

BIP #9: Public Involvement DRAFT Meeting Notes
Wednesday, January 25, 2006: 6:30-8:30 PM
Metro, Room 270, 600 NE Grand Ave.

Team Members Present: Eileen Argentina, Jo Ann Bowman, Barbara Hart, Brian Hoop, Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Laurel Butman, Christine Egan, Gay Greger, Tim Hall, Sandra LeFrancois, Rick Williams, Karen Withrow.

Team Members Not Present: Art Alexander, Sarah Bott, Lynne Coward, Sue Dicile, Beth Kaye, Mary Jo Markle, Romeo Sosa.

Staff: Maija Spencer **Guests:** April Burris, Paul Leistner, John Ryan, Jonah Willbach.

1. Notes from December 14, 2006

It was moved by Karen & seconded by Eileen to approve notes. The team approved the notes as they stand.

2. Public Comments

John Ryan shared his ideas and work on systems design. He asked how he could share more detailed information with the group. It was suggested that he submit papers to the committee for further information.

Paul Leistner recommended to the group that any new team members be carefully selected. This group's work can be confusing, so it would be best to choose members who have had experience engaging with the City in the past.

4. Report on Implementation Team Meeting – December 2, 2006

Eileen reported on this team's work at the Bureau Innovation Project Implementation Team meeting in December, which happens monthly and is attended by Council, the Mayor, bureau directors, and various BIP team representatives. She described the list of tools this team will make and our relationship with the work of BIP #8 and #1 (visioning project). She stressed the need for a commitment from bureau directors to make any product work. There was a lot of support from the group present, and the general consensus was that this team is on the right track. It was suggested that this team should look at what the police and environmental services use for public involvement plans.

It was asked if there was any concern expressed by the bureau directors about strict requirements for bureaus vs. voluntary requirements. At this meeting, there was not.

5. Update on meeting with the Mayor – January 4, 2006

A group made of members from BIP teams #1, 8, & 9 met in November to coordinate efforts. At this meeting, group members asked to hear more about the Mayor's vision and his charge for the teams. This meeting was set-up for January, as part of BIP #8's regular team meeting, and BIP #9 was invited as guests. The agenda was planned for the Mayor to talk for 15 minutes, but this was not the case – the mayor stayed about an hour

& a half. Those who were at this meeting shared their impressions with the team, including:

- The Mayor gave pretty wide parameters to BIP #8 – giving his trust to the team to come up with the best outcomes.
- The Mayor was briefed to talk on #8, not #9, so there was some confusion. The purpose of the meeting was to talk about BIP #8's goals and the Mayor's vision of community governance, but this was not clear to all attending.
- Community governance involves building partnerships and breaking down walls between government & public. The traditional role has been the public making a list of problems for government to fix, but community governance envisions the public playing a role in coming up with solutions. For more explanation, go the Mayor's website and read the transcript of his speech for the State of the City (1/20/06).
- The Mayor's message reinforced this group's work, as we need to change the bureaucracy of the City and provide a better way for the public to be heard.

6. Re-visit/re-affirm our charge/next steps

Elizabeth reviewed the team's assignment. The Mayor's office chose 1 of the 30 recommendations from the previous public involvement task force for this team to tackle. We cannot achieve all 30 recommendations at once. Starting with public involvement standards is good, as the public commonly complains there are not consistent standards.

She drew the diagram below on the white board:

Level of Public Involvement

Least -----**Most**

(light bulbs) -----(ice rink @Pio Sq)

Type of project.

- List of types of activities to be done (mailing, forum, etc) for that type.
- Requirements/criteria (such as time frame)

**There would be boxes for each type of project across the spectrum above.

- **Least:** An example would be light bulbs - the City changes light bulbs without consulting the public, and the public does not expect to be asked.
- **Most:** An example of this would be building an ice rink in Pioneer Square. Most of the public would expect to have a role in this decision.

Along this continuum, this team will be identifying and figuring out the types of boxes along the spectrum and what the parameters are for each.

Questions may include (this list may not be complete):

- What's the timeline
- What's the scope (geographic etc)
- What the policy implications – precedent in charter, code, laws
- URGENCY? – allows an out if there are emergency matters
- What's the cost?
- Precedent – mandates – must do (i.e. transportation projects)
- What is the level of community interest?
- What's the history of the project?

Most bureaus do this intuitively, but it is not written down. This is not a rigid system – we are creating parameters around types of projects, such as: with this type of project, there should be at least a year notice or a certain minimum amount of public involvement.

This team's job:

- What are the types of projects?
- How many boxes?
- What are the scope/characteristics used to fit projects into boxes?

Elizabeth noted that, in a prior discussion, Paul Leistner had offered to reconvene the original PI task force to go through the issues and decide where the remaining issues fit in. This group could create a list for the future work to be done.

Q: What about how the public brings in their ideas to the city? Where does the intake flowchart fit in? **A:** This should work regardless of where the project originates. The bigger question is how do we identify and move projects to actually get tackled?

Key points from the discussion:

- Many bureaus get 10-15 requests a week from the public for projects they want in their park. It is not always possible to go thru an elaborate process for every single thing. Need criteria for when to move into public involvement process.
- Most projects that end up as large public involvement projects had public input in the early planning stages or came from a previous public involvement project. With long-term plans, the public needs to be reminded that there was a lengthy public involvement process a decade (or more) ago that led to this project happening now. Public involvement staff should provide a fact sheet or some information on the history of the project.
- This approach seems to fit with the Public Involvement task force recommendations.
- The next step would be evaluation – should we come up with a requirement for bureaus to evaluate public involvement processes?
- There might be a way to include Christine's flowcharts into this continuum.

- It was noted that Metro’s guide is more at the toolbox level. It does not examine where projects actually fit into the continuum.
- IAP2 (www.iap2.org) has a continuum that is much like this and is commonly used by public involvement practitioners. Others have already done similar processes, so we don’t have to make this up completely – just agree on the details.
- The process should also include what things you would do in every phase of the project – from scoping to planning to the end of the project.
- The team was reminded the outreach and involvement handbook is on the BIP #9 website (<http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/index.cfm?&a=98503&c=39102>). Anyone can comment on the site on how to improve and update it.
- Each level should have a minimum number of activities, but it should advise that more can always be done, especially as a project evolves and grows.
- Build in some course correction step or a check-in – so you pay attention to the warning signs that you may not have decided on the right level of public involvement. Staff doesn’t always realize that a project would be such a big deal.
- Should we add council-directed projects? Bureaus often do not have a lot of say in these projects.

Next Steps:

- Brainstorm what else can go in list of questions, and then figure out what criteria fits each project.

7. Goal Statement Review

The goal statement was reviewed to see if it still is accurate for this team’s work. It was agreed that the boards & commission piece should be dropped for now, due to time constraints. This team could recommend that it becomes part of another process.

It was decided that “projects” applies many things – projects, plans, etc. that have effects. Perhaps “projects” could be replaced by “city activities.”

8. New community members: This team has lost several community members. Please submit any ideas before the next meeting to Eileen, JoAnn and/or Maija for community members you know that would be good additions to the team.

9. Next meeting: location

It was agreed that rather than changing meeting locations every time, meeting in this space at Metro would be convenient for all. Karen will confirm the room’s availability.

Follow-up Note: Karen has confirmed that Metro is available for subsequent team meetings and she has reserved the room. The BIP #9 Team will be meeting at Metro in Room 270 for the remainder of our scheduled meetings.