, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of historically underrepresented communities. The City actively works to improve its policies, institutional practices, and decisions to address such needs.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Amend Goal 1.F to address critical verbiage and align with common language defined by the Office of Equity and Human Rights. This suggested revision is as follows:</p> <p>Goal 1.F Social Justice and Equity. The City seeks social justice and equity by working to expand choice and opportunity for all Portlanders, recognizing a responsibility to involve underserved and underrepresented communities in planning. The City actively works to improve its policies, institutional practices, and decisions to achieve more equitable distribution of burdens and benefits.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The CI PEG acknowledges that Social Justice is not necessarily defined the same way by different communities. Adding 'Equity' to the goal title provides greater clarity of the goal concepts and should serve to resonate with more people than 'Social Justice' alone. Additionally, the PEG members believe it is important to be more explicit in what is meant by social justice and equity through drawing the connection to equitable distribution of burdens and benefits.</p>
<p>[Add new goal for Building Strong Civic Infrastructure - see 'Revision' to the right]</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>The following concept should be added as a new goal to the Working Draft Chapter 1:</p> <p>Building Strong Civic Infrastructure: The City recognizes that it is essential to <u>develop and support civic structures and processes that encourage</u> active and meaningful community involvement <u>and</u> strengthens the capacity of individuals and communities to participate in planning processes and civic life in Portland.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The idea for a new goal supporting ongoing development of the Portland's 'civic infrastructure' was brought forth by Planning and Sustainability Commissioner, Mike Houck. The CI PEG supports this suggestion for a new goal and further refined his proposal (outlined under the 'revision' above).</p>

Comment [Deb5]: COMMENT FROM LINDA: I think per Mike's comment that it's important to refer to structures (like the neighborhood system) or processes (like land use notifications), so I took a stab at a modification.

Deleted: have

Deleted: that

Deleted: works to

CI PROGRAM - Ch 8

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	CI PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.1 Community involvement program. Require and implement a Community Involvement Program to provide an active, ongoing, and systematic process for community participation throughout planning and decision making. Enable community members to identify, consider, and act upon a broad range of issues within land use, transportation, parks, sewer and water systems, natural resources, and implementing measures.</p> <p>Policy 1.2 Planning and Sustainability Commission. Require and acknowledge the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) as the officially recognized committee for community involvement needed to meet the requirements of Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 1.</p> <p>Policy 1.2.a Coordinate with the Planning and Sustainability Commission on the implementation and evaluation of planning and decision-making processes using the Community Involvement Program.</p>	<p>NOTE: CI PEG recommends these policies and subpolicies be moved to Chapter 8, as the programmatic elements are a better fit with the Comprehensive Plan administration and implementation chapter.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>Move policies 1.1 and 1.2 to Chapter 8-Administration and Implementation. With this move, it is suggested that a goal, policy, or narrative be added to bridge the community involvement program between Chapters 1 and 8.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>Change this oversight body to an autonomous group of community involvement experts that will have the authority to engage staff early in a process to guide design and decision-making, as well as ensuring the City is held accountable to its community processes through to the end - not the PSC.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The equity audit of the working draft and the state’s Primer for Public Participation in Planning suggest that this current structure presents a potential conflict of interest with the PSC advising and overseeing itself on its community involvement responsibilities. Additionally, the work of community involvement requires a set of skills and expertise that are often left off of the PSC, such as persons with disabilities, because the PSC’s typical role in planning may not accommodate the necessary community voices required of community involvement work.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>The following policy concepts should be added to the Working Draft as subpolicies (under 1.2):</p> <p>Develop and Update Community Involvement Manual: The committee for community involvement shall develop and regularly review and update a manual to assist City staff to learn about and use best practices for community involvement to meet the goals and policies of this section.</p> <p>Review Public Involvement Processes: Review and provide feedback to staff on proposed public involvement processes for individual projects, during a project, and after the conclusion of the project.</p> <p>Evaluate the Community Involvement Program: The committee for community involvement periodically shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Community Involvement Program in meeting the goals and policies of this section and recommend and advocate for program improvements.</p> <p>Ensure adequate funding and human resources: “The level of funding and human resources allocated to the citizen involvement program should be sufficient to make citizen involvement an integral part of the planning process.”</p> <p>Community Involvement in annual project priority-setting processes.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>These are the elements called for in the state’s Primer. The PEG recognizes that some of these items may be better reflected in supporting documents, such as the Community Involvement Manual and/or Zoning Code. However, they believe strongly that these are critical elements to achieving change in how the City approaches community involvement under the Comprehensive Plan and that these ideas are currently missing from the guiding documents.</p> <p>CI PEG members identified an additional need to tie community involvement requirements to fiscal decision-making authorized under the Comprehensive Plan, for example the Capital Improvement Program <u>and the selection of projects when seeking grant funding</u>. Community members are often left out of annual priority-setting for planning, public facilities, and transportation projects and investments. CI PEG comments for Policy 1.6 Early Involvement touch on this need, but it is suggested that Chapter 8 should also contain reference to the role of community members in Implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>

