



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Comprehensive Plan Update – Community Involvement Committee (CIC)

Draft meeting notes

Date and Time: August 26, 2015 from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

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

Committee Members present: Jason Barnstead-Long, Lois Cohen, Jessica Conner, Linda Nettekoven, Stanley Penkin, Laura Stewart (by phone), Alison Stoll

Absent/Excused: Paula Amato, Denise Barrett, Christina Blaser, Kenneth Doswell, Howard Shapiro, Judy BlueHorse Skelton, Jovan Young

Staff: Eden Dabbs, Sara Wright

Meeting Goals:

1. Review Task 5 outreach plan
2. Review Community Involvement Program
3. Discuss how to support formation of new Comprehensive Plan community engagement review body

Welcome and Announcements

Stan Penkin, acting as chair, began the meeting at 8:15. There were not enough members present for a quorum, so there was no vote on the June meeting minutes. Committee members expressed a desire to see as many members as possible attend the last two meetings. The group agreed that the last CIC meeting should be a celebration rather than a meeting, and should be scheduled in early December. BPS staff will look into scheduling an event.

Task 5 Outreach Check-in

Sara provided an overview of the outreach plan for Early Implementation (Task 5) projects. Outreach will focus on affected property owners (Measure 56 notifications, which will refer property owners to the Map App, Helpline, and small-scale informal drop-in hours and info sessions with staff) and on geographic and interest-based groups.

CIC members suggested targeting outreach to: minority chambers, OAME, minority papers, small business development center at PCC, Community Alliance of Tenants. Jason suggested using the outreach as an opportunity to reach out to people experiencing or at risk of



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

displacement. Linda suggested reviewing how the MUZP map overlays with displacement vulnerability map, focus outreach in those areas.

CIC members recommended getting on agendas and calendars for under-served groups, and doing it as early as possible. Be clear about messaging why it's important to them. Use Climate Action Plan equity groups.

CIC members suggested Mercy Corps for an open house venue.

The group briefly reviewed a half-page overview piece, and provided some feedback about language, to make it feel more personal and clarify that the Comprehensive Plan is built on years of public feedback.

Community Involvement Program

Sara presented the draft overview of the Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation project related to public involvement, the Community Involvement Program. While this project does not fall under the CIC's review, it is informative for the CIC to follow. It also includes the development of the charter for the "New CIC".

What Should the "New CIC" Look Like?

Sara handed around the description of the future Community Involvement Committee from Chapter 2 of the [Recommended Draft of the Comprehensive Plan](#).

Policy 2.17: "The Community Involvement Committee (CIC), an independent advisory body, will evaluate and provide feedback to City staff on community involvement processes for individual planning and investment projects, before, during, and at the conclusion of these processes."

Sara asked for the group's thoughts on the structure and recruitment for the new CIC, when it is convened after the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

CIC members agreed that it is important to clarify the relationship between PIAC and the new CIC. Will it be like the relationship between BPS and BDS? Also, should ensure that the charter of the new CIC complies with Public Involvement Guidelines.

CIC members briefly discussed the name of the advisory body. Some members felt that the phrase "advisory committee" suggests that the committee's advice will necessarily be taken,

and this should be clarified from the start. Jason suggested the use of the word “group” rather than “committee” to make it sound less intimidating for potential members.

CIC members suggested that the new body have a built-in rotation to incorporate new voices while maintaining continuity and institutional knowledge. Lois suggested that half the committee start initially, and then be joined by a second group six months or a year later. Members also expressed concern about maintaining attendance and momentum. Should have a way to release people who do not attend meetings. The current CIC, like many ongoing committees, has struggled to keep people feeling engaged and attending meetings. Members agreed that the recruitment process should be very clear about the frequency of meetings, attendance expectations, and the amount of homework. Jason suggested having the first few meetings be like open houses to help potential members understand what they would be getting into. Current CIC members could attend those events to be a resources.

Communicating with the public about how testimony/feedback are processed

Linda mentioned that she had heard a complaint from a neighborhood association Land Use Chair that their neighborhood had developed testimony about the Comp Plan, and that none of their recommendations were included in the Recommended Draft. This reflects an ongoing confusion about how feedback/testimony are weighed, incorporated in draft development, and responded to. Sara said that Comp Plan Update Helpline staff have handled callers with a wide range of expectations about their testimony. There are callers who believe that there’s no point in testifying because their opinion will be disregarded, and callers who believe that their testimony will certainly be incorporated into the next draft, and expect to be notified personally about that. CIC members suggested continuing to include messaging, including in the email autoreply for emailed testimony, that says, more or less, “not all ideas from testimony will be included in the final draft.”

Members raised questions about testimony on the [Recommended Draft](#) (now posted and ready for testimony), which is supposed to be sent to Council. Members expressed concern that testimony would go to the wrong places, such as just to the Mayor, to the Planning and Sustainability Commission. Sara said that Commissioners and their staff have been briefed to forward all testimony to the CPU testimony email address, and the PSC staff person who checks the PSC email box will do the same. Confusion about this is inevitable, given the number of projects moving along all different stages, but staff are aware and will be vigilant about trying to correctly direct testimony and comments.

Other things

Sara briefly described the status of the [Residential Infill Project](#) (not a Comprehensive Plan project, but interesting from a public engagement perspective nonetheless and closely associated with the Comprehensive Plan by the public). The Stakeholder Advisory Committee applications are under review, and will be finalized at the end of the week. CIC members reflected on the need for standardizing the process for assembling advisory committees.

There was no public comment. The meeting concluded at 10:00 AM.

Remaining CIC meetings

- Wednesday, October 28, 8:00 to 10:00a.m.; location TBD
- December meeting/celebration – time, date, and location TBD

For more information, please contact Sara Wright, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability at 503-823-7728 or sara.wright@portlandoregon.gov.