



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

Summary Meeting Notes

Comprehensive Plan Update – Community Involvement Committee (CIC)

Date and Time: April 20, 2016, from 9 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Location: 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Portland, Conference Room 7A

Meeting Goals: *Recognize end of CIC process; get update on Community Involvement Program project; review and endorse Task 5 memo.*

Attendance: Jason Barnstead-Long, Lois Cohen, Jessica Conner, Kenneth Doswell (for last hour of meeting), Linda Nettekoven, Stan Penkin, Howard Shapiro, Laura Stewart (by phone for first hour and a half of the meeting), Alison Stoll, Maggie Tallmadge.

Staff: Susan Anderson, Tabitha Boschetti, Deborah Stein, Sara Wright

The meeting began at 8:10 a.m. Susan Anderson, Director of the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, thanked the CIC for nearly seven years of service. Work during the Portland Plan really went beyond traditional planning work, and emphasized equity, which has really informed the work of the Bureau. CIC members offered comments about the work of the committee over the years.

- Equity needs to be the focus of all planning work.
- It's important to have space at every level of planning and decision-making for honest and open conversations between staff and community members, which has been the case with this committee.

The body agreed unanimously to accept the past meeting minutes.

Community Involvement Program

BPS staff reviewed the Community Involvement Program. Staff are developing the Proposed Draft, and working through the comments submitted on the Discussion Draft. Staff noted a few themes of comments, including multiple comments about improving the readability of the document and comments about language choice, particularly on the use of the words “community” vs “citizen” and “involvement” vs “engagement”. Staff said that the Proposed Draft will use “community involvement” to describe the full range of engagement activities with individuals and community members and explained the rationale – the term “citizen” can be intimidating to non-citizens and to members of communities with many non-citizen members, and “community” is more welcoming than “public”. “Involvement” is consistent with state and city policy language, and can be considered to encompass the full range of public participation activities on the IAP2 spectrum.



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | www.portlandonline.com/bps
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

- CIC member asked how we can standardize the use of “community” (as opposed to “citizen”) by City staff and officials.

- Staff: it’s a slow education process

Staff reviewed the structure for a new Community Involvement Committee to advise community involvement activities and practices related to legislative projects, and asked CIC members to provide their feedback, as veterans of a very relevant committee.

- CIC members asked for clarification about the role of ONI in the new CIC.
 - Staff confirmed that ONI will not host this body, but will help with setting up the committee. A CIC member suggested that the Office of Equity and Human Rights should also be involved, and staff agreed.
- Call it CIC or rename it? State says “Citizen Involvement Committee”. Something catchier. Seems formalized.
- To keep the committee fresh, need to keep revisiting and refreshing charge and agenda.
- Membership recruitment and retention was discussed.
 - Staff: ONI will help set up the process for recruiting and chartering the new committee. It’s helpful to have another bureau involved, as BPS staff should have a little distance from the process.
 - Important to have Office of Equity involved as well, to better include non-geographic communities
 - CIC members discussed the pros and cons of term limits.
 - Terms should be staggered, so that everybody doesn’t end all at the same time.
 - Term limits can help avoid burnout/fadeout.
 - However, it takes a while to get up to speed, and to go through the “forming storming norming” process and come together, and many projects take more than two years. Three-year terms?
 - CIC members suggested allowing option for renewal for people who are very committed. (It was noted that some of the members who have served the longest have also been the most reliable in attending meetings and providing feedback.)
 - Recruiting and onboarding new members needs to be thoughtful. Do serious outreach, to people who don’t already know they’re interested.
 - Invite potential members to attend meetings to find out what it’s like, and after they’re appointed, staff and current members should meet with them and support them.
 - Pick an energetic chair. Look for people who will commit and lead.
 - Should have a paid position for community organizer. Or if that’s not possible, maybe a paid consultant to review manual?
 - CIC members requested that staff reach out to past and current CIC members to find out what the barriers to attendance and participation has been. What has contributed to burnout/fadeout in this process would be very useful to explore.

- Staff noted that comments received on the draft suggested that the new CIC include official liaisons to ONI, PSC, budget committee, PIAC, and Office of Equity, and asked for CIC feedback.
 - Yes, communication with staff, Planning and Sustainability Commission, and City Council are important, otherwise the body can just feel pro forma and irrelevant.
 - How would a liaison work? Liaisons would be members of both bodies? Regular reporting between bodies?
 - CIC experience - liaising is demanding and logistically challenging, but very valuable. Liaising with PEGS was very helpful, but that was a short-term commitment. Liaising with PSC has been harder (longer-term, PSC already very taxed)
 - Liaison to all of those groups seems like it would be important, but being member of both would be hard.
 - Committee members could each be given responsibility to liaise with a specific bureau/commissions/committees
 - Really useful to have systems set up for information-sharing, even if it's not officially a liaison.

Task 5 Memo

Staff explained that this is an addendum to the 2015 memo evaluating Task 3 and Task 4 community involvement. Looking at the IAP2 spectrum of public participation, which ranges from inform to empower, the activities for Task 5 focused on “inform” and “consult,” with some projects including some elements in the “involve” and “collaborate” categories. Strong focus on doing strong notification including support for people who get notifications to learn more and testify effectively. Challenge of communicating very complex material in a way that works for as many people as possible. CIC members discussed questions and revisions to the document.