Comment [Deb6]: COMMENT FROM LINDA: This reads well the way it is. I have 3 concerns about the fiscal processes: 1) the way Capital Improvements Projects are selected, 2) the way staff decides which grants to seek and for what purposes, and 3) the way the City amends it's Transportation Systems Plan (they can't seek funding for projects that aren't already listed in the TSP and they aren't very transparent about making amendments.) I hope the TSP amendment process will be addressed when PBOT updates the TSP later this year. If not we'll have to raise that issue later. I added some language about the grant funding, but I'm not sure it's clear so see what you think. I'm fine either way.

Deleted: June 2

ONGOING - Ch 1

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.4.b. [Partners in decision making.] Continuously build and maintain partnerships and coordination with federal, state, local, and tribal governments.</p> <p>Policy 1.4.c. [Partners in decision making.] Continuously build and maintain partnerships and coordination with neighborhood and business associations as recognized local experts and channels for place-based efforts.</p> <p>Policy 1.4.d. [Partners in decision making.] Continuously build and maintain partnerships and coordination with historically underrepresented communities.</p> <p>Policy 1.4.e. [Partners in decision making.] Enhance partnerships, coordination, and engagement of organizations, institutions, and agency partners.</p>	<p>REVISION Move subpolicy 1.4.e up as an overarching policy to 1.4.b-d.</p> <p>REVISION Add subpolicy to Working Draft 1.4 (ongoing community involvement work) to address City staff capacity and professional development: “Provide professional development opportunities to ensure staff have the tools, attitudes, skills, and experience needed to design and implement processes that engage a broad diversity of affected and interested communities - including historically underrepresented groups - in ways that are meaningful and appropriate to them.”</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY The new community involvement policies will require a reinvestment in staff development to ensure the City’s goals for a more equitable city are being achieved. The CI PEG recommends an explicit commitment to ensuring the needed change takes place and staff are supported in their work.</p>
<p>Policy 1.6 Early involvement. Improve opportunities for interested and affected community members to participate early in planning and decision making. This includes participating in process design, identifying issues and opportunities, and recommending and prioritizing projects and/or other types of implementation.</p>	<p>REVISION Change the first word of the policy, ‘Improve’, to ‘Provide’. Improve is a relative term, making it difficult to determine what is an improvement at any point in time. Provide is a clear directive for which compliance and findings will be easier to determine.</p> <p>REVISION The following policy concepts should be added to the Working Draft as subpolicies (under 1.6): Early and Ongoing Involvement in Priority Setting. Develop and implement regular outreach to the community to identify the planning priorities of neighborhood, business, and community-based organizations and individuals. Bureau leaders shall consider community priorities in developing bureau work plans. Notification system. Develop and maintain a notification system that uses innovative communication tools and strategies to send formal notices with easy to understand and relevant information to affected and interested community members, with enough lead time to allow them to respond effectively. Provide central source of information for all projects. Ensure easy access for community members to timely, relevant, and easily accessible information about all planning projects through centralized tools.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY There are critical elements to providing clear, accessible, and ongoing communications currently missing from the body of policies. The City’s community involvement program under the Comprehensive Plan will work only if community members can easily find information and understand how and when they can participate. These suggested subpolicies are intended to reflect the City’s ethic of open, transparent, and collaborative government. Additionally, the CI PEG stresses that priority-setting should not occur only when capital programs are being crafted, but the City needs to develop an ongoing priority-setting process with the community to capture emerging opportunities or issues.</p>

Comment [Deb7]: COMMENT FROM GREG: Note that “historically underrepresented groups” should be consistent with the common language noted above.

