

Citywide Public Involvement Task Force

Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2003

Task Force member Attendance: Bryan Aptekar, Parks; JoAnn Bowman, Bowman Consulting; Willie Brown, NE Coalition; Laurel Butman, OMF; Sik Yin Chan, Portland Impact; Nancy Chapin, APNBA; Phil Colombo, Central NE Neighbors; Jim Francesconi; Jim Gladson, BES; Tim Hall, Water; Brian Hoop, ONI; Arlene Kimura, East NA's; Lynn Lnox, BHCD; Sy Kornbrodt, Mult. Co. CAC; Jeanne Lawson, Jeanne Lawson & Associates; Paul Leistner; Patti McCoy, Columbia Corridor Assoc; Jake Oken-Berg, youth rep.; Anne O'Malley, Portland Habilitation Center; Jerry Powell, GREAT; Scott Seibert, Metro CAC; Corinne Weber, SWNI.

Guests in Attendance: David Nemo, PDC; Don MacGillivray, Buckman; Jeanne Westgard, CPP; Jim Karlock, North PDX resident; David Ashton, East County News

Approval of Minutes: Minutes approved for July 23, 03 meeting.

Updates

- ❑ Brian introduces two new Task Force members, Sik Yin Chan, Portland Impact, and Anne O'Malley, Portland Habilitation Center, representing low-income and people with disabilities constituencies respectively.
- ❑ Agenda includes presentations on progress made by each workgroup. Most of presentations were simply outlining what was in documents handed out.

Principles Workgroup

- ❑ Paul Leistner and Jeanne Lawson presented.
- ❑ Group identified broad categories that needed to be addressed listed in bold. Included concepts related to those topics from existing principles adopted by City of Portland, Metro, Multnomah County, SW Community Plan, and International Association for Public Participation.
- ❑ Crafted a purpose statement and commentary on why effective public involvement is important to give the document a conceptual framework. Effective participation leads to better decisions, legitimacy, and accountability.
- ❑ SW residents are actively advocating for incorporation of SW Community Plan ideas into recommendations.

Accountability Workgroup

- ❑ Jim Gladson presented.
- ❑ Outlined three broad categories including:
 - ❑ Codification: Where do we place these rules? Ordinance, comp plan, standard operating procedures, best practices manual?

- ❑ Structural: What are the checklists bureaus should go through to ensure they are doing adequate public involvement?
- ❑ Review and investigation: What is our role to shine the light on an issue? How do we utilize the Ombud's Office to assist?

Commissioner Francesconi

- ❑ Commissioner Francesconi made a few comments.
- ❑ Key issues:
 - ❑ Wants to move the City from less public information only and more public involvement.
 - ❑ Bureaus need to coordinate public involvement efforts more.
 - ❑ Supports creation of standard operating procedures.
 - ❑ Need to have early notice and frequent engagement with public.

Diversity Workgroup

- ❑ Brian Hoop presented key issues being considered:
 - ❑ Need adequate funding for quality outreach to diverse constituencies.
 - ❑ Bureaus need to be accountable to reach diverse constituencies.
 - ❑ Fund community groups to provide leadership training.
 - ❑ Train staff in cultural competency skills and use of popular education.
 - ❑ Make contracting procedures more accessible for women, minority, and emerging small businesses.
 - ❑ Public involvement efforts need to be accessible to non-english speakers and people with disabilities.

Education and Training Workgroup

- ❑ Brian Hoop presented key issues being considered:
 - ❑ Provide adequate leadership training for neighborhood association system as well as efforts to build leadership capacity in communities of color, etc.
 - ❑ Staff need ongoing skills training in public involvement best-practices and cultural competency skills.
 - ❑ Partner with PSU and school districts to create opportunities for youth to be more engaged with City civic and public involvement efforts.

Communication Workgroup

- ❑ Mary Volm presented key issues being discussed:
 - ❑ Create a public information position to coordinate bureau efforts.
 - ❑ Support citywide public involvement staff network to better coordinate bureau outreach and communication efforts.
 - ❑ Citywide newsletter for more cost-effective distribution of project info.
 - ❑ Better utilization of web-based technologies such as database management, online sign-ups for topical lists, etc.
 - ❑ All PI outreach notices need to list special needs accommodations contact
 - ❑ Better relationship building with diverse media and organizations.

Process Design and Implementation Workgroup

- ❑ Brian Hoop presented update.
- ❑ Acknowledged this group has struggled to merge very complex issues.
- ❑ Group agreement on three major steps for organizing recommendations:
- ❑ Stratum One: Process by which to direct a project into a public involvement or public information process. City staff have been meeting to develop a proposal. (*See David Nemo presentation below.*)
 - ❑ Stratum Two: Process by which a bureau would design a public involvement process.
 - ❑ Stratum Three: Process by which a bureau would implement the public involvement process.
- ❑ General thinking is that every bureau would be required to develop a public involvement policy and that major projects would be required to have a public involvement plan available to the public.

Discussion about workgroup updates

- ❑ Suggestion made to merge committees into the following:
 1. Process and Accountability groups work together.
 2. Diversity and Education groups work together.
- ❑ After consideration it was decided to keep existing workgroup structure.
- ❑ Staff support and steering committee need to identify concepts that are in multiple groups and delegate who is taking lead so as not to duplicate efforts.
- ❑ Suggested tasks for each workgroup:
- ❑ Identify who would implement recommendations.
- ❑ Need to consider fiscal impacts.
- ❑ Identify what implementation timeline might be:
 - ❑ What can be done immediately in first six months.
 - ❑ What can be done in 2-3 years.
 - ❑ What are long-term projects requiring 3+ years.
- ❑ Need to ask bureaus to assist with this effort and consider how staff will be engaged in the development of these ideas.

Presentation by City staff

- ❑ David Nemo outlined staff proposal for criteria to determine which types of major policy, planning and capital improvement projects would require public involvement plans and what would be the main components of those plans. A group of 10+ City staff worked on this.
- ❑ Staff need to see recommendations and time to help decide whether ideas should be ordinances, policies, best practices handbook, etc.
- ❑ Feedback:
- ❑ Interest in role for public in crafting public involvement plans or how do we ensure ongoing engagement of public to improve bureau PI efforts. Neighborhood leaders want to be able to work cooperatively with City on new policy initiatives.

- ❑ This does not stop a bureau from going beyond federal and state mandates.
- ❑ Concern raised this does not address administrative issues such as Police exculsion districts for prostitution, for example.
- ❑ Suggestions for types of issues that should also be included: Police patrol boundaries; tram; big pipe; etc.
- ❑ Does not address how a neighborhood or community group gets an issue into the City planning process.

To Do:

- ❑ Send out staff proposal for feedback from task force members.

Next steps and timeline

- ❑ Laurel explained proposal from steering committee to extend the task force's timeline to allow for an adequate public feedback loop.
- ❑ Group generally supported extending timeline.
- ❑ Suggestions from task force members:
 - ❑ Schedule a Council worksession to update Council on our efforts.
 - ❑ Schedule one-on-one meetings with Council offices to update them.
 - ❑ Need to design a public involvement plan for taking this out to public.
 - ❑ Have 4 hour meetings in Oct./Nov. to allow adequate time for discussion.
 - ❑ Not enough time is allowed to develop defensible recommendations.
 - ❑ Need fiscal impact statements. More expensive recommendations will need more defensible strategies and research.