- More info about the context of interpreted calls – what’s the percentage of calls in a given language compared to the population of speakers of that language?
 - Staff: Yes, more context should be added. Note that the notifications went to property owners, not to the whole population of Portland, and we don’t have information about what percentage of language speakers own property.
 - Not surprising that Vietnamese is most-interpreted language on Helpline calls, because there is an established community rather than most recent immigrant communities that are focused on more basic needs, feeding family, making rent. Interested enough to want more information. But people do want playground for kids, sidewalks. Focus where people have needs
- Capacity building – ideally, would have done workshops years in advance (in different languages!) building capacity of CBOs and other organizations to understand what the comp plan is, what land use is.
 - Staff: District liaison program hoping to move in that direction, working to build capacity. Interested in co-developing curriculum of new version of ABCs of Land Use for different organizations - What we want to tell may not be what they want to know about.
 - Some of that work does happen with ONI in diverse civic groups. Those groups already have set-up for leadership training. Good model. Already funding. Would be adding.

- Should be way to send official notices that are more engaging and less dry than the usual land use notices. So convoluted, likely to just get tossed.
 - Staff: Difficult to meet legal requirements and also be engaging, and we're always trying to do better.
 - What about using a cover sheet. Make it engaging, lots of graphics, include attachment with legal language.
 - We did more graphics in Portland Plan- used a visual of "Granny Franny", very engaging.
 - Easier with Portland Plan because visionary. Comp Plan gets into legal details, harder to do
 - PIAC is reviewing City's notification processes across city. Gathering info from potential stakeholders for what works, what doesn't work. Good work trying to make Measure 56 more legible, but there's a bigger need to look at notification in general.
 - Consider example of the way airlines are doing safety presentations now – providing important information in a funny and engaging way.
 - Portland should be famous for making people laugh and learn.
- Map App in other languages?
 - Staff: No. Works decently with Google translate. Not optimal, but functional.
- Staff: Along the graphics line, added icon to reports showing where project is in the process. Makes a tiny bit more manageable.
 - That graphic raises the issue of how to engage people toward the end of a long process. Have heard from people that it looks daunting – if that much process has already happened, why bother getting involved now? How can we keep the process transparency but also make it feel more inviting for people to engage?
- Make sure to note the places where we've fallen short.
 - Staff: after the overview, the memo dives into each project. Elements under each about challenges. Should we move some of these themes to the earlier section?
- At some level, this memo needs to address the bigger picture issue of Comp Plan being too complicated. Driven by state process. It really is too big. Many timelines, multiple projects, shifting deadlines, overlapping, amending each other. People struggle to understand and identify what they need and want to take action on. Hard on staff too.
- Need to note that products need to be more readable. Each document is filled with terms and jargon. Every large document should have a glossary. Jargon can't always be avoided, but important to define.
- Started process with big open houses, strong attendance. Tighter timelines later in the process means that groups with large membership aren't able to do the necessary process to develop positions. For district coalitions, information has to filter out through the neighborhood associations and their land use committees, then positions have to come back through that whole system with proper process to ensure that they're representative and are actually consensus opinions. Neighborhoods first, then land use committee, then board of directors. Can be very informed, but not coming to consensus.
- People learning things last-minute are very fearful. Needed to know up front that it was going to be a long, long process.
- Places that are already experiencing explosive growth are particularly challenged by process, because they already feel overwhelmed and not heard.
- City Council's amendment process for Task 4 has been problematic.

- Staff: Memo is about Task 5, but we will try to find a way to communicate this issue in memo.
- Even places where people are okay with the proposed amendment, they are upset about the speed with which the process is unfolding, and the lack of time to work through issues. This creates unnecessary tension. Fairness, inclusion. How do we communicate plans and amendments to plans in timely orderly process. Everyone even possibly impacted should learn about them.
- Many amendments just make language clearer, and some are huge. Flaw in system for Council.
- “Missing Middle” housing amendment in particular has been really problematic. Alarms people because it’s not clear what would actually follow.
- Measure 56 has great integrity, but the notices don’t go to adjacent owners/residents. Post on property physically? Notify people impacted by change? Not that they necessarily have a say, but they should be notified so they can choose to comment.

Staff note that the memo must be presented to PSC on May 24th. Before then, updated numbers will be added, the outreach log updated and reformatted, and narrative about the concern about the size and scope of the project will be added to the main body of the memo as an overarching theme. The draft will be sent out to CIC members for a final review before being submitted to PSC. CIC members agreed unanimously (Laura Stewart not on the phone any more) to support the memo’s transmission to PSC with the changes that were discussed.

Some CIC members tentatively agreed to present to the PSC on May 24th. Staff will follow up to schedule a meeting of those volunteers to talk about presentation. One member suggested that the statement to PSC should emphasize that the Portland Plan should shine through the Comprehensive Plan.

Thanks and appreciations exchanged. There was no public comment. Meeting adjourned at 11 a.m.