Deleted: June 2

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.11 Accountability. Ensure that planning and decision making are meaningfully shaped by ideas, preferences, and revisions contributed to by the public.</p> <p>Policy 1.11.a. Document and conscientiously consider information received through community involvement.</p> <p>Policy 1.11.b. Ensure that community members receive feedback from decision makers, including the rationale for decisions.</p> <p>Policy 1.11.c. Strengthen channels of communication among City Council, the Planning and Sustainability Commission, City staff, and community members.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Subpolicy 1.11.b should be clarified to reflect the span of control under the Comprehensive Plan. The CI PEG recommends the following revision:</p> <p>“1.11.b Ensure that community members receive information on how staff conveyed community input, the decisions made, and reported rationale of the decision-makers.”</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>CI PEG supports the intent of 1.11.b, but recommends changes to provide greater clarify and ability for City staff to follow through with the commitment made in the policy. Furthermore, CI PEG members recommend adding that staff need to acknowledge how community information is forwarded to decision makers. Ideally, a community involvement accountability process would include: the process of community involvement, opportunities to participate in the process, the input received from the public during that process, the way that this input was conveyed from staff to decision makers, the role public input played in staff's revisions to decision makers, and the way that decision makers took community input into account in making decisions.</p>
<p>Policy 1.12 Process evaluation. Strive for continuous improvement in the effectiveness of community engagement approaches.</p> <p>Policy 1.12.a Evaluate each community involvement process from both the City and participants' perspective and consider collected feedback and lessons learned in future involvement efforts.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Replace the word ‘strive’ with ‘provide’.</p> <p>Parse subpolicy 1.12.a to address the ongoing needs for continuous improvements in community involvement. Create a new policy under Project Specific Policies section to include the first phrase, “Evaluate each community involvement process from both the City and participants’ perspectives...”</p>
<p>Policy 1.14 Capacity building. Build capacity for community members to effectively participate in planning and decision making.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Revise policy 1.14 Capacity Building to address the concepts in this suggested policy language:</p> <p>“Capacity Building. Provide ongoing education, information, resources, and skill building opportunities to help community members develop the knowledge and ability to participate effectively in planning and decision making.”</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The suggested change will provide greater clarity for staff and the community about what is intended as ‘capacity building’.</p> <p>NOTE: The CI PEG recommends subpolicies 1.14a-c be located in the Community Involvement Manual rather than as policy statements.</p>

PROJECT-SPECIFIC - Ch 1

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.3 Representation. Strive to engage the full diversity of affected Portlanders during planning and decision making, representing Portland in its full diversity, including but not limited to people of all ages, racial and ethnic backgrounds, income levels, and abilities.</p> <p>Policy 1.3.a. Identify the demographics of potentially affected communities when initiating a project. Monitor participation throughout the process to assess whether participation corresponds with affected communities, and adapt involvement practices and activities accordingly to increase effectiveness at reaching targeted audiences.</p> <p>Policy 1.3.b. Design public processes to engage people that may not live in Portland, such as, employees, employers, students, and those that visit the city for a variety of reasons.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Add the following subpolicy under Working Draft policy 1.3 to address the cultural and historical assessment required:</p> <p><u>“Assess the history, culture, past plans, and primary language(s) spoken, and other needs of the affected community when initiating a project.”</u></p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>Subpolicy 1.3.a is strong and supported by the CI PEG. However, the subpolicy addresses only demographics that can be gathered through the US Census and similar databases. The CI PEG thinks this policy will not go far enough to meet the City’s equity and accessibility goals. The CI PEG further suggests it is equally important for City staff to look at other information that should impact design and implementation of the community involvement program, such as history of the community and its relationship to the City, cultural norms of populations living in the area, identification of people who are not counted in the Census (such as people with disabilities), etc.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>Add to Working Draft subpolicy 1.3b “property owners”, to the list of people that need to be engaged and who may reside outside of Portland.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>Add a subpolicy to Working Draft policy 1.3:</p> <p>“The City uses data and cultural information to understand the needs, priorities, and trends affecting different communities in Portland and uses this information to guide priority setting and shape public involvement and decision-making processes.”</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The Representation policy and subpolicies do not directly connect the use of data to priority setting and decision making, which may also be related to ongoing work under the Comprehensive Plan. This suggested addition would address the deficiency. Additionally the CI PEG suggests this subpolicy would help bring perspective to trends or larger issues of community concern that, when taken as a whole, could affect the way staff approach project work.</p>

Comment [Deb8]: COMMENT FROM GREG: Should (did) we include “language” in this list?

Deleted: June 2

Policy 1.4 Partners in decision making. Enhance community involvement in planning processes based on a model of shared governance.

Policy 1.4.a. Establish clear roles, rights, responsibilities, and degree of accountability of participants, including the City, community leadership, business, organizations, and individuals in creating, developing, and implementing policies or programs.

REVISION

Add a subpolicy to Working Draft policy 1.4:

“The City commits staff time and resources to build strong and ongoing relationships, understanding, and trust with different communities and community-based organizations in Portland.”

ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY

The CI PEG suggests that in order to build partners for decision making and to engage a full diversity of community members, it is necessary to make a commitment to dedicating staff time and resources and should be stated clearly in the Comprehensive Plan. This policy revision would better align the Comprehensive Plan with the City’s adopted Public Involvement Principles. Policy 1.4 is shares a link to Policy 1.5 Transparency and the CI PEG suggests the possibility of integrating 1.4a into the Transparency policy.

REVISION

The term ‘shared governance’ needs to be defined for clarity.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY

The CI PEG suggests the change in order to explicitly describe the equalization of roles in decision making between the community and the City - one should not be greater than the other. Partnership in decision making is the desired outcome.

REVISION

Add a title to subpolicy 1.4.a: “Establish clear roles and responsibilities”

Deleted: with

Comment [Deb9]: COMMENT FROM GREG: I’m glad we make a note about this here. I’m personally not clear on what’s intended here by the term, and I am skeptical about what it can mean that “one is not greater than the other.” I might express generally here that there was some discussion among the group about the use and meaning of the term “shared governance,” and that the issue (whether and how to use the term) was not resolved.

Deleted: June 2

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	CI PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.5 Transparency. Create and maintain transparency in all community involvement processes.</p> <p>Policy 1.5.a. Establish clear expectations about project sponsorship, purpose, design, and how decision makers will use the process results.</p> <p>Policy 1.5.b. Identify how the public can influence all stages of the process, including the outcome. Communicate clearly how the public’s input changed or affected the process and/or outcome.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Strike ‘clearly’ from subpolicy 1.5.b as it is too subjective and difficult for making findings.</p>
<p>Policy 1.7 Process design. Create well-designed community involvement processes and techniques that appropriately fit the scope, character, and impact of planning and decision making.</p> <p>Policy 1.7.a. Use a variety of involvement methods and tools, as appropriate, based on continuous review of best practices.</p> <p>Policy 1.7.b. Customize community involvement processes to be responsive to the needs of different affected groups and encourage full, authentic, culturally appropriate, effective, and equitable participation.</p> <p>Policy 1.7.c. Collaborate with appropriate City and agency partners and community participants when designing the process.</p> <p>Policy 1.7.d. Respect participants’ time when designing involvement processes. Acknowledge and address reasonable timelines and respect different communities’ abilities to respond in a timely manner.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Move subpolicies 1.7a-d into the Manual and revise the 1.7 policy language to also include reference to the need for ‘culturally appropriate processes’ designed to meet the needs of ‘affected communities’.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The suggested change will retain a link between Goal 1.E Accessible and Effective Participation, while moving the specific methods for implementation to the Manual.</p>
<p>Policy 1.8 Adaptability. Adapt community involvement processes for public projects to respond to changes in the scope and priority of the issues and decisions at hand.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Combine elements of Policy 1.8 with subpolicy 1.3a (related to monitoring participation). Also, review for clear and concrete outcomes. Language that relates to methodology or specific tools that can be used to monitor and adapt would be better suited for the Manual.</p>

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	CI PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.9 Accessibility. Ensure that community involvement processes are broadly accessible in terms of location, time, and language, and that they are supportive of the engagement of individuals with a variety of disabilities.</p> <p>Policy 1.9.a. Select accessible locations where the facilities meet the requirement of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and are close to transit. Consider geographically diverse locations.</p> <p>Policy 1.9.b. Encourage engagement activities at times of day that accommodate a variety of schedules and lifestyles.</p> <p>Policy 1.9.c. Strive for information to be in multiple languages, provided through interpretation and translation, based on the demographics of the affected participants.</p> <p>Policy 1.9.d. Consider providing childcare and other services that reduce barriers to community involvement.</p> <p>Policy 1.9.e. Provide opportunities for participation in places where communities typically gather.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Add to the end of 1.9 policy language: “...and other limitations on participation...”</p> <p>Move subpolicies 1.9a-e to the Manual.</p>
<p>Policy 1.10 Information for effective participation. Provide community members with the information and expertise necessary to ensure informed participation.</p> <p>Policy 1.10.a. Provide information and educational opportunities through a variety of means, in alternative formats, and with enough lead time, to enable effective participation. Distribute technical and other information to public libraries and other facilities open to the public. Provide information and context in a format accessible to the reader and relevant to their experience. Strive to explain how a project or policy will affect individuals in their lives. Provide real-life context.</p> <p>Policy 1.10.b. Strive for notification methods for planning and decision making to be fair, beyond the minimum legal standards, clear, and timely.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Move references to specific methods to the Manual. Example: Retain the first sentence under subpolicy 1.10.a, but move the remainder of the subpolicy into the Manual.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY</p> <p>The CI PEG members have concerns about the use of the word ‘strive’ in this instance. It does not carry the needed directive to go beyond <u>minimum</u> requirements. Notices should be clear, relevant, and accessible, no matter the legal standard. The suggested change will retain a link between Goal 1.E Accessible and Effective Participation, while moving the specific methods for implementation to the Manual.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>The following best practices concepts should be added to the Manual:</p> <p>Notice – Clear and Relevant: Notices must include clear and accessible information that tells people how the subject of the notice is relevant to them and how they can participate and have an impact.</p> <p>Notice – Innovative Methods: Innovative communication tools and strategies should be used to provide notice as widely as possible, especially to affected community members and those who have expressed interest in receiving notice.</p> <p>See also CI PEG commentary regarding ‘beyond legal standards’ under Goal 1.E.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>The following policy concept should be added to the Working Draft as subpolicy under 1.10:</p> <p>Data Collection and Analysis: Actively involve community members in inventorying, mapping, data analysis, and the development of alternatives.</p>

Deleted: the

Deleted: legal

Deleted: June 2

January 2013 Working Draft Chapter 1 Goals and Policies	CI PEG REVISIONS AND COMMENTARY
<p>Policy 1.13 Best practices and innovation. Improve community involvement efforts through new and creative methods, tools, and technologies to help people understand and evaluate information and provide input.</p> <p>Policy 1.13.a Leverage government and community partners’ skills and expertise to develop innovative tools and methods.</p> <p>Policy 1.13.b Coordinate and share successful engagement practices with both agency and community partners.</p> <p>Policy 1.13.c Evaluate and pursue creative and culturally appropriate methods to inform and engage people from groups who are currently or historically underrepresented groups.</p>	<p>REVISION</p> <p>Consider whether or not portions of 1.13 policies and subpolicies would be better placed under Ongoing Policies, moved to the Manual, or integrated with the new policy language suggested under 1.12 above.</